

**Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan: Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan Feedback Survey
(Regulation 14 Consultation)**

Spatial Strategy and Housing Policies	
Policy MW1: Supporting Sustainable Development	Agree
Policy MW2: Meeting Local Housing Needs	Agree
Comments:	
<p>Policy MW1</p> <p>Whilst we agree with the principle of supporting (and delivering) Sustainable Development, we disagree with Part B of the Policy.</p> <p>As currently worded, the Policy is restrictive and is at odds with not only the drive to deliver housing in sustainable locations which is at the forefront of the Government's directive but also Policy SP4 of the emerging Shropshire Local Plan ('eSLP').</p> <p>Further, part B (as drafted) ignores Shropshire's Council's assessment of sites and that of Site MUW006 (Land to the rear to the cemetery and north of Oakfield Park, Much Wenlock) that was rated as 'Good' in both the Overall Settlement Sustainability Conclusion and Overall Black Country Contribution Sustainability Conclusion that supported the eSLP. In part, the conclusions made by the Council are linked to how the Site would seamlessly connect into the existing pattern and form of development and offer opportunities to enhance existing services alongside improved public footpath connections to the Town (all of which would be within the 10-minute walk of the Town Centre which is shown at Figure 5 of the revised Neighbourhood Plan).</p> <p>In summary, the way in which the policy is drafted will not only limit the delivery of housing but will also reduce the benefits that are associated. In particular, the ability to deliver not only much needed housing (of all types and tenures), but also, development that can assist with a solution in providing mitigation to address the existing issues of flooding that is experienced in the Town through the provision of a flood attenuation scheme that can be delivered (alongside residential development).</p> <p>This goes to the heart of sustainable development and in taking the approach as proposed by Policy MW1 (B), it ignores the drive for locating residential development that is sustainable. This is intrinsically linked to the spatial strategy and ensuring there is a mix and range of sites allocated, delivered in the right locations, supported by the necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy MW2</p> <p>Whilst we agree with the policy, reference should be made to development meeting the up to date needs as set out in the most recent Housing Needs Assessment. This will then ensure development delivers the type and tenure of housing that is required.</p> <p>In terms of the level of affordable housing, it is imperative that the Neighbourhood Plan accords with Policy DP3 of the eSLP in securing a level of 20% for development in south Shropshire.</p>	

Reducing Flood Risk Policies	
Policy MW10: Flooding and Drainage	Strongly Agree
Policy MW11: Sustainable Drainage and Management	Strongly Agree
Comments:	
<p>Policy MW10</p> <p>Whilst we strongly agree with the Policy, to assist with positive place making and planning, we want to highlight the importance of supporting development that can offer solutions to assist with providing mitigation to address the existing flooding issues in the Town. We therefore suggest additional wording should be added at Criteria A as follows:</p> <p>“Sites which can deliver flood mitigation and reduce runoff to the Town alongside securing wider benefits, including but not limited to, residential development/net gains in Biodiversity/formal areas of open space, should be supported”.</p> <p>Policy MW11</p> <p>We strongly support the policy as this is imperative to secure positive and good place making.</p>	

Transport and Movement Policies	
Policy MW12: Improving Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Opportunities	Strongly Agree
Policy MW14: Mitigating Vehicular Impacts at Junctions and Pinchpoints	Strongly Agree
Comments:	
<p>Policy MW12</p> <p>Whilst we strongly agree with the policy, sites which are located within sustainable locations (see Figure 12 in the revised Neighbourhood Plan) and offer opportunities to deliver upon the objectives (of the policy) through enhancement of existing, cycle and pedestrian routes (see table 6 which lists out the improvements for Much Wenlock's walking network that includes proposals for Bridgnorth Road) alongside securing possible traffic calming measures, should be supported.</p> <p>Policy MW14</p> <p>Whilst we strongly support the principle of the policy, we suggest 'supported and' should be added in part B so it reads:</p> <p><i>Development which provides new transport infrastructure or improves existing transport infrastructure should be supported and designed to maximise use by pedestrians, those with mobility impairments and cyclists.</i></p> <p>This will then allow a clear objective to be set by the Town Council and one in which can be measured through delivery/implementation.</p>	

Community Well-Being Policies	
Policy MW15: Improving Opportunities for Community and Cultural Facilities, Sport and Recreation	Strongly Agree
Comments:	
<p>Policy MW15</p> <p>Whilst we strongly agree with the policy and in particular part B, specific reference should be made to how new residential development can deliver upon the objectives of this policy.</p>	

Good Quality Design, Local Character, and Heritage Policies	
Policy MW18: Character and Design of Development	Strongly Agree
Policy MW19: Energy Efficiency and Mitigating Climate change	Strongly Agree
Policy MW20: Conserving Heritage Assets	Strongly Agree
Comments:	
<p>Policy MW18</p> <p>We strongly support the principle of the policy as this is fundamental in delivering upon the objectives of sustainable development.</p> <p>Policy MW19</p> <p>We strongly support the principle of the policy as this is fundamental in delivering upon the objectives of sustainable development. Further, this is a fundamental design aspect of the buildings we build, and the holistic approach taken to the development and delivery of our sites.</p> <p>Policy MW20</p> <p>We strongly support the principle of the policy.</p>	

Green and Open Spaces, Local Landscape and Wildlife Policies	
Policy MW22: Recreation Open and Play Space	Strongly Agree
Policy MW23: Green and Blue Infrastructure and Delivering Biodiversity Net Gain	Strongly Agree
Policy MW24: Landscape and Environment	Agree
Policy MW25: Dark Skies	Agree
Comments:	
<p>Policy MW22</p> <p>We strongly agree with the principle of the policy and support the need for on-site delivery. This is a fundamental objective of successful place making and design.</p> <p>Policy MW23</p> <p>We strongly support the principles of the policy as it aligns with those set by the Environment Act.</p> <p>Policy MW24</p> <p>Whilst we support the principle of the policy, it needs to ensure consistency with Policy DP12 of the eSLP. For example, there is no such requirement in the eSLP for 20% tree canopy in locations such as Much Wenlock. This requirement should therefore be removed.</p> <p>Policy MW25</p> <p>We support the policy as this forms a key aspect of the design process.</p> <p>Implementation</p> <p>Whilst we support the Neighbourhood Plan Review, it is imperative this is kept under review and monitored so that it aligns with emerging policy from both a national and local perspective.</p> <p>This is particularly important in consideration of the recently revised National Planning Policy Framework and the updated Standard Method for calculating Housing Land Supply with the latter document increasing the housing requirement for Shropshire by 86% (from a standard method of 1,070 dwellings per annum ('dpa') to 1,994 dpa).</p> <p>We therefore suggest clear reference is made as to when any Review would be undertaken considering changes at both a national and local level.</p>	