



*Our plan – Our future*

# Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan

**Residents Survey Analysis Report**

**July 2012**

**Gill Porter  
Shropshire RCC**



## Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire Analysis

The data input and data analysis was carried out independently by Gill Porter, Community & Rural Development Coordinator at Shropshire RCC. Unless otherwise stated, percentages are given as a percentage of the total number of respondents.

Survey forms were distributed to the 1300 homes in the parish initially and the 721 responses are equivalent to a response rate of 55.4%. Questionnaires could either be completed on behalf of the household, or individuals were able to complete their own questionnaire. Only section 6, Housing – Identifying Needs, was limited to one response per household. Questionnaires were returned using either the online facility or were collected by volunteers, and forwarded to Shropshire RCC.

Age Ranges	No. and % of respondents
14 – 18	13 (1.8%)
19 – 25	15 (2.1%)
26 – 35	22 (3.1%)
36 – 45	75 (10.4%)
46 – 55	91 (12.6%)
56 – 65	196 (27.2%)
66 – 75	178 (24.7%)
76 – 85	98 (13.6%)
Over 85	23 (3.2%)

Table 1: Summary of age ranges of respondents

1.3% of respondents did not provide their personal information

### Providing Houses

84.3% (587) respondents agreed that the Neighbourhood plan should allocate land for affordable housing for local needs, but this dropped to just 52.7% (355) who felt land should be allocated for open market housing.

In terms of scale of development of individual housing schemes within Much Wenlock Town 297 respondents wanted no more than 10 houses and 251 wanted between 11 and 25 houses. Just 61 respondents wanted more than 50 houses.

Respondents were able to opt for more than one option with the type of homes they thought should have priority:

Types of homes to be given priority	No. and % of respondents
For Housing Associations to let	345 (51.6%)
Sheltered homes to buy/or rent	332 (49.7%)
To be sold at market prices	252 (37.7%)
Homes with shared equity	224 (33.5%)

Table 2: Type of homes that should be given priority

Over half of respondents (59%, 395) felt that no more than 50 new homes should be built by 2026, with just 19.7% wanting no more than 100, and 12.9% no more than 200. Just 2.4% felt that no more than 500 homes should be built.

Just over half (54.2%, 345) respondents felt that new homes should be built on the edge of town or elsewhere in the parish.

366 comments were received about locations that respondents felt were suitable for new houses, these were counted by individual reference. Of the total comments received 46 comments (12.6% of comments) stated no locations were suitable. The top 10 locations and number of respondents are listed in table 3.

Location for new houses	No. of respondents (% of comments received)
Bridgnorth Road	60 (16.4%)
Morris Corfield Site	54 (14.8%)
Hunters Gate	28 (7.7%)
Near primary school	28 (7.7%)
Quarries	28 (7.7%)
Scoltocks Yard	16 (4.4%)
Around Gaskell Field	15 (4.1%)
Travis Perkins/BT Exchange	15 (4.1%)
Any Brownfield Site	12 (3.3%)
Infill only	12 (3.3%)

Table 3: Locations suitable for new houses

The remaining responses were divided amongst another 55 locations.

The question of location of new houses also raised a number of comments about issues to consider before making any decisions on where homes should be built. These included:

- Current pressure on sewage and drainage systems
- Parking is already an issue, and development needs to be mindful of this
- Will all services be able to support new homes

384 respondents identified locations where houses should not be built. Again additional comments were raised about the capacity of the sewage and drainage systems to cope with more housing. In

addition comments were also made about the need for any development to be sympathetic to, or in keeping with the character of Much Wenlock.

The issues identified in these questions reoccur during the whole questionnaire.

Table 4 shows top 9 locations where houses should not be built.

Locations for no new homes	No. of respondents (% of comments received.
Greenfield/belt/farm land	73 (19.0%)
Much Wenlock Centre	65 (16.9%)
Outside Town Boundary	32 (8.3%)
On potential flood risk areas	24 (6.3%)
Homer	15 (3.9%)
Priory area/parkland	14 (3.6%)
Southfield Road	13 (3.3%)
Gaskell Field	11 (2.9%)
Wenlock Edge Boundary	11 (2.9%)

Table 4: Locations where homes should not be built

The remaining 126 responses were divided amongst another 38 locations.

The last question in this section asked for any other comments respondents may have on housing. 288 (39.9%) respondents completed this question. Many respondents made a number of points, and the actual comments made totalled 488. These have been broken down into three general categories: design, housing needs and general comments or concerns.

55 comments were received about the design of any new housing. Of these 30.1% of comments reflected on the need for the design to be complimentary to the existing town. Other comments included the need for new developments to be of sustainable construction with environmental considerations e.g. grey water recycling effective surface water drainage, and planting to enhance the local area, as well as installation of renewable energy. There were also 4 comments about the need for houses to be designed for families.

144 comments were made about housing needs.

Housing Needs	No of comments
Affordable housing for local/young people	32
General housing for local people	18
Need for rented properties	15
Sheltered Housing	13
Garages/parking needs	10

Table 5: Top 5 housing needs identified from the general comments in question A9

Table 5 shows the top 5 comments received about housing needs for Much Wenlock. The remaining comments were about the need for there to be a variety of sizes and styles of accommodation including apartments and flats, and smaller scale family homes e.g. 2/3 bedroom starter homes.

319 general comments and concerns were raised about new development in Much Wenlock. 17.2% of comments raised concerns about the capability of the sewage and drainage systems to cope with new housing, and the threat of flooding that has already adversely affected many people. 12.9% of comments focussed on the need to preserve the character of Much Wenlock, or were worried that too much new housing would damage the character of Much Wenlock.

Below are a few of the comments received:

*“This is a small historic town and a major part of its beauty is in its small size and historic centre. This is not a town with acres of unused industrial land ripe for conversion to housing estates, not is it a town with a long term interest in becoming a business hub for medium to large scale businesses. This is a town which supports small scale businesses and tourism and houses a reasonable sized community within a limited space development area.”*

*“Much Wenlock is a unique and beautiful historic town of national importance. Its integrity should be protected by not allowing for constant expansion through housing schemes. Further development will change the inherent quality of the town as current services will be inadequate and will need to be expanded also.”*

*“New housing does not have to be a pastiche of historic styles, or characterless boxes. High quality contemporary design should also be encouraged, as long as it is appropriately scaled and respectful of its setting.”*

## Jobs and the Local Economy

There was wide ranging support for a variety of types of employment that should be encouraged except for Transport, storage and distribution, see table 6. Respondents were able to select all those areas that they felt should be encouraged. 64 additional suggestions were made about other types of employment, specifically about the types of shops that would benefit the town e.g. Dress shop, named retailers e.g. Waitrose, Holland and Barratt, florist. Cycle shop was also suggested, which came up later in the questionnaire as well, under ways to encourage more walking and cycling.

Other suggestions included activities or employment within environmental areas e.g. biomass, wood pellet production, local goods and produce.

Type of Employment	No of responses
Tourism, leisure and crafts	505 (73.7%)
Shops – retail	400 (58.4%)
Light industrial and manufacturing	332 (48.5%)
Pubs, restaurants and cafes	301 (43.9%)
Community Services	286 (41.8%)
Food and drink production	261 (38.1%)
Financial and professional services	219 (32.0%)
Offices	216 (31.5%)
Social Enterprises	187 (27.3%)
Transport, storage and distribution	86 (12.6%)

Table 6: Types of employment to be encouraged

Comments made against these selections, and evidenced in other sections of this questionnaire, demonstrate that there is concern amongst residents about the impact on existing infrastructure, particularly roads.

The majority of respondents (446, 67.2%) were in favour of more land being allocated to encourage employment with the majority favouring former quarries (73.9%), brownfield land (63.0%) and existing buildings (77.5%) as the type of sites that could be used in this way. Just 47 respondents (7%) felt Greenfield land should be allocated.

76.6% of respondents felt that land should be allocated for employment within or around Much Wenlock Town, with 46.6% of respondents feeling this should be elsewhere in the parish. Alongside this just over half of respondents (368, 56.4%) felt that existing employment sites should be protected from changes of use.

Only 222 (32.6%) of respondents believe that someone in their family is likely to seek employment in the next 5 years.

Overwhelming support (585, 89.9%) of respondents was for encouragement of working from home.

To encourage new businesses to locate in the parish 407 respondents (74.0%) believed better broadband would help, with 300 (54.5%) believing more purpose built premises would encourage local businesses. 138 additional comments were made about what else would encourage new businesses to locate in Much Wenlock. 27.5% of the comments suggested that rent and rates were a factor and they needed to be affordable, or perhaps have subsidies to encourage businesses to start up. 24.6% of comments cited better transport infrastructure e.g. access roads, parking and public transport.

The final question in this section asked for any additional comments on jobs and employment. 206 comments were received.

Table 7 shows the most common comments received:

Comments received	No. of comments (% of comments received)
Improved roads/parking/public transport	27 (13.1%)
Opportunities available in surrounding towns	24 (11.7%)
Encourage jobs & training for young people	19 (9.2%)
Protect character of Much Wenlock	18 (8.7%)
Small scale only, due to infrastructure	17 (8.3%)
Local jobs for local people	17 (8.3%)
Tourism industry shouldn't be overlooked	14 (6.8%)
Incubator units for business start up	12 (5.8%)
Needs to meet the needs of the community	12 (5.8%)
Promote inward investment	12 (5.8%)

Table 7: Comments about Jobs and Employment

Some queries were raised by respondents about the need for more information before they felt they could comment appropriately.

*“We have no statistics concerning jobs and employment in Much Wenlock.”*

*“It is not clear what meaning is attached to ‘local’ within what area do you define local?”*

## Protecting our Environment

The majority of respondents (685, 97.6%) believe that future development should be in keeping with the town’s character and landscape setting, and this is borne out by some of the comments made under both housing and jobs and employment.

Table 8 shows the responses to the question about what the Neighbourhood Plan should promote in order to protect and enhance the quality of the built environment. Respondents were able to select as many options as they wished.

Protecting and enhancing the built environment	No. of responses (%)
Design that respects the scale of the existing townscape	613 (87.7%)
Use of traditional local building materials	541 (77.4%)
Traditional styles and scale of shop fronts	509 (72.8%)
Green space and gardens within settlements	489 (70.0%)
High levels of energy conservation in new buildings	474 (67.8%)
Better pedestrian and cycle access to the town	370 (52.9%)
Signage, advertising and street furniture that respects the locality	360 (51.5%)
Minimum standards for living space in dwellings	295 (42.2%)

Table 8: Protect and enhance the quality of the built environment

A further 71 comments were received. 10 of those comments suggested that spacious and sympathetic development was required for both retail and housing.

*“We also need to have some new innovative styles in the town. Wenlock should not be frozen in time architecturally.”*

*“The plan should mix good architectural design with spacious and sympathetic development.”*

In addition there was widespread support for other measures, as shown in table 9.

The neighbourhood plan should promote	No. of responses (%)
Enhanced protection of historic and natural features	597 (85.9%)
Improved flood prevention measures	545 (78.4%)
Positive management of the varied local wildlife	462 (66.5%)
Increased provision of green space	353 (50.8%)
Enhanced protection of the landscapes of disused quarries	328 (47.2%)

Table 9: Areas the neighbourhood plan should promote

50 additional comments were received. Concerns were expressed about traffic issues and the pressure this could put on the town, and about the capacity of the sewage and drainage system. A number of comments were also raised about how the quarries could be used for employment and to improve the landscape.

352 comments were made about the buildings, places or views that it is important to protect.

Buildings, places or views important to protect	No. of responses (% of responses)
High Street/Town Centre	84
Windmill Hill & view	70
All historic/traditional buildings	64
Church and surrounding area	54
Wenlock Edge & Woods	52
Wenlock Priory	43
Guildhall	37
Linden Field	29
Surrounding Views	27

Table 10: Buildings, places or views to protect

In total 58 buildings, places or views were identified.

A further 214 general comments were received on protecting the environment. 92 of these comments (43%) raised concerns about flood prevention and the systems in place for warning of potential floods. A further 42 comments were raised about the inadequacy of the current sewage and drainage system and the impact of this.

## Improving Community Services

Table 11 shows the results of those areas that respondents felt the Neighbourhood Plan should aim to improve. Respondents were able to select more than one answer.

Areas to improve	No. of responses (%)
Allotments	239 (33.7%)
Broadband Service	419 (59.1%)
Vehicle parking facilities	477 (67.3%)
Public footpaths	265 (37.4%)
Access for disabled people	292 (41.2%)
Public library	272 (38.4%)
Public transport	410 (57.8%)
Road safety measures	286 (40.3%)
Public toilet facilities	440 (62.1%)
Leisure & recreational facilities	217 (30.6%)
Facilities for young people	404 (57.0%)

Table 11: Areas to improve



When specifically asked about public toilet facilities, 368 (64.8%) respondents identified improvements were needed on Gaskell Field, and 360 (63.4%) identified car parking areas as needing improvement. Again respondents were able to select more than one answer. 182 respondents also felt that improvements were needed to public toilet facilities in the High Street, and 103 (18.1%) selected the cemetery/new allotments site.

A further 78 comments were made that identified 18 different specific locations for public toilets.

Table 12 shows the responses to the questions on how public transport should be improved. Respondents were able to select more than one response.

How public transport should be improved	No. of response (%)
More convenient services to Shrewsbury	265 (50.6%)
More convenient services to Bridgnorth	224 (42.7%)
More convenient services to Telford	415 (79.2%)
Cheaper fares	246 (46.9%)
Greater reliability of services	212 (40.5%)

Table 12: Improvements to public transport

122 additional comments were made about how public transport can be improved, 60 of which were for more regular or frequent services to surrounding towns, especially to support people working or studying in those towns. A further 36 comments identified specific services that would benefit the community, particularly younger people, e.g. evening and weekend services to access leisure and social activities.

The question on how parking facilities could be improved generated 320 comments. 64 comments identified free parking, either for the whole time, or for the first hour, or for residents only, with 27 individual comments suggesting that a residents parking permit or scheme should be introduced to make parking easier for residents, particularly outside their own homes. An additional 17 comments suggesting that parking could be cheaper.

Of the remaining comments suggestions for general improvements to parking e.g. condition of car parks, more parking and more coach parking made up 18 comments.

29 different sites were suggested where new car park facilities could be developed.

181 comments were received about better leisure and recreational facilities. 16 comments (8.8% of comments received) felt that current facilities were good or excellent already.

48 comments (26.5% of comments) suggested improved access to the school's facilities was needed, this was both physical access and the times it was available, the pricing of facilities and the range of activities that are available. Of these comments 11 specifically identified more flexible opening times e.g. at bank holidays.

22 comments (12% of comments) highlighted the need to protect and preserve the current facilities.

Some concerns were also raised about the impact on leisure facilities if the school was to become an Academy and whether these facilities would then be lost to the community. In addition there was concern that part of Gaskell Field had been lost to the school, and that this field should be being run by the local community, not the school or the Town Council.

Facilities for young people prompted 194 comments. 38% (74) of the comments identified the need for a youth club or youth café facility in the town, with a further 31 comments (16% of comments) suggesting somewhere for young people to socialise, both day and evening.

Availability and access to facilities at the school, and activities organised by the school were identified specifically to improve facilities for young people, with 31 comments (16% of comments).

17 comments suggested that the only way to find out what young people want is to ask them. The remaining comments suggested a variety of activities and possibilities for young people, as well as highlighting other areas e.g. improvements to public transport already discussed.

Only 11 comments suggested that no improvements or further facilities were needed.

103 additional comments were received about improving community services, generating over 50 different ideas, with no clear majority in favour of any one.

*"I applaud this survey – people need to be involved and – even more – they need to feel they have a voice which is heard. The crux of a truly working community town might be majorly put down to two way communication."*

## Creating a Sustainable Community

Producing local renewable energy was the first question within this section. A few comments were received about why there was not an option to comment with this question, or offer other alternative views.

The results of which local renewable energy the plan should encourage are shown in table 13.

Ways of producing local energy	No of responses (%)
Domestic wind turbines powering a single home	113 (19.6%)
Commercial wind turbines powering many homes	138 (23.9%)
Hydropower from local streams	289 (50.1%)
Using land for local wood for fuel production e.g. wood, biomass	234 (40.6%)
Photovoltaic solar 'farms' to generate electricity	231 (40.0%)
Use of farm slurry to generate energy	344 (59.6%)

Table 13: Ways of producing local renewable energy to be encouraged

The questions about traffic prompted many comments.

Excessive traffic speed was selected by 422 people (71.3% of respondents) with traffic to pedestrians selected by 357 respondents, excessive traffic volume by 338 respondents and 151 selecting excessive traffic noise.

This was demonstrated further by the comments from 145 respondents who identified three major areas of concern as speed of traffic, number of large vehicles or HGVs and parking issues as issues within the town.

The top 5 areas identified for where traffic problems are in Much Wenlock are shown in table 14. Respondents were able to identify as many areas as they wanted to, and this question prompted 506 comments.

Areas of traffic issues	No. of mentions by respondents
Sheinton Street	124
Barrow Street	121
Gaskell Arms Junction	111
High Street	103
Farley Road	55

Table 14: Areas identified with traffic problems

A further 36 roads, lanes, junctions and areas were identified but only 3 respondents felt that there were no areas with problems.

When asked what could be done to resolve traffic issues 400 respondents identified a number of solutions.

- 76 respondents believed that a bypass was the way to solve the problem.
- 66 respondents believed that speed control and speed warning signs would help – there were also 21 comments about reducing the speed limit to 20 mph, and a further 4 comments that suggested the speed limit on all approach roads should be reduced to 40mph.
- 56 respondents suggested a one way system in the town
- 33 respondents suggested either traffic lights or roundabouts could be used to ease traffic flow particularly at difficult junctions e.g. Gaskell Arms Junction
- 32 respondents also suggested that pedestrianizing the high street would alleviate traffic problems.

There were also a number of comments about general measures that could help or support other factors e.g. weight restrictions on some roads, improved parking and parking enforcement, and general traffic calming measures e.g. speed humps.

When asked about encouraging walking and cycling a number of comments identified that the current situation with traffic made it too dangerous, particularly with width of footpaths, or lack of footpaths in certain areas, speed of traffic, and not having safe crossing points where they are needed.

312 comments were given for encouraging more walking and cycling. 82 comments requesting more walking and cycling routes and safe routes especially for children to get to school. 45 comments suggested that more advertising, route signs and guides for walking and cycling would encourage more people. 27 comments suggested that having secure parking for cycles in a variety of places would encourage more people to use bikes.

A majority of respondents (517, 86.3%) felt that land should be allocated to encourage growing of local food – this was also supported in the next question about a sustainable community which identified local produce/allotments and growing your own food as elements of a sustainable community.

When asked what a Sustainable Community is, there was a wide variety of answers given with 296 comments in total.

Environmental responsibility and awareness as individuals and as a community was suggested by 66 respondents, with a further 32 comments identifying generation of local power, as being part of what a sustainable community is.

65 respondents identified local food/produce/crafts/business as key to being a sustainable community. There were also 18 comments about need for allotments or community gardens and 12 comments about growing your own food.

There were a number of comments that focussed on the community element. 43 comments about supporting the local community and each other, 22 about protecting resources for future generations, 15 about having respect for each other and individual needs and 14 comments about having a balance to the community in respect of ages etc.

## Housing – Identifying Needs

These questions were only answered by 396 people. The percentages given are based on the responses from those who answered only.

Table 15 shows responses for the type of property and table 16 shows the size of property

Description of Property	No. of responses (%)
Owner occupied	230 (58%)
Private rented	47 (11.9%)
Rented from Shropshire Council	35 (8.8%)
Rented from Housing Association	15 (3.8%)
Shared equity (part rent/part purchase)	1 (0.3%)

Table 15: Type of property

Size of the property	No. of responses (%)
One Bedroom	21 (5.3%)
Two Bedroom	57 (14.4%)
Three Bedroom	121 (30.6%)
Four Bedroom	86 (21.7%)
Five or more bedroom	40 (10.1%)

Table 16: Size of property

Only 34 respondents of those that completed this section stated that there were adults or couples within their property looking for their own home within Much Wenlock. Of these not all responded to how many people were looking:

- 10 respondents had 1 person looking, 7 had 2 people looking, 4 had 3 people looking and just 1 person had 4 people looking for property.

Just over half of those looking for property (18, 52.9%) are registered with Shropshire Homepoint.

Of these respondents the majority (53.1%) were looking for 2 bedroom property, with 1 and 3 bedroom properties at 21.9% and 18.8% respectively. Just 6.3% were looking for 4 bedroom property and none were looking for five or more bedrooms.

The type of home they are seeking is as follows:

- 6 (18.8%) Owner occupied
- 13 (43.8%) Rented from Shropshire Council
- 8 (25%) Rented from housing association
- 4 (12.5%) shared equity

When asked if anyone in the home would be looking for property within the next 5 years 63 respondents (21.1%) answered yes.

All respondents identified that the type of property they would be looking for would be for 3 bedrooms or less and would be most likely to seek the following type:

- 25 (41.0%) Owner occupied
- 10 (16.4%) Privately rented
- 13 (21.3%) Rented from the council
- 9 (14.8%) Rented from a Housing Association
- 4 (6.6%) Shared equity

## **And finally.....**

147 further comments were received. These have been categorised and are detailed below:

### **Community**

- Clubs/activities especially for young people, holiday clubs etc
- Community café – for art, music etc with seasonal food
- Foster community spirit, not profit
- Gaskell Field needs proper drainage
- How is the balance of ages/incomes etc to be managed?
- Important to provide care for the elderly
- Need a better village hall
- Needs to be more inclusive

- Need to get people involved and supporting MW
- Older population increasing, and needs to be considered for the future
- Please put the lights on the tree at Christmas by the Church
- Provide for young people
- Should not become just a commuter town
- Sometimes disproportionate interests of older people represented
- Town seems less friendly now, people are less inclined to get involved
- What support is there for volunteering, gaining grants/fundraising?

#### **Economic**

- Need to create sustainable employment
- Prices in MW are too high, inflated for tourists.

#### **Environment**

- AONB – do not damage
- Centre for recycling needed
- Countryside needs to be fit for purpose e.g. walkers, cyclists
- Dog waste bins needed
- Hydro power on local streams?
- Lack of ecological considerations
- Need trees, green spaces, seating in town, flowers
- No large wind turbines
- Stop flytipping

#### **Flooding**

- Become worse as result of new building
- Many are probably unaware of the problems
- More housing could make flooding worse
- Need reassurances that flooding will not happen before any further development takes place

#### **General**

- Developments in Telford should not encroach into Wenlock
- Economic stimulation is needed across the county, not just in MW
- I don't want the town to change
- It is increasingly expensive to live/work in MW – rates, rents etc are all sky high
- Leave in good condition for future generations
- Much Wenlock is a gem
- Nearly losing our unique character
- Preserve the unique character of MW and the surrounding countryside
- Protect the character and style of this unique place
- Shropshire Council services are expensive and poor
- There is no where I would rather live, but that's because of the people
- Unique character is because of its mixed heritage and architecture
- We are very fortunate to live here – don't destroy it
- We should protect what makes MW special
- Wenlock needs to be conserved and protected, it needs to remain special
- Wenlock should be a place to live, not a museum
- What did Lady Forester give land for?
- What is most important, value for money or a sustainable community

## Planning/Development

- Affordable housing needed
- Any housing should fulfil a need, not just be built because there is space
- Avoid large, bland housing estates
- Before any further housing is considered implications of additional traffic need to be worked out
- Better infrastructure needed before any development takes place
- Can the Neighbourhood Plan monitor what developers do?
- Can the property on Gaskell corner be renovated – currently an eyesore
- Could small blocks of apartments/flats be considered?
- Danger with too much development is that MW becomes a dormitory town or retirement town
- Development has many knock on effects e.g. pressure on parking in town etc
- Development limits reached
- Don't allow new developments to make existing problems worse
- Don't let this be only about only those who can pay – but who bring nothing to the community life of this town
- Do not extend the town planning boundaries
- Emotion should not cloud judgement
- Feel let down and overlooked re housing
- History of lack of control of planning conditions
- Homer is not suitable for any development
- How does MW safeguard against inability to take action when things go wrong?
- How do we support young people who want to stay in MW?
- It is not our responsibility to provide homes for anyone who wants them
- Level of development proposed by Shropshire Council is completely unsustainable
- Medical services will need to expand if more homes are built
- Modern design can be exciting and attractive, but requires thought and money
- No more residential housing
- Over development in recent years
- People who object to new housing, need to think about the other side of the story
- Planners will do exactly what they want to do, regardless
- Plans should consider a variety of needs, not just standard family homes
- Pointless to provide housing, if there are no jobs to support them
- Priority should be for smaller (2/3 bed) family homes to encourage younger people to live in MW
- Sheltered housing is needed close to town
- Shropshire Council's suggestion of 500 houses is senseless – we can say no!
- Small scale, environmentally sympathetic development only
- There must be a need and it must be sustainable
- There should not be change for changes sake.
- This is 21<sup>st</sup> Century not middle ages – individuals must take responsibility for themselves
- Town is in danger of losing its identity if development continues in the way it has over the last 10 yrs
- Use brownfield sites first
- Use old quarries to expand MW
- Wenlock must grow and adapt to the future
- Wenlock should be a place to aspire to
- What about those who wish to downsize?

- Why are taxpayers being asked to pay towards homes for other people?
- Why does new development have to be modern – why can't it be in keeping with what's already there?

### **Tourism**

- All decisions need to reflect MW as a tourist destination
- Dependent on parking for cars/coaches, improved public toilets and a range of shops
- Encourage people to stay longer – better signs to car parks, less traffic in centre
- More walks needed around the beautiful countryside
- Need to think about how the town looks to people visiting or passing by
- Tourism should not be forgotten – think about why people come here
- What about Wenlock memorabilia/souvenir – not just the Olympics ones? A Wenlock brand

### **Town**

- Can something be done about the undeveloped plot of land in the high street
- Greater variety of shops – not charity shops
- Keep it as the thriving little town it is now
- Landscape area next to old Barclays Bank
- More choice of shops needed to serve local needs, not tourists
- Need a fish and chip shop
- Need a permanent police station
- Need office based accommodation for organisations to share (VCO's)
- Need to encourage local people to use the town rather than go elsewhere
- No large retail developments
- No more tea shops/cafes – they are of no use to residents
- No supermarket
- Pedestrianise the High St – reduces traffic and pollution and makes it nicer for shoppers
- Positive – that shops are small independent retailers, not chains or franchises
- Town needs TLC – pavements, buildings, hedges, toilets, open spaces
- We are not here to compete with Telford/Shrewsbury etc – keep it small and rural
- Wenlock is a beautiful town, let's keep it that way – it needs to be kept alive by diversifying and expanding sensitively
- What about a Saturday street market to bring people into the town?
- Why isn't MW town in the AONB?

### **Town Council**

- Needs to be more in touch with local people
- Town Councillors are too far removed from the town to make the right decisions

### **Traffic**

- Allow cars to park part on the pavement to keep roads free
- Bypass for MW is essential
- Improve public transport – would specifically help young people to access services/education
- More parking needed
- Not safe to cross roads, or walk on pavements
- One way traffic system
- Parking issues need to be resolved or people will go elsewhere
- Remove bridge leading to Southfield Rd
- Traffic calming measures needed



- Traffic issues have been around a long time
- Variety of issues incl: cars on pavements, large vehicles in the town

### Survey

- A pity the questions don't allow us to rank our opinions
- Allow flexibility in the plan – don't tie every detail down
- Are the committee strong enough to stand up to developers and landowners.
- Be careful that good ideas are not shouted down before they are given a chance
- Can you keep people better informed about progress?
- Concerned that others will learn from the mistakes in MW
- Congratulations to all those who have tried to make a difference to this town
- Congratulations to the group who formulated this questionnaire
- Have completed form as part of civic duty, but no confidence it will change anything
- Each case should be judged on its own merits – Neighbourhood Plan should not exclude all other possible options – still need to think about progress
- Engagement of all residents is vital
- Go for a legacy to be proud of
- Have the school children been consulted – seek the views of the next generation
- Hope all comments will be taken into account
- How is this survey different – nothing constructive ever happens
- Is the first question in section F right?
- Issues are incredibly complex – don't feel have enough information to answer all questions
- It is likely only adults will complete this survey
- Need evidence based research on what makes small towns viable, without what makes them special being lost.
- Need good leadership and communication to develop a balanced view the get community support for it
- No question on whether young people who have left the area would like to move back and why they can't?
- No question on the needs of older or disabled residents and their needs for accommodation
- Please allow sufficient time for people to get involved – for various reasons we only had 1 day to complete it.
- Please remove the signs advertising this project – they serve no purpose – was planning permission sought to put them up
- Poorly constructed with areas of ambiguity
- Survey completed jointly (as a couple) – several comments made
- Survey has potential to be of little or limited use
- Survey is about physical aspects – what about services?
- Survey is pointless – it doesn't confront over population or over employment in the public sector
- Survey states all can complete but only one per household delivered.
- Thank you for the chance to put our views
- Thank you for the opportunity to participate and for preparing the survey
- Thank you to all the volunteers
- The plan has already been decided, and this survey is just letting us think we've had a say
- The resulting plan should be very clear, with no loopholes
- There are many different views even within households
- There is a concern this is a 'tick box' exercise and views will not be taken seriously or acted on.

- This is the first information received about the Neighbourhood Plan, knew nothing about it before this survey
- This plan is too narrow a focus
- This should be driven by the residents of the town not town councillors
- This survey should have been sent to every individual.
- Too much time talking – let's see action and results
- We have been through this before and nothing has changed
- Website is excellent, but not everyone has access to internet or computers.
- What a stupid survey
- What you are doing seems sensible
- Will this survey be added to the responses from all the other surveys in the last 5 years
- Why are there no questions about schools
- Why is this survey any different? Previous referendum was ignored by everyone especially planners