

Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan – Summary of representations submitted to the Examiner

Name	Organisation	Summary of Comments
Rachel Bust	The Coal Authority	No specific comments
David Hammond	Natural England	<p>The approach and methodology used in the preparation of the Plan is in line with advice that would be offered by Natural England. Relevant legislation and documents have been referenced and we are pleased to see consideration of the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Management Plan undertaken.</p> <p>Objectives cover the areas and issues Natural England would wish to see cover in local plans, and we acknowledge the Town Council's links and cross referencing of objectives within the document to support sustainable development.</p> <p>Subject to the above Natural England have no substantive comments to make in respect of this Plan</p>
Lucy Blasdale	Homes and Communities Agency	No specific comment. Broadly supportive of proposals.
Mark Davies	Environment Agency	<p>Suggest that additional work should be undertaken and Severn Trent Water be consulted to ensure waste water treatment works issues have been addressed, for example with reference to their Periodic Review 2014 (PR14) process/Asset Management Plan (AMP). Depending on the outcome of this, EA would advise that the Neighbourhood Plan may require a phasing policy linked to the necessary improvements. Depending on the scale of growth envisaged there could be a legal agreement (contributions) to accelerate the necessary improvement works.</p> <p>Recommend that Objective 3 could be reworded to: „reducing flood risk, protecting, improving and enhancing local water quality and water resources’. The policies within this objective could then be aimed at the relevant water issue i.e. flood risk,</p>

		<p>water quality, water resources or combination of the above.</p> <p>Reasons for the policy and supporting evidence base could include waste water treatment and quality considerations, with reference to the Water Framework Directive (WFD) objectives</p> <p>In relation to ground water and Source protection Zones (SPZ) reference should be made to EA Groundwater Policy and Practice (GP3) to protect controlled waters and meet WFD objectives. A signpost to this could be included within the plan.</p> <p>Support for policies RF3 and RF4.</p> <p>Recommend that “potential” flooding issue is identified for site RES1 and other locations as appropriate. Recommend that this issue be clarified in the plan with information submitted to demonstrate that the development numbers proposed can be accommodated on this site, in consultation with the Council’s Floods and Water Management team, having regard to the Sequential Test as set out in the NPPF and supporting technical guidance/reference to Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy. It may be that on-site design and/or other strategic mitigation are necessary to ensure a sustainable development and a safe development in line with the NPPF.</p>
Michael Taylor	English Heritage	<p>English Heritage welcomes and supports the Neighbourhood Plan. We are pleased to note that the Plan recognises and provides for the protection of the high quality built historic environment and landscape within the Plan area.</p> <p>Suggest that the wording of Policy H.7 be reconsidered: ..."should conserve and enhance the settlements' special architectural and historic character".</p> <p>Consider the wording in relation to conservation areas.</p>

Mark Sackett	RPS Planning on behalf of Persimmon Homes	<p>Detailed comments on the Neighbourhood Plan, focussing on housing delivery and the proposed allocation for housing development at site RES1.</p> <p>Suggest that the Plan fails to meet the basic conditions in particular failure to conform with the NPPF and failure to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>The Plan needs to establish a clear housing target and monitoring framework to achieve appropriate levels of housing delivery.</p> <p>The proposed site at RES1 is supported and should be redrawn to accommodate around 85 dwellings to help deliver affordable housing, traffic calming, CIL receipts, a new play area and flooding/drainage mitigation measures to contribute to improving sustainable development. No evidence has been provided that the site can be delivered at the reduced level of 25 dwellings or that it can contribute to sustainable development.</p> <p>Also includes reference to other sites proposed by Wenlock Estates for development which are excluded from the Plan. Sites are promoted for additional housing development, employment land and community uses. Suggest that development of housing and employment in the town will contribute to sustainable development by stemming the loss of facilities and services and generating additional CIL revenue.</p>
Mark Sackett	RPS Planning on behalf of Wenlock Estates	<p>Detailed comments on the Neighbourhood Plan, focussing on housing delivery and the proposed allocation for housing development at site RES1.</p> <p>Suggest that the Plan fails to meet the basic conditions in particular failure to conform with the NPPF and failure to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development.</p>

		<p>The Plan needs to establish a clear housing target and monitoring framework to achieve appropriate levels of housing delivery.</p> <p>The proposed site at RES1 is supported and should be redrawn to accommodate around 85 dwellings to help deliver affordable housing, traffic calming, CIL receipts, a new play area and flooding/drainage mitigation measures to contribute to improving sustainable development. No evidence has been provided that the site can be delivered at the reduced level of 25 dwellings or that it can contribute to sustainable development.</p>
Mr Boon	Landowner Liquid Fertilisers / Quality Liquid Feeds	Notes the content of the Plan and the Plan period to 2026, and considers that the Plan should be no more restrictive than the adopted Local Plan.
Mr R J L Smith	R J L Smith & Associates	<p>Detailed comments on the severe flooding in Much Wenlock from 1996 to 2007. The letter also sets out losses incurred as a result of this flooding.</p> <p>Also makes detailed comments about the capacity or otherwise of the town culvert and the sewage treatment works. The letter comments that in his view the Plan now proposed can only exacerbate an already unsatisfactory situation.</p> <p>The letter offers access for the independent examiner to written exchanges and photographs of historic flood water damage.</p>
Mr R M Dower (e-mail 26/06/2013, further letter 26/10/2013)	Private individual	<p>Detailed comments on two issues in Stretton Road, Much Wenlock.</p> <p>The first relates to the land designated for employment use in the Plan (Policy EMP 1). Mr Dower's letter sets out a detailed appraisal of the site's history both generally and in relation to recent applications submitted by Shropshire Council. The letter makes detailed comments about the broader drainage of the site and potential access issues. Mr Dower concludes that there is no logical reason to allocate this parcel of land for employment use.</p>

		<p>The second relates to the siting of a proposed attenuation pond (known as Shylte Brook) also on Stretton Road. Mr Dower owns adjacent land. Mr Dower proposes the relocation of the pond to the north. Mr Dower also sets out a detailed chronology of correspondence with Shropshire Council on this issue.</p>
Mr J E Yeats	Private individual	<p>Makes detailed comments about the effects of the severe surface water flash flooding in June 2007.</p> <p>The letter provides background to the three further flood events in 1992/93 and the proposed mitigation methods to provide for sufficient drainage capacity.</p> <p>The letter also makes particular comments about sewage overflow in the Farley Brook.</p> <p>The letter makes comments about the use of sustainable urban drainage systems in a catchment area of the type found in Much Wenlock.</p>
G Bowden (two separate letters)	Private individual	<p>The first letter of 9 July provides detailed comments on the appropriateness or otherwise of a variety of sites which may be capable of future development. Some of these sites relate to proposals in the neighbourhood plan and some do not. The letter of 9 July also includes a detailed assessment of historic flooding in the town and drainage issues associated with some more modern housing developments.</p> <p>The letter of 9 July 2013 also submits detailed information on the Games Ground.</p>
G Bowden (two separate letters)	Private individual	<p>The letter of 25 July encloses a photograph of drainage issues in the Hunters Gate residential development.</p>