

## Matter 1 - Appendix 2 - MWTC [A0028 and others]

### SC Local Plan References in Much Wenlock Town Council Minutes from January 2016 to April 2021

Full Council – FC

Planning & Environment Committee – P&E

12<sup>th</sup> January 2017 – FC

#### 6. REPORT FROM SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL

Members received the following verbal update from Cllr. David Turner:

.....

- Shropshire Council was carrying out a partial review of its Local Plan which includes extending the Plan period from 2026 to 2036, and reviewing housing requirement, strategic distribution of future growth, strategies for employment growth and the delivery of development in rural settlements. Provided the Cabinet approved the proposals public consultation would take place for 8 weeks beginning on 23 January 2017. The Neighbourhood Development Plan for Much Wenlock runs from 2013 to 2026 and the town council would need to ensure that its local principles retained their importance as part of the Local Plan review.

6<sup>th</sup> July 2017 – FC

#### 10. Town Clerk's Report

.....

The Town Clerk also gave the following verbal report:

.....

iv. A letter had been received from Berry's on behalf of Wenlock Estates which advised that land adjoining the primary school at Hunters Gate had been put forward for development of approximately 90 dwellings in response to Shropshire Council's 'Call for Sites' & Local Plan Review. The letter offered the Town Council an opportunity to discuss the plans in more detail and the Town Clerk recommended that a meeting should be arranged.

As representatives of Wenlock Estates on the Gaskell Recreation Ground charity Cllr. David Gibbon JP and Cllr. Trevor Childs declared an interest in the letter from Berrys.

It was **PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED** that:

- i. **The Town Clerk's report be NOTED.**
- ii. **Berrys should be invited to explain their proposals in more detail at a meeting of the Planning & Environment Committee.**

....

5<sup>th</sup> September 2017 – P&E

#### 6. Shropshire Council 'Call for Sites' and Local Plan Review

The Chairman invited Stuart Thomas from Berrys, on behalf of Wenlock Estates, to brief the Town Council about their response to Shropshire 'Call for Sites' & Local Plan Review. Mr Thomas explained that the review was a formal request to anyone interested in putting forward potential sites for consideration within the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and this consultation ended in March 2017. Berrys had therefore put forward land adjoining Much Wenlock Primary School to the rear of Hunters Gate for promotion as a suitable development site for housing development in the emerging Local Plan. Berrys recognised that the site was not included in the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Much Wenlock nor Shropshire Council's SAMDev and they had therefore put forward the site as a new site in response to the public consultation exercise. It was not a planning application and there were no details nor plans to be seen, it was merely an expression of interest as part of the review process.

The next stage of the review was the 'preferred site options' which would be published by Shropshire Council before the end of this financial year, when the preferred sites for development would be announced. Berrys is engaged in that process and would not have put forward the site had they not thought it suitable for development. Mr Thomas assured Members that this was the start of a process with an ongoing dialogue between stakeholders.

The Chairman asked what numbers had been suggested and was informed that the plan includes some 90 dwellings which would include an element of affordable housing, open space and access improvements as part of a holistic development.

Cllr. Milner Whiteman said that the land was outside of the development boundary and asked whether Berrys proposals would be affective before or after 2026 since the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan only covered the period up to 2026. Mr Thomas said that it depended on Shropshire Council's consultation and the housing numbers that they think they need over the next 10 years or so. The Neighbourhood Plan would need to be compliant with the SAMDev Plan and the Local Plan up to 2036.

Cllr. Herbert Harper acknowledged that the review was in response to central government wanting to push forward housing development as part of its growth agenda but he expressed concern that Berrys submission made no reference to Much Wenlock being designated as a flood risk catchment area and this should be recognised so that a good flood alleviation scheme was put in place. Mr Thomas said that a scheme of this nature would have to address drainage issues and comply with surface water run-off.

The Chairman asked whether there would be any possibility of new community facilities, such as a new medical practice or something similar being accommodated within that site. Mr Thomas said they had a blank canvas and everything was open for discussion. They just had a line round a site that they thought suitable for development and, if Shropshire Council approved it as one of their preferred sites for development, Berrys would actively seek to have a conversation about what that site delivers, so it was not impossible to include community facilities. Furthermore, there would be a significant Infrastructure Levy arriving from such a development of that scale from which the Town Council would benefit.

The Chairman thanked representatives from Berrys for giving a clear account of their submission, after which they left the meeting.

The Chairman PROPOSED that the Town Council should consult with Shropshire Council to understand how the Neighbourhood Development Plan fits in with the Local Plan Review. After being **SECONDED** it was **RESOLVED that Adrian Cooper should be invited to discuss the implications of the Local Plan Review with the Town Council.**

#### **7th September 2017 - FC**

##### **20. Planning**

- a) There were no planning applications referred to the Town Council for consideration.

**NOTED.**

- b) The Chairman of the Planning & Environment Committee gave a verbal update following the last meeting of the Committee. She informed Members that Berrys (on behalf of Wenlock Estates) attended the last Committee meeting to explain that they had put forward a site for development on which they would like to build around 90 dwellings including affordable. There were no firm plans and Shropshire Council was to decide in the Autumn, whether the site was acceptable and if it was deemed to be, then more detailed plans would be developed. Plans could include community facilities. There was some concern about the Neighbourhood Plan period which expires in 2026 and further details would be conveyed to the local community as they became available.

**NOTED.**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> November 2017 - FC**

##### **6. Shropshire Council Report**

Cllr. David Turner gave the following verbal report:

.....

- o The Local Plan Review consultation had begun and responses could be made until 21 December 2017.

##### **22. Consultation**

The following consultation was considered:

.....

- b. Local Plan Review – ‘Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development’ consultation  
**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that this be considered at the next meeting.**

#### **5<sup>th</sup> December 2017 – P&E**

#### **10. Local Plan Review**

Members considered for approval how to respond to the Local Plan Review.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that the following response should be recommended to the Town Council:**

- a) **That the Town Council accepts that the 150 dwellings distribution is a well-considered development distribution, but the additional provision required figure of 105 is carefully considered particularly in respect of the figure of 0 completions indicated in the Plan period 2016/2017, and this figure be amended if required.**
- b) **The Town Council questions the figures shown for existing commitments and allocations and suggest that a full additional provision of 2 ha is required for employment land.**
- c) **That the Town Council wishes to see the whole of its small parish considered as a combined parish area for development purposes.**
- d) **That the Flood Catchment is emphasised in the Local Plan Review and that such a designated Rapid Response Flood Catchment must warrant a considerable consideration in relation to housing development and continued development in such catchment.**

#### **7<sup>th</sup> December 2017 – FC**

#### **16. Consultation**

Local Plan Review – ‘Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development’ consultation.

On behalf of the Planning & Environment Committee, Cllr. Herbert Harper informed Members that, at its last meeting, the Committee had agreed a response to the Local Plan Review, which was recommended for submission to Shropshire Council. The recommendation had been formulated following meetings with Shropshire Council’s planning policy officers where the Neighbourhood Plan’s inclusion in the review had been considered.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and unanimously AGREED that the following response should be submitted to Shropshire Council for inclusion in the review of the Local Plan:**

- a. **That the Town Council accepts that the 150 dwellings distribution is a well-considered development distribution, but the additional provision required figure of 105 is carefully considered particularly in respect of the figure of 0 completions indicated in the Plan period 2016/2017, and this figure be amended if required.**
- b. **The Town Council questions the figures shown for existing commitments and allocations and suggest that a full additional provision of 2 ha is required for employment land.**
- c. **That the Town Council wishes to see the whole of its small parish considered as a combined parish area for development purposes.**
- d. **That the Flood Catchment is emphasised in the Local Plan Review and that such a designated Rapid Response Flood Catchment must warrant a considerable consideration in relation to housing development and continued development in such catchment.**

On behalf of Town Councillors, the Chairman thanked Cllr. Harper for carrying out a thorough review to formulate the Town Council’s response.

#### **5<sup>th</sup> April 2018 - FC**

#### **5. Shropshire Council Report**

Cllr. David Turner gave the following verbal report:

.....

- o Shropshire Council’s Local Plan Review 2016 – 2036 continued and the “Call for Sites” closed in December 2017. Submissions were being reviewed by the Planning Team and local councils would be given an opportunity to comment.

## 17<sup>th</sup> May 2018 - FC

### 5. Shropshire Council Report

After congratulating both new councillors on their election Cllr. David Turner gave the following verbal report:

- As part of the Local Plan Review Shropshire Council had released a summary document entitled "Consultation on Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development". Cllr. Turner would be attending a meeting to discuss the sites that had been put forward.

## 1<sup>st</sup> November 2018 - FC

### 1. Chairman's Welcome and Report from Shropshire Councillor, Peter Nutting

.....

The new Local Plan would soon be going out for consultation and there was an opportunity for anyone to respond to the consultation and put forward sites for development that had not been identified in the Plan.

### 5. Shropshire Council Report

....

Councillor Turner referred to the new Local Plan for which the consultation period was expected to be between 29<sup>th</sup> November 2018 and 31<sup>st</sup> January 2019. The Plan indicated that 150 dwellings would be required in Much Wenlock between 2016 and 2036. 45 had already been completed, leaving 105 outstanding. The preferred housing site between the primary school and Hunters Gate would provide 80 houses. This scheme would also include appropriate flood prevention measures and consideration of a roundabout for access to the A458. Councillor Turner was pleased to see that mention had been made of the town's Neighbourhood Plan in the Local Plan.

With regard to affordable housing, Councillor Turner stated that the Town Council was committed to support the Neighbourhood Plan and to address the need for affordable housing in the town.

## 4<sup>th</sup> December 2018 – P&E

### 8. Shropshire Local Plan Review 2016 – 2036 – Preferred Sites

Councillors noted the consultation period for the Shropshire Local Plan Review – Preferred Sites, from Thursday, 29 November 2018 to Thursday, 31 January 2019. The document would be discussed at the Planning Committee meeting on 8 January 2019. Full Council would consider at the meeting on 6 December whether to hold an extraordinary meeting in January for discussion of this single item.

## 6<sup>th</sup> December 2018 – FC

### 5. Shropshire Council Report

...

The Shropshire Council Local Plan review consultation on preferred site allocations was now underway. The 'preferred site' for Much Wenlock was on land off Hunter's Gate on Bridgnorth Road. Shropshire Council would be holding a public meeting at the Priory Hall on Thursday, 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2019 at 7.00pm.

## 8<sup>th</sup> January 2019 – P&E

### 7. Shropshire Local Plan Review 2016 – 2036 – Preferred Sites

- a. Councillors noted correspondence from a member of the public regarding the above.
- b. Councillors reviewed the Much Wenlock section of Shropshire Local Plan Review – Preferred Sites with regard to **housing**.  
It was noted that the consultation required only consideration of the site put forward, not any other possible sites. Much Wenlock needed to provide 95 dwellings with 80 proposed for land off Hunter's Gate and 15 windfall.

Councillors considered the development site was sustainable. A site of this size would normally accommodate 121 dwellings but only 80 were proposed to allow space for provision of the required flooding attenuation. 16 of the dwellings would be affordable housing units.

It was noted that some residents would prefer several small housing developments. However, these would not generate a large amount of Community Infrastructure Levy funding at one time and would not bring infrastructure improvements to the town. The proposed development off Hunter's Gate would include improvements to flood management and could include a new roundabout on the Bridgnorth Road. These would both be beneficial to the town.

Councillors considered the importance of flood management and were pleased that the consultation documents noted that Much Wenlock was in a rapid response area for flooding. Improvements were required to the current drainage for Hunter's Gate along with appropriate provision for the proposed development, which could be by means of underground tanks. This would give rise to amenity land and open spaces.

Councillors agreed that a roundabout on Bridgnorth Road should be a guaranteed feature of the proposed development to slow traffic approaching the town. Access to the proposed development from Hunter's Gate should be pedestrian only with vehicular access onto Bridgnorth Road.

Councillors considered the design of buildings for the proposed development. Despite initial opposition from residents to the development on Hunter's Gate, this was an excellent estate and Councillors would wish to see the same attention to detail in terms of building design and materials for any new houses, with a mix of styles and sizes. Reference would be made to the Neighbourhood Plan in this regard.

Councillors acknowledged that more houses on further sites could have been proposed for Much Wenlock. If an objection were to be made against the proposed site, very good arguments would need to be made to the Planning Inspectorate.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to recommend to full Council that the Council support the preferred site off Hunter's Gate with the proviso that a roundabout be included in the scheme and the problem of flooding in Hunter's Gate be dealt with at the same time. Vehicular access should be onto Bridgnorth Road.**

It was noted that the response form for Much Wenlock related to the Much Wenlock Place Plan area and included Cressage. Councillors agreed that they would not wish to comment on proposals for Cressage.

Councillors considered the provision of **employment land**.

It was noted that the site previously allocated on the Church Stretton Road had become a car park for the Olympic Games, then an industrial site, part had been used for an attenuation pond and most of the site had been transferred from Shropshire Council to Skan Automotive. What remained was not suitable for the provision of employment land and more was required. Shropshire Council will need to find two hectares of land, as recommended in the proposed Local Plan.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to recommend to full Council that Shropshire Council be asked to seek additional employment land in the town.**

**10<sup>th</sup> January 2019 - FC**

## **5. Shropshire Council Report**

...

A public meeting about the Local Plan Review had been held by Shropshire Council the previous week. Cllr. Turner gave an overview of the Plan, which covered the period 2016-2036. Residents had expressed concerns about the preferred site, highways, flooding, impact on local services and other matters. Cllr. Turner encouraged the Town Council to look at options other than the site preferred by Shropshire Council. He reported that the consultation period had been extended to 8<sup>th</sup> February.

**NOTED**

### 13. Shropshire Local Plan Review – Consultation on Preferred Sites

Members noted that the Council would hold an extraordinary full Council meeting on Thursday, 17<sup>th</sup> January 2019 at 7.00 pm in the Guildhall to review the consultation documents. Any member of the public wishing to speak at that meeting should request to do so in the usual way. It was noted that the consultation was being undertaken by Shropshire Council and individual members of the public were invited to make their comments to Shropshire Council.

### 17<sup>th</sup> January 2019 - FC

#### 5. Public Session

- a) Shropshire Councillor David Turner spoke about the Local Plan consultation on preferred sites. He considered the consultation gave the Town Council an opportunity to broaden their view of possible sites for development. He stated that the preferred site was located outside the current development boundary and that there were other sites within the boundary, including brownfield sites, which could accommodate 46 dwellings. If these were all developed, in addition to the proposals included in the Local Plan, there would be substantially above 80 houses. Councillor Turner stated that small developments, as well as large, would qualify for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments and referenced an error in the minutes of the most recent meeting of the Planning & Environment Committee. Councillor Turner noted that the Town Council did not intend to comment on the proposals for Cressage but these would have an impact on amenities in Much Wenlock. He also noted that proposals for development at Buildwas power station, Tern Hill and Cosford were not included in the Local Plan and suggested that the Town Council press for deferral of proposals until more was known about the power station development.

Councillors replied that although small developments did qualify for CIL payments more would come forward from larger developments. Shropshire Council had not included development of the Buildwas Power Station site in the Local Plan as it would take at least three years to clear the site before any development could begin and the make-up of that development was uncertain.

Councillor Turner stated that the sum of CIL payable would be the same whether from several smaller or one large development. He maintained that comment could still be made on the Power Station development.

- b) A representative of the Civic Society made a statement on behalf of the organisation. The Civic Society had a strong commitment to community based planning and had been disappointed at the decision of the Town Council to disband the Neighbourhood Plan Joint Monitoring Committee. The Civic Society contended that there was no urgent need for a single large housing site as the housing targets of the Neighbourhood Plan were currently being met and exceeded. The Society wanted developments to meet the needs and requirements of existing residents. 70% of the Civic Society members who responded to their recent survey opposed this single large development. Concern was expressed that Shropshire Council would not enforce appropriate flood control measures on the proposed site, given the failure of the scheme on the existing Hunters Gate site. The development of identified brownfield sites was another option. The Civic Society noted the need for owner occupier retirement properties in town.

In summary, the Civic Society urged the Town Council not to support an early extension of the town development boundary and to review alternative sites instead of supporting the proposal to build 80 houses on a single, flood- prone site.

Councillors responded that the preferred site off Hunters Gate had been identified in the Neighbourhood Plan for the development of 25 houses. The average national housing quota for one hectare of land was 32, so 25 dwellings on a three hectare site was not a realistic number and planning officers could not restrict development to that number. The brownfield sites identified by Shropshire Council were below the attenuation pond.

The speaker from the Civic Society maintained that land for open space and attenuation would also be required on the preferred site and the Neighbourhood Plan had specified that development on that site should take place 25 houses at a time. However, there were other sites in the town which could be developed first, including the brownfield sites which had been identified by Shropshire Council.

- c) A resident stated the case for development on a site he had put forward for consideration. This was not a Shropshire Council preferred site as it was outside the current development envelope. However, the land was adjacent to the attenuation pond which, in planning terms, was development. The speaker's land was

also self-attenuating, containing two ponds. The other sites proposed were all subject to flooding, including the preferred site, which was 40% in the flood plain.

The speaker considered that Much Wenlock needed to grow to sustain the life of the town. The population in the country was growing and Much Wenlock needed to take its share. If the brownfield sites were used for housing, employment land would be lost. He encouraged people to be creative in their approach to development for the town, and not think it had to stay within the current envelope.

The speaker noted that Much Wenlock Town Council had little say in the development of the town as Shropshire Council frequently approved applications which the Town Council had recommended for refusal. He encouraged residents to make their representations directly to Shropshire Council.

The Mayor endorsed the speaker's encouragement to submit comments to Shropshire Council.

- d) A speaker made reference to the recent presentation by the housing group, Connexus, in which Connexus had suggested that another 20 houses could be built on the Callaughton Lane site. These had not been included in the Local Plan and, coupled with the proposed 80 houses on the preferred site, would have a significant impact on that end of the town.

Councillors had not previously known of the Connexus proposals, which would be for an exception site.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED AND RESOLVED to suspend Standing Orders to allow comments to be considered from members of the public who had not given prior written notice that they wished to speak.**

- e) A resident raised concerns about flooding in the town, particularly in Hunters Gate. He informed the meeting of a system of piping that had been installed some years ago but that had not been used effectively. He believed that a significant sum of money had been put forward to either the County Council or Severn Trent to complete the system. Councillor Turner had undertaken to try to find out where these funds were being held.

Councillors noted that the Hunters Gate developer had not carried out the drainage work required but that measures were being taken to rectify the problems.

- f) A resident of Hunters Gate spoke about the flooding problems experienced on the estate and the inadequate work carried out by the developer. He was concerned that remedial drainage and traffic measures should be implemented before any further development. The current problems would only be exacerbated by further development.
- g) A member of the public made additional comments about the incomplete drainage system noted by the previous speaker, point e). He raised concerns about the impact on the residents of Farley, who had previously experienced far worse flooding problems than Much Wenlock. He also noted the relationship and timings of the Neighbourhood Plan, SamDev and the Local Plan.

The Mayor thanked residents for their contributions and noted that the Council had also received a number of letters and emails, which would be passed on to Shropshire Council.

## **6. Shropshire Local Plan Review 2016 – 2036 – Preferred Sites – Much Wenlock section**

Councillors considered the Much Wenlock section of the Local Plan Review, Preferred Sites.

- a) Councillors noted the views of the Planning Committee. Committee members had considered the preferred housing development site for Much Wenlock, land adjoining the Primary School and Hunters Gate, reference MUW012. It was noted that Shropshire Council had to supply around 28,000 dwellings in the county before 2036. In Much Wenlock the preferred dwelling guideline was 150. At the recent public meeting the Planning Policy & Strategy Manager at Shropshire Council had provided more up to date figures than those shown in the consultation document: 55 dwellings were already committed as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018 and an allowance had been made for 15 windfall sites, leaving only 80 dwellings to be allocated in the town.

The Committee had considered only the Hunters Gate site. 80 dwellings had been allocated to this site, 16 of which would be affordable. Shropshire Council had stated an indicative capacity of 114 dwellings for a site of

this size. The development would include attenuation and green space. It would also give the best chance of resolving the current problems of flooding in Hunters Gate and would address speeding along Bridgnorth Road with the installation of a roundabout. All traffic should go out from the proposed site onto Bridgnorth Road, not through Hunter's Gate.

In summary, the Planning Committee supported the development at Hunters Gate.

Employment land had also been considered. It was noted that the town had lost some of its allocated employment land and more would need to be found. The committee supported the preferred employment land guideline of 2 hectares.

b) Comments from Councillors were noted and are summarised as follows:

There were understandably concerns about the preferred housing site in terms of its size and flooding issues. However, the proposed allocation of 80 dwellings would cover the period until 2036. The existing flooding problems in Hunters Gate could be resolved as part of the proposed development and the introduction of a roundabout would be essential. The brownfield sites mentioned were designated as industrial sites or were unsuitable for development. The development of the Power Station would have a huge impact on Much Wenlock but was not for consideration at this time.

The preferred site would include affordable housing, something the town was keen to provide, although it was a pity there would not be more. Brownfield sites should be used for employment land, not housing. The allocation of 150 dwellings was a modest requirement and should be welcomed. It would be better to work with Shropshire Council on the preferred site rather than object to it.

It was noted that affordable housing would be unlikely to come forward with the development of small sites. The larger development would give opportunities for increased recreational ground and public open space as well as school and surgery provision. However, there should be safeguards with regard to the drainage scheme and an independent drainage engineer could ensure that the scheme was safe and fit for purpose.

The Neighbourhood Plan was not intended to restrict development and should not be seen as a barrier to development. It would continue to inform planning decisions.

c) **It was PROPOSED, SECONDED AND RESOLVED to support the preferred housing site off Hunters Gate (MUW012) with the proviso that a roundabout be included in the scheme and the problem of flooding in Hunters Gate be dealt with. Vehicular access should be onto Bridgnorth Road. As outlined in paragraph 16.8 of the Shropshire Council consultation document, the following should be addressed:**

- **Measures to effectively address flooding and waste water management issues in Much Wenlock. Due weight should be given to the fact that Much Wenlock is in a rapid response flooding area, in the highest category;**
- **The provision of premises to support the future delivery of secondary health care and other community services;**
- **Assessment of the need for additional primary and secondary school provision;**
- **Local and strategic highway improvements and traffic management;**
- **Provision of additional leisure, recreation and amenity facilities, with a particular focus in the south of the town.**

d) **It was PROPOSED, SECONDED AND RESOLVED to support the preferred employment land guideline of 2 hectares. However, the figure for commitments and allocations as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 was believed to be incorrect as land previously allocated was no longer available. Shropshire Council should therefore carry out a full review of employment land in Much Wenlock and identify land for development.**

7th February 2019 - FC

## 5. Shropshire Council Report

Shropshire Councillor, David Turner, gave a verbal report.



... The consultation period for the Local Plan Preferred Sites would finish on 8<sup>th</sup> February and individuals were encouraged to respond. Local residents were keen to see the Town Council use the Neighbourhood Plan to address planning issues. A number of people had met the previous day in an effort to refresh the Neighbourhood Plan and they would welcome involvement from members of the Town Council.

#### 6<sup>th</sup> June 2019 - FC

##### 18. Shropshire Local Plan Review 2016-2036 – Preferred Sites

Councillors noted a verbal report from a discussion held with two local residents regarding Shropshire Council's preferred sites for housing development in the town. Town Councillors had stated that the consultation was being undertaken by Shropshire Council, not the Town Council, and that there had been no indication from Shropshire Council that the consultation period had been extended. The meeting had been positive and had provided better understanding between the parties.

#### 4<sup>th</sup> July 2019 – FC

##### 5. Shropshire Council Report

Shropshire Councillor, David Turner, gave a verbal report.

...

Shropshire Council was now consulting on three strategic sites as part of the Local Plan Review: Tern Hill, RAF Cosford and Ironbridge Power Station. The public meeting relating to the Power Station would be held on Wednesday, 17<sup>th</sup> July at Buildwas Village Hall.

Timescales for the Local Plan Review had been revised and all proposals were to go to Shropshire Council Cabinet in March next year. It was unlikely that the Plan would be adopted before 2022. A detailed submission from some residents of Much Wenlock had been received by Shropshire Council.

*NB. Minutes relating to SC Strategic Sites Consultation and the Ironbridge Power Station applications are not included within this summary.*

#### 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2019 – P&E

##### 7. Implications for Much Wenlock housing development in connection with proposals for the former Ironbridge Power Station

- a. Councillors noted comments made by a member of the public at the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> August: in view of the 1,000 houses proposed for the former Power Station site, would the Town Council withdraw its support for the development of 80 dwellings on site MUW012, land adjacent to Hunter's Gate, proposed in the Shropshire Local Plan Review of Preferred Sites.
- b. Councillors noted the decision taken by the Town Council at the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2019, minute 6c, to support site MUW012.
- c. Councillors considered the request made at the Town Council meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> August and reviewed relevant information. It was noted that a total of 150 dwellings were required for Much Wenlock as part of the Local Plan and that there were few infill sites available in the town. An alternative site MUW008, land to the south of Sytche Lane, was on a steep hill, which could give rise to drainage problems. It was also noted that Shropshire Council viewed the site MUW008 as having potential for 324 dwellings, a much larger development than proposed for MUW012. The site MUW012 had been identified for development in the Neighbourhood Plan, although for a lower number of houses. Development of MUW012 was expected to bring improvements to the town such as a roundabout on the Bridgnorth Road. A smaller development would be unlikely to bring infrastructure improvements.

Councillors noted that very careful consideration had been given to Shropshire Council's preferred sites options earlier in the year and this had resulted in the Council's support for the site MUW012.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to recommend to full Council that the Council's support of site MUW012 be confirmed and no change be made to the Council's response to the Preferred Sites consultation.**

5<sup>th</sup> September 2019 - FC

**15. Preferred Sites Consultation Response**

Councillors considered the recommendation from the Planning & Environment Committee with regard to the request received from a member of the public that the Council review its response to the Shropshire Council Preferred Sites consultation in the light of proposals for the former Ironbridge Power Station.

As several Councillors were absent, it was **PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to defer consideration of this matter to the next meeting.**

1<sup>st</sup> October 2019 – P&E

**7. Correspondence regarding preferred housing development sites**

Councillors noted correspondence from a member of the public on behalf of the Mendips View residents group. The Mendips View residents group outlined their objection to the proposal by the Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group that land at the Sytche be developed, instead of the preferred site off Bridgnorth Road.

3<sup>rd</sup> October 2019 - FC

**6. Public Session**

...

- c. A representative of the Mendips View Residents Group spoke regarding agenda item 11. The Residents Group supported the position of the Town Council on the preferred site for housing development as being land adjacent to Hunter's Gate. The Residents Group strongly objected to the suggestion put forward by the Neighbourhood Refresh Group, without reference to the residents of Mendips View, that land to the south of Sytche Lane be developed instead. The Mendips View Residents Group stated that the Hunter's Gate site would be closer to the primary school and would give direct access on to the main road. There would be no alleviation of traffic pressure on the Gaskell corner by development at Sytche Lane rather than land adjacent to Hunter's Gate. The agricultural land adjacent to Sytche Lane was currently soaking up water and helping to prevent flooding in Farley and Sheinton. The Hunter's Gate site had been identified by Shropshire Council as their preferred development site and there was no reason to contradict their professional judgement.

**11. Preferred Sites Consultation Response**

Members considered the recommendation from the Planning & Environment Committee with regard to the request received from a member of the public that the Council review its response to the Shropshire Council Preferred Sites consultation in the light of proposals for the former Ironbridge Power Station.

The Planning & Environment Committee had reviewed the decision to support the preferred site MUW012, land off Hunters Gate, and recommended that support for MUW012 be confirmed and that no change be made to the Council's position. The Council had previously given close attention to the sites offered and MUW012 stood out as being the most suitable and sustainable and providing the best option for the town.

It was noted that the Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group had suggested in all three documents submitted to Shropshire Council, that site MUW008, land adjacent to Sytche Lane, which was linked to site MUW003, should be the preferred site. It was noted that MUW008 had a capacity of 334 dwellings and the indicative capacity of MUW012 was 112, with the intention to build 80 dwellings.

Councillors were asked for their individual comments and spoke in support of MUW012, citing the potential infrastructure benefits of this site, concerns about drainage and the topography of MUW008, the preference for a site with a smaller maximum capacity and the sustainability of Hunters Gate. It was noted that Councillor Turner had previously highlighted the sustainability of Callaughton Lane for housing development, a factor which applied equally to Hunters Gate on the other side of the road.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and unanimously RESOLVED to maintain the Council's position of support for site MUW012, land off Hunters Gate.**

### **5<sup>th</sup> November 2019 – P&E**

#### **9. Local Plan - Preferred Sites**

Councillors noted that Adrian Cooper, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager at Shropshire Council, would be moving on 11<sup>th</sup> November to be leader of Shropshire Council's Climate Change Task Force, initially for 12 months. **It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to send a letter to Mr Cooper, thanking him for his cooperation and support.**

### **3<sup>rd</sup> December 2019 – P&E**

#### **9. Local Plan - Preferred Sites**

Councillors noted correspondence received from the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group (MWNPRG) regarding the above. It was noted that the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan covered the period to 2026, whereas the Shropshire Council Local Plan would cover the period to 2036 and would supersede the Neighbourhood Plan.

It was further noted that the Town Council was not the Planning Authority and that the decision on development sites would be taken by Shropshire Council. An appropriate response would be made to the MWNPRG.

### **7<sup>th</sup> January 2020 – P&E**

#### **9. Local Plan - Preferred Sites**

Members noted the reply made to the letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2019 from the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group.

### **6<sup>th</sup> February 2020 – FC**

#### **5. Shropshire Council Report**

...

With regard to the Shropshire Council Local Plan Review, Councillor Turner noted that the promoters of the site off Hunters Gate/Bridgnorth Road had now put forward a proposal for 130 dwellings, rather than the 80 previously proposed. The promoters had stated that the increase in numbers was necessary to make the development viable in the light of measures required to address flooding issues. Councillor Turner expressed his concerns about the impact of such a development on the town. It was noted that Shropshire Council had taken no decision so far on whether to support the revised proposals. It had been suggested that the promoter arrange a public display.

The Mayor noted that the flooding issues were not new. In 2017, when Berrys had made a presentation to the Town Council, specific reference had been made to the rapid response catchment area in Much Wenlock.

### **3<sup>rd</sup> March 2020 – P&E**

#### **4. Public Session**

Mr Roy Dower spoke regarding the revisions to proposals for the preferred development site MUW012, off Bridgnorth Road. He noted that the new proposal for 130 houses was on almost 5 acres more than the preferred site and, in his opinion, was no longer the 'preferred site'. He questioned whether the site would have been supported initially if the proposal had been for 130 houses and stated that the town was looking for less than 95 houses, not 130. Mr Dower raised concerns about flooding and infrastructure.

Mr Dower was thanked for his contribution.

Agenda item 7 was brought forward on the agenda.

#### **5. Preferred Site Allocation: MUW012, Much Wenlock**

Members noted revised proposals for the above site from Wenlock Estates/Berrys.

All Councillors present had attended the presentation at the Priory Hall on 26<sup>th</sup> February organised by Berrys/Wenlock Estates where the revised proposals had been outlined. Councillors noted the significant increase from 80 to 130 houses. They found it difficult to understand how the proposers had underestimated the requirement for flooding attenuation when submitting their original proposal.

Councillors noted that Shropshire Council wanted people to have their say on the new proposals by Berrys, and were intending to offer people the chance to comment to Shropshire Council by Friday 20<sup>th</sup> March. This was not formal consultation.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED that the Planning Committee was not in favour of any increase above the 80 dwellings proposed previously for site MUW012.**

**5<sup>th</sup> March 2020 – FC**

#### **5. Shropshire Council Report**

Cllr Turner advised that he had addressed Shropshire Council Cabinet on 12<sup>th</sup> February regarding consultation on the Local Plan Review and the shortage of time in which revised proposals for Much Wenlock could be considered. He noted that the Plan period had been pushed out to 2038.

#### **6. Public Session**

c. Mr Eric Humphries referenced item 9 on the agenda regarding the revised proposal for site MUW012. Mr Humphries expressed his opposition to the latest proposal for a larger site with 130 houses, rather than the 80 previously proposed. He drew attention to the effects of recent road closures on traffic in the town and the impact of additional traffic as well as concerns about flooding. The proposed, additional housing would be built on one of the wettest fields in Much Wenlock. Mr Humphries stated that, in his view, the new proposal was for a new site and should not be referred to as the 'preferred' site. He hoped that the Town Council would debate and vote against the revised proposal, rather than simply note it.

The Mayor responded that consultation on the revised proposal was the responsibility of Shropshire Council, not the Town Council. Shropshire Council intended to offer people the chance to comment on the new proposal by 20<sup>th</sup> March. The Town Council would make its views known at the appropriate time.

#### **9. Preferred Site Allocation: Site MUW012, Much Wenlock**

Councillors noted revised proposals for site MUW012 from Wenlock Estates/Berrys, proposing an increase from 80 houses to 120/30 (figures provided varied). A public consultation event had been held by the developers on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2020. It was not known whether there had been any alteration to the revised proposals following the event.

It was noted that at a meeting of the Town Council's Planning & Environment Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2017, attended by a representative of Berrys, Town Councillors had raised the issue of essential flooding measures on Hunters Gate. Berrys had assured the Council that this would be addressed. However, only now did Wenlock Estates/Berrys appear to have realised that attenuation would be required on the site and this would necessitate either cutting profit or increasing housing numbers.

The Town Council had supported the proposal for 80 houses. However, now that revised proposals had been submitted, it could be argued that the whole process should be restarted in Much Wenlock to give other landowners the opportunity to change their proposals. Shropshire Council had advised that it was not their intention to do this at present, although it would be possible to submit comments at the formal consultation stage for the Local Plan.

It was noted that the flooding measures currently in place for Hunters Gate and Callaughtons Ash were ineffective and the need for additional measures was included in the Much Wenlock Place Plan.

It was noted that the revised proposal had not come to the Town Council as an application. Members of the Planning & Environment Committee had discussed the proposals in the form presented and, on the basis of what was known, were unanimous that they would not be in favour.

Concern was expressed by a member of the public that the revisions meant that the site could no longer be considered the preferred site and that the proposer was attempting to circumnavigate the system. Residents were looking for the Town Council to take a view on the proposals, even if this did not affect Shropshire Council's decision.

Councillors were advised by a member of the public that the Town Council could decide to take a position on the proposals rather than noting them.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to note the revised proposals for site MUW012 subject to a formal proposal being received.**

**4<sup>th</sup> June 2020 - FC**

**5. Shropshire Council report**

...

Review of the Shropshire Local Plan was progressing. An emerging proposal for a large housing and commercial development near Bridgnorth on the A458 between Tasley and Morville Heath, would result in a significant increase in traffic through the Gaskell Arms junction, particularly when combined with proposed development on the Ironbridge Power Station site. A current planning application for Farley Quarry, if approved, would result in up to 100 HGV movements per day, again impacting on the highways around Much Wenlock.

Councillor Turner had raised concerns about the proposal for housing adjacent to Hunters Gate. Whilst the proposal would address flooding in this area it was not a comprehensive plan for the whole of the catchment and would not give protection to other areas of the town. The proposal formed part of the Local Plan, for development up until 2038, and Shropshire Council had little control over when the development might go ahead.

**30<sup>th</sup> June 2020 – P&E**

**8. Shropshire Council Local Plan Review**

Members noted correspondence regarding the above, dated 18<sup>th</sup> June 2020, sent by the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group to Shropshire Councillors Nutting and Macey in anticipation of consideration of the pre-submission version of the Local Plan at the Shropshire Council Cabinet meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> July.

Members considered several points made in the letter:

- It was stated that the Local Plan ignored the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan  
Cllr Hill noted that the Neighbourhood Plan covered the period up to 2026, while the new Local Plan extended to 2036 and had to take account of a longer time period.  
The most recent document would carry more weight in planning terms so there was little point in revising the Neighbourhood Plan until the Local Plan had been completed.
- With regard to the link between flood alleviation and housing development, Cllr Hill noted that the Drainage and Flood Risk Manager at Shropshire Council was very aware of the flooding problems in Much Wenlock and both Shropshire Council and the Town Council were paying close attention to the flooding problems. The Town Council had not submitted any comments regarding the proposals for additional houses on site MUW012 as no application had been received. If another site were chosen for housing, this would not solve the problem of flooding in the Hunters Gate area.
- The letter outlined the view of the group that Much Wenlock was likely to be overwhelmed with development in surrounding areas – Ironbridge, Bridgnorth, Presthope, possibly Shadwell Quarry. Members agreed that the number of developments proposed for the local area was very concerning but there was little expectation that the Town Council's comments would make a significant difference to what was proposed elsewhere. There had been a huge number of objections to the outline plans for the Ironbridge power station site, but nothing further was known. It was agreed that the A458 junction was vital and if development did go ahead at Ironbridge then the Council would push harder for a bypass.
- The assertion in the letter that there was an "absence of a strategic assessment of flooding risk" was thought to be incorrect. The Shropshire Council Drainage and Flood Risk Manager was already working on a flooding assessment.
- With regard to a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, Councillors held the view that now was not the time and it was unlikely that sufficient funds would be available to undertake a review.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to note the letter.**

2<sup>nd</sup> July 2020 – FC

**5. Shropshire Council report**

...

On 20<sup>th</sup> July Shropshire Council's Cabinet would be considering the Local Plan review pre-submission consultation document. The draft proposals would be published on 10<sup>th</sup> July and there would be public consultation over the summer.

**6. Public session**

Mr J Orves, a resident of Hunters Gate, requested that the Council reconsider its position on the proposed housing development adjacent to the current Hunters Gate estate. He noted that the number of houses proposed in the locality had increased and cited the plans for Ironbridge Power Station. He had previously highlighted to Shropshire

Council his view that the number of houses proposed for site MUW012 would not be viable and now the number proposed had been increased. Further flooding had occurred at the site, higher up the hill, and he believed that the proposed design would not take that into account. The proposals were for a significantly higher number of houses than were included in the Neighbourhood Development Plan. He argued that the drainage problems should be resolved by the builder of the existing houses and he requested that the Town Council inform Shropshire Council that the proposals were not appropriate.

Councillor Jenkins expressed some support for the views put forward and noted that the infill housing being completed was bringing the town close to the housing target previously proposed.

Shropshire Councillor Turner noted that the characteristics of the flooding which had occurred in February had been different to those of previous flooding events and different measures would be required to address the problem.

**9. Flooding and Neighbourhood Development Plan**

Councillors considered correspondence received from Mr Orves regarding flooding problems in the town, the relationship between housing development and flooding attenuation, and the importance of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Councillor Hill agreed that errors had been made with Hunters Gate and the problems had been raised recently with John Bellis, the Drainage and Flood Risk Manager at Shropshire Council. He had concurred that it was now too late to raise the issues with Persimmon, the developer, and that due diligence had not been carried out by Shropshire Council at the time.

With regard to future development, the Neighbourhood Development Plan specified that sites of no more than 25 houses were desirable. However, no specific sites had been identified in the Plan. Whilst such smaller sites were desirable, they were not practical.

It was noted that the Town Council could continue to ask for funding to resolve the flooding problems but could not make this happen. Money had been set aside by Severn Trent for flood alleviation but this would not be taken up in the current year and it was thought that the proposed scheme would need to be revised. Flooding problems across the town needed to be addressed.

In respect of housing development at Hunter's Gate, the only position the Town Council had taken was to reluctantly support 80 houses on the site, providing this resolved the drainage problems. Until the draft Local Plan was published, it was not known what number of houses would be included. The Council would consider the proposals in the Local Plan when it went out to consultation.

Members noted the impact of proposals for several large housing developments around Much Wenlock, such as the Power Station, Bridgnorth, Presthope and, potentially, Shadwell Quarry.

**It was RESOLVED to suspend Standing Orders to allow Shropshire Councillor David Turner to speak on this item.**

Councillor Turner stated that the responsible authority at the time of the Hunters Gate development had been Bridgnorth District Council, not Shropshire Council. He believed that the Town Council should have commented on the revised proposals for the extension to the site sooner.

Town Councillors responded that they would consider the proposals made in the Local Plan and respond to the consultation.

The Mayor advised that the Drainage and Flood Risk Manager at Shropshire Council had offered to meet residents of Hunters Gate to discuss the flooding issues.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to advise the petitioners from Hunters Gate of the offer made by the Drainage and Flood Risk Manager to meet to discuss the flooding problems and that a representative of the Town Council should attend any meeting arranged.**

## 28<sup>th</sup> July 2020 – P&E

### 8. Shropshire Council Local Plan Review

- a. Members noted correspondence regarding the above, dated 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2020, sent by Much Wenlock Civic Society to Shropshire Councillors P Nutting and R Macey.

It was noted that the following statement made in the letter was incorrect: “The clear impression to many of those present was that very little local investigation had been made into other options.” Councillors had, in fact, studied the options for development sites in the town very closely.

- b. Members noted that the pre-submission version of the Local Plan had been considered at the Shropshire Council Cabinet meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> July and that the Cabinet had agreed to a fresh ‘Regulation 18’ consultation, whereby views could be submitted on all sites included in the Plan, rather than consultation on the ‘soundness’ of the Plan.

- c. Councillors noted that up to date figures for housing completions in Much Wenlock had been obtained from Planning Policy at Shropshire Council:

Completions in Much Wenlock between 2016-2019 (2019 is the last fully monitored year) = 32

Number of dwellings with planning permission or prior approval 2016-2019 = 21

Number of dwellings proposed through Local Plan allocations 2016–2038 = 120

Proposed ‘windfall’ allowance over the plan period = 27

It was noted that the Council’s response to the Local Plan proposals would be considered at the extraordinary full Council meeting to be held on 20<sup>th</sup> August 2020. However, background information was considered, as follows.

Councillors noted that flooding was a significant problem for the town and the proposals for the preferred site, MUW012, included flooding attenuation intended to address flood water from Callaughtons Ash, Oakfield Park and other areas in the town. The proposed scheme would take 30% of the flood water that went into the town into a new pipe and away into the parkland. It was noted that whatever happened with the housing development, the flooding would still need to be addressed. The proposed flooding attenuation scheme would cost £1.5m and could be financed through the housing development on the preferred site. It was not to be expected that the Environment Agency would fund such a scheme when the money could be provided in connection with housing development. It was noted that too much time had elapsed since the construction of the existing Hunters Gate estate to insist that the developer remedy the faults with the drainage system installed at the time. This would not, in any case, deal with the additional flooding problems associated with other areas in the town.

It was agreed to ask a member of the Flood Group to prepare a report on the drainage scheme proposed in association with the housing development.

With regard to the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan (MWDP), it was noted that this did not include any allocated sites or housing numbers, other than a total of 130 dwellings. When the Plan was being developed a site was identified for 25 houses (the current MUW012). However, the landowner then withdrew this site as its size meant it would accommodate far more than 25 houses. Mr Ashworth, the independent assessor for the MWDP, would not agree to so few houses being allocated to the site as the number was far below the legal quota for the size of the land. The total allocation of 130 dwellings for Much

Wenlock had been the lowest number that Shropshire Council would accept to be included in the MWDP at the time and, then, only if this applied to the town itself, not to the whole parish area.

The Neighbourhood Plan had to be in agreement with the Local Plan, which was why the Town Council had resisted moving forward with a revised Neighbourhood Plan until the Local Plan had been completed.

It was noted that no decision had yet been taken regarding the outline application for the Ironbridge Power Station site and that a large number of objections had been made.

With regard to windfall housing sites, the Council was pushing for the Presthope park homes to be counted towards housing completions.

## **20<sup>th</sup> August 2020 – FC**

### **3. Disclosure of pecuniary interests**

Members were reminded that they are required to leave the room during the discussion and voting on matters in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest, whether or not the interest is entered in the register of members' interests maintained by the monitoring officer.

Councillor Thomas made the following statement: "After extensive talks with Shropshire Council's legal team I have received advice about not chairing and, of course, not voting this evening. As many of you will know my family are landowners and if the site under discussion this evening does not form part of the preferred sites in the Local Plan Review for any reason, then it follows that developers may be looking to identify alternatives. My family also rents two fields owned by the same landowner and there could be a perception of bias. As a consequence of these interests and the advice I've received, I intend to leave the meeting before the public session as the following items are all connected to the Local Plan."

...

Councillor Daniel Thomas left the meeting and Councillor Mary Hill took the chair.

### **5. Shropshire Council report**

Shropshire Councillor David Turner gave a verbal report.

He urged residents to respond to the Local Plan consultation, not just on proposals for Much Wenlock but also for other areas. He noted that he had received dozens of comments from residents regarding the preferred site in Much Wenlock, the majority of which were in rejection. Cllr Turner raised a number of questions regarding the proposed housing development and its impact on local infrastructure and services. He noted that a copy of the Draft Local Plan documentation should now be available in Much Wenlock library for viewing by members of the public.

...

Councillor Harper noted that statements had been made asserting that the Draft Local Plan did not take notice of the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan (MWNDP), yet there were 12 references to the MWNDP in S13 of the Draft Local Plan. Councillor Turner did not agree that this demonstrated that Shropshire Council had taken notice of the MWNDP.

Councillor Harper noted that substantial community benefits of a spend of £1m on flooding alleviation, a new roundabout and 24 affordable dwellings (20% of the total number) might be delivered by the proposed housing development. He referenced the petition recently received by the Town Council from residents of Hunters Gate demanding measures to remedy flooding. Councillor Harper questioned whether Councillor Turner saw these as community benefits and whether Shropshire Council would see this as a way of providing relief from flooding in Much Wenlock. Councillor Turner responded that he did not have the specialist knowledge to know whether £1m was sufficient to provide the flooding alleviation required, as there were no proposals in the public arena. Councillor Turner noted that the Government had recently allocated £5.2bn to be spent on flood alleviation by 2027 but he could not commit Shropshire Council or its officers to what it was likely to do over the coming five or 18 years.

Councillor Jenkins noted the many questions raised by Councillor Turner and suggested that some of those points be considered at a different time.

Councillor Turner was thanked for his report.



## 6. Public session

- a. Following introductory comments regarding the proposed housing allocation for the town and allocation for site MUW012, Mrs Lesley Durbin asked the following question:
  - i. The Town Council and the Planning & Environment Committee can legitimately withdraw their support for MUW012 as it does not comply with the stated policies of Much Wenlock Town Council which they adopted in the Neighbourhood Plan in April 2013; and remains the statutory policies for Much Wenlock until 2026. It is not in the gift of individual councillors to make decisions on behalf of themselves which go against the stated wishes of the local community put into the Neighbourhood Plan by majority votes in referendum, Councillors are denying 'the will of the people'. Why do both committees not withdraw their support to the Shropshire Council Local Plan Review in line with the Neighbourhood Plan?

Mrs Durbin provided figures for recent traffic movements at the Gaskell junction, as well as figures for traffic movements estimated to be generated by the proposed Ironbridge Power Station development and the development at MUW012, and then asked the following question:

- ii. By what calculation does the Much Wenlock Planning & Environment Committee and the Much Wenlock Town Council see that this extra traffic congestion will benefit the residents of Much Wenlock?
- b. A representation was presented on behalf of Much Wenlock Civic Society regarding the proposed site allocation MUW012 VAR and increase in the overall number of dwellings from 150 to 200. The Civic Society asked the Town Council not to support the new site allocation and increase in the number of dwellings on the following grounds:
  - i. There should be no major development in the town until the effect of the proposed development at the Ironbridge Power Station is known.
  - ii. The number of houses could be proposed by the Local Plan Review but a review of the Neighbourhood Plan should be used to deliver them.
  - iii. An independent report should be made into all flooding, including a solution found for the existing Hunters Gate. Only then should any building on the adjacent land be considered.
  - iv. The consequences of increased pollution and traffic on health has not been assessed.
  - v. If a developer makes a large contribution to infrastructure, this will proportionately reduce any contribution to social rented and shared ownership properties, which the Neighbourhood Plan proposed should be the highest housing priority.
  - vi. If the Town Council endorses the proposal in the review, it will be endorsing the building of a large-scale development in a Rapid Response Flood Catchment Area.
  - vii. Haworth has admitted in recent documents that there is 'slight overcapacity' at the Gaskell corner at peak times, even before any additional development.
- c. The Chair read a statement from Arthur Hill, a member of the Flood Group, relating to flooding issues. Mr Hill stated that two catchment wide surveys had previously been carried out and that recommendations for attenuation pools at Stretton Road and the Sytche had been subsequently implemented at a cost of approximately £2.1m. However, no attenuation had been provided for Hunters Gate. A solution had been proposed by Mouchel and, more recently by McCloy, a leading expert in the field. The benefits of the scheme were outlined, including prevention of flooding at Farley and reduction in sewer output down to the Raven by up to 30%. The proposed scheme would benefit several areas of the town. Small developments would not address the existing flooding problems. The proposed development scheme for MUW012 would include provision of flooding attenuation, at the expense of the developer. Funding would not be found elsewhere. Mr Hill also stated that when the Neighbourhood Plan had been submitted for scrutiny to the public examiner, the recommendation for a low number of houses had been deleted. The current site MUW012 had been accepted as the recommended site, but with a higher housing allocation.
- d. Mr Chris Bowden spoke regarding flooding in the town. He noted that there was a fear of flooding in the town. There were several solutions, but these were very costly, and funding would be needed. The development scheme would provide funding although, at this time, it was not known exactly what would be included in the flooding alleviation scheme from the developers for resolving the problems. The proposals were unlikely to solve all flooding problems in the town, some of which would still need to be addressed separately.

If small blocks of 10 or 15 houses were built, these would connect to a system that couldn't cope. If the housing numbers specified in the Neighbourhood Plan were to be provided from small developments, there would be two active building sites in the town every year, each generating traffic within the town. One larger development on Bridgnorth Road would generate traffic from only one site, onto the Bridgnorth Road.

The proposals in the Local Plan provided an opportunity to solve some problems and bring benefits to the town. Mr Bowden noted that his house had flooded this year, for the first time in 50 years, because Callaughtons Ash had failed.

The Chair noted that in addition to those members of the public who had spoken, a number of people had contacted the Town Council directly. She named and thanked those people for their contributions.

The Chair rearranged the agenda to take agenda items in the order 7a, 7d, 7b, 7c.

## **7. Shropshire Council Local Plan Consultation**

a. It was noted that further 'Regulation 18' consultation on the pre-submission draft of the Shropshire Local Plan, 2016 – 2038 would be undertaken between 3<sup>rd</sup> August and 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020.

b. The Chair provided an overview of the main issues which had been raised locally:

- i. Flooding: with regard to the need for an independent report, two reports had been produced previously and this year an in-depth report had been prepared by McCloy. The findings would be made known in due course.
- ii. Housing numbers: 200 was the residential development guideline in the Draft Local Plan for the period 2016 – 2038. This figure included 32 completions and 21 with prior approval, leaving an allocation of 120 plus 27 windfall sites; there were not 200 new houses to be built.
- iii. Why site MUW012 and not MUW008?: in 2013, Mr Ashcroft, the independent examiner of the MWNDP wrote that the site in the Bridgnorth Road area was accepted "by all concerned" as the "optimum location for a housing allocation". When considering potential sites for development Shropshire Council conducted a rigorous study of the sites offered and found that MUW008 was not as suitable as Hunters Gate. Town Councillors considered the same sites and came to the same conclusion.
- iv. Disregard of the MWNDP: Neighbourhood Plans were intended as development plans, not non-development plans.  
Councillor Harper referenced a document on Neighbourhood Planning in the House of Commons Library, no. 05838, dated 12<sup>th</sup> October 2018. He noted that in May 2014 the people of Much Wenlock had voted for 130 dwellings between 2013 and 2026, with no allocated site, as policy H3 in the draft MWNDP had been deleted by the independent examiner. It would be difficult to argue against the statement made by Mr Ashcroft referenced in 7biii. above.
- v. The need for social housing: the proposed development would bring forward 24 social housing units. Connexus was said to be working on another site in the town but the location was not known.
- vi. The impact of development at Ironbridge Power Station and Tasley: this would be considered later in the meeting.
- vi. Pressure on local services: nobody in the Town Council would disagree that this was a concern but, unfortunately, additional services were never provided before developments. It was known that Shropshire Council was in discussions with the schools to assess capacity and the secondary school had confirmed they could take an increased number of pupils.
- vii. Traffic issues: this was a national concern, with or without additional housing. A roundabout on Bridgnorth Road would slow traffic, a matter the Council had been trying to address for many years. It was understood that traffic from the proposed development would be directed onto Bridgnorth Road, not Barrow Street. The Gaskell corner was an ongoing problem.

Councillor Whiteman commented that the only solution to the Gaskell corner was a bypass. Councillor Themans supported Councillor Whiteman's comments. He believed that the main problem would not be traffic from the proposed site, but traffic from Tasley and Buildwas. It did not appear that this had been considered in the Draft Local Plan and it was essential that the Council did not support the Local Plan without recognition of traffic problems from other developments.

Councillor Harper referred to the housing allocation for the town. He referenced the adopted Core Strategy of March 2011 for the period 2006-26, where the requirement for Much Wenlock as a district centre was stated as up to 500 homes. This represented a build rate of 25 per year. In the MWNDP the target of 130 dwellings in the urban part of the parish for 2013-26 equated to a build rate of 10 per year. In the Draft Local Plan Much Wenlock was identified as one of 11 key settlements. Development rates were outlined in Appendix 5 of the documentation and Much Wenlock was one of the lowest at 200, representing 9.09 dwellings per year.

Councillor Whiteman commented that the site had been identified and would be developed for housing, but the question was whether it would also deal with the flooding.

Councillor N Park thanked members of the public for messages she had received directly. She commented that Much Wenlock needed more family homes, not just now but for the next generation. She was concerned that residents of Hunters Gate had suffered as Persimmon had not put in adequate flooding measures. She questioned how long residents would be prepared to wait until the drainage could be resolved if the new development were not built. Shropshire Council did not have the funds to remedy the problems.

Councillor Hill noted that the main consideration for Much Wenlock was flooding. The situation had changed since the MWNDP was developed, with climate change and increased flooding events. The existing two attenuation ponds were helping but were not enough for the town, but funding for more would need to be found. The bulk of money in the Severn & Wye catchment area would go to flood alleviation along the rivers. Whether the proposed development went ahead or not, there would be continued flooding. Callaughtons Ash had resulted in further problems. If the Hunters Gate development went ahead, the stakeholders would need to work together closely to ensure an appropriate flood alleviation scheme was implemented and to trust the experts.

Councillor M Park listed the three issues most often raised with him since he had become a Councillor: flooding, affordable homes and traffic calming, particularly the speed at which vehicles entered the town. The Draft Local Plan offered a part solution to all three of these issues. Councillor Park noted the emails he had received from members of the public and encouraged everyone to submit comments to Shropshire Council.

Councillor Harper noted that the Draft Local Plan included flood prone areas in the county and that Much Wenlock was in the top 10. There was nothing to stop housing being developed in a Rapid Response Flood Catchment Area.

The Chair urged individual residents to submit their comments to Shropshire Council. The Town Council had to consider what was best for the town as a whole. Most residents seemed to have no problem with the number of houses proposed for the town but wanted affordable housing and the flooding to be resolved. The scheme proposed would provide 24 affordable homes. In addition, a large sum of Community Infrastructure Levy would be generated for the town, to be used for infrastructure projects. It was noted that £36,000 received from the Callaughtons Ash development had been spent on the Gaskell Recreation Ground for community benefit.

Councillor White expressed his concern that members of the public who had contacted him did not want a large development in the town. He understood that this might mean that the flooding would not be dealt with. He expressed his concern that there had been no consultation on the increased number of houses for the site.

Councillor Harper commented that Berrys, the agent, had held a consultation event at the Priory Hall when the proposed housing number for MUW012 had been increased, and that Shropshire Council would regard

this as consultation. Councillor White disagreed, stating that, in his opinion, this had been an information session and no proper consultation had taken place.

The Chair remarked that the stark choice was that in order for the flooding problems to be addressed, the town would have to have the housing.

**It was PROPOSED by Councillor Milner Whiteman and SECONDED by Councillor Herbert Harper that Much Wenlock Town Council have no objection to the proposed housing allocation number in the revised Local Plan, Section 13, Much Wenlock Place Plan Area.**

**We welcome the importance which has been placed on flood alleviation both on and off the housing allocation site MUW012VAR (Hunters Gate 2 site, pages 224/5) and the statement that a roundabout will be provided from the A458 into the site.**

**The Town Council also notes and supports the many references to the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan throughout the Shropshire Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.**

A recorded vote was requested by Councillor White.

In favour: Councillors Harper, Hill, Jenkins, M Park, Walter and Whiteman

Against: Councillors N Park and White

Councillor Themans was no longer present at the meeting, due to technical difficulties.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the above response to S13. Much Wenlock Place Plan Area in the Shropshire Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan.**

c. It was noted that the Town Council had already submitted objections to the outline planning application for the Ironbridge Power Station (19/05560/OUT) and the Proposed Quarry to the East of Much Wenlock Road in Buildwas (19/05509/MAW) and that decisions on both applications were awaited.

d. It was **RESOLVED to defer consideration of the impact on Much Wenlock of proposals for other areas included in the Draft Local Plan to the next full Council meeting, due to pressure of time.**

## **1<sup>st</sup> September 2020 – P&E**

### **9. Shropshire Council Local Plan Review**

Councillors considered a number of questions raised at the recent extraordinary full Council meeting, held on 20<sup>th</sup> August 2020.

e. With regard to comments made about conflict with the Neighbourhood Development Plan, the following extracts from the Plan were noted:

“While we intend that the Plan will last through to 2026, we recognise that challenges and pressures will change.” (pg 5)

“...the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan must be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework ... and local policy, in particular Shropshire Council’s Core Strategy (2011). ...The Core Strategy sets an indicative scale of up to 500 new dwellings for Much Wenlock between 2006 and 2026...” (pg 4)

“Open market housing will only be permitted outside the Much Wenlock development boundary where this type of development can be demonstrated to be essential to ensure the delivery of affordable housing as part of the same development proposal.”

It was noted that the proposed development on site MUW012 would include 20% affordable housing.

f. Concerns had been raised about the impact of additional traffic at the Gaskell corner. This was undoubtedly a pinch point and development at the Power Station would generate additional pressure. It was noted that recent air pollution monitoring had shown that pollution levels in this location were not excessive.

Councillors noted the need to raise concerns with Shropshire Council about the impact of additional traffic in the town, not only at the Gaskell corner but also in Barrow Street, Wilmore Street and Sheinton Street. It was noted

that the proposal for a bypass for the town had been dropped in 1996 due to reduced funding from central Government. The economic case for the bypass was negative and it was not considered to demonstrate good

value for money. In 2008 it was agreed by Shropshire Council that the scheme should not be reintroduced into the major scheme forward programme. Despite the financial constraints, Councillors considered that a bypass might be the only solution to the town's traffic problems.

It was suggested that Shropshire Council officers should provide proposals for addressing the traffic problems. A possible option could be a one-way system through the town. The Clerk was asked to add consideration of traffic issues and Town Council support for a bypass to the agenda of the October full Council meeting.

- g. Shropshire Councillor David Turner had posed many questions at the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> August. It was noted that some of those questions could not be answered by the Town Council, but should rather be directed to Shropshire Council or other agencies.

With regard to the range of housing proposed for site MUW012, this would not be clarified until a planning application was submitted. However, the Town Council would work with the developer and Shropshire Council to achieve an appropriate outcome. There would be 20% affordable homes and the Town Council would press for these to be allocated to those with Much Wenlock connections.

The Chair introduced Mr Chris Bowden, a member of the Flood Group, who was invited to comment on some of the queries raised.

A certain amount of green space would need to be provided in the development proposed for MUW012 and it was noted that the landowner had requested that this be recreational space, rather than a floodable reserve.

It was understood that the capacity of the town's water supply was under review, with the intention of enhancement. Additional pipework would be required for the foul sewage network.

It was noted that the flooding attenuation scheme for the proposed development would not deal with all of the town's flooding issues and that the use of CIL money generated by the development might be used to provide additional flooding attenuation. The Town Council, John Bellis at Shropshire Council and the Flood Group would work together to find solutions. Flow calculations were being made to determine the requirements for pools on the parkland and it was believed that the resulting scheme would also dramatically reduce flooding downstream at Farley. New Government funding for flood alleviation would primarily be directed towards addressing river flooding.

With regard to the proposed roundabout on the Bridgnorth Road, this was intended to slow traffic, not reduce the amount.

The Town Council had no figures for the provision of medical facilities but this was the responsibility of the CCG, not the Town Council. The Headteacher at William Brookes School had previously confirmed that the school could accommodate growth from the Buildwas development.

Consultation had been undertaken by both Berry's, the agent for the developer, and Shropshire Council.

### **3<sup>rd</sup> September 2020 - FC**

#### **1. Chairman's welcome**

The Mayor welcomed everybody to the meeting.

He noted that Shropshire Council's Local Plan review consultation would close at the end of the month and encouraged everyone to respond.

#### **5. Shropshire Council report**

Shropshire Councillor David Turner gave a verbal report. He noted that public consultation on the Shropshire Draft Local Plan was open until 30<sup>th</sup> September and information was available on line. A hard copy of the documentation could be viewed at Much Wenlock Library.

#### **11. Shropshire Draft Local Plan Consultation**

- a. Councillors considered the proposals for employment land for Much Wenlock. It was noted that the amount of land available was much reduced and that there was little employment land available in the town.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to request that Shropshire Council find more employment land for the town than that proposed in the Draft Local Plan.**

- b. Councillors considered the impact on Much Wenlock of proposals for other areas included in the Local Plan. Development proposals for Tasley were specifically referenced, with some Councillors concerned about the possible increase in traffic from this development which would pass through Much Wenlock. Proposals for other settlements in the area around Much Wenlock would also increase traffic through the town.

Councillors were deeply concerned about the potential impact of increased commuting and service traffic from vast housing developments near to Much Wenlock on the medieval town. The large developments proposed for other areas nearby could overwhelm the road network. Some support was expressed for a bypass for the town.

It was noted that traffic management was the responsibility of Shropshire Council, not the Town Council. The Town Council should continue to lobby Shropshire Council for action to address the problems and to discuss the issues in detail with the Town Council.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to express the Town Council's great concerns about the impact on Much Wenlock of increased traffic from developments at Tasley, Buildwas, Shrewsbury and other areas and to ask Shropshire Council to take decisive steps to lessen that impact. The Town Council would also lobby Councillor Turner as the town's representative at Shropshire Council.**

#### **8<sup>th</sup> October 2020 – FC**

##### **5. Shropshire Council report**

Councillor Turner noted that the Local Plan Review consultation had closed the previous week and that there had been a huge response.

#### **5<sup>th</sup> November 2020 - FC**

##### **5. Shropshire Council report**

Councillor Turner advised that the Shropshire Council meeting for the next stage of the Local Plan review had been postponed from 23<sup>rd</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> December 2020 – P&E**

##### **8. Local Plan Review**

Councillors noted the current timetable for the Shropshire Council Local Plan review. Adoption was estimated to be in May 2022.

#### **3<sup>rd</sup> December 2020 – FC**

##### **6. Shropshire Council report**

...

Councillor Turner advised that there had been a delay in progress with the Local Plan after receipt of some 2,600 submissions during the Regulation 18 consultation period. Some allocations had been altered but not that for Much Wenlock. Councillor Turner had asked a Member's question and was expecting a response at the Shropshire Council Cabinet meeting the following week with regard to the likelihood of the Much Wenlock Place Plan area seeing a doubling of population as a result of the Wenlock, Buildwas and Cressage development proposals. The planning application for Buildwas Power Station was expected to be considered by Shropshire Council's Southern Planning Committee in February.

...

Councillor Turner was asked for further clarification of the timescale for the Local Plan. He advised that it was anticipated that Cabinet would submit the final draft for Regulation 19 consultation on 7<sup>th</sup> December. In March the Plan would go to the full Council and then, if passed, to the Planning Inspectorate. A number of hearings would be held by the Planning Inspector during 2021 with the expectation that the Plan would be adopted by Shropshire Council in Spring 2022.

## **2<sup>nd</sup> February 2021 – P&E**

### **8. Shropshire Council Local Plan**

- a. Members noted that the period for public consultation on the Regulation 19 pre-submission version of the Local Plan had been extended by three weeks and would now close at 5.00pm on Friday, 26<sup>th</sup> February. Comments regarding 'strategic corridors' had been submitted by the Town Council to Shropshire Council.
  
- b. Members noted that, on request and where residents did not have access to the internet, paper copies of the Local Plan could be provided due to the limited access to Shropshire libraries at present.

## **4<sup>th</sup> February 2021 – FC**

### **1. Chairman's welcome**

...

The Mayor advised that the Local Plan consultation into the latest pre-submission version of Shropshire Council's Local Plan had been extended and would close at 5pm on Friday, 26<sup>th</sup> February.

## **4<sup>th</sup> March 2021 – FC**

### **5. Shropshire Council report**

...

With regard to the Local Plan Review, it was expected that submission would be made to the Secretary of State in July 2021, with the Inspector's Report being given in May 2022 and Shropshire Council adopting the Plan in July 2022.

# Neighbourhood Plan References in Much Wenlock Town Council Minutes January 2016 to April 2021

Full Council – FC

Planning & Environment Committee – P&E

**2<sup>nd</sup> February 2016 – P&E**

## **1. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR MUCH WENLOCK**

Members considered feedback from the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Panel as follows:

- Housing completions were on target in accordance with the Plan.
- There was likely to be a 2-year delay before the designated employment sites at Stretton Road could be marketed as such until the attenuation ponds had been installed.
- The Community well being indicator was adequate.
- Much Wenlock was below the county average for available open space per head of population.
- The Affordable Housing project off Callaughton Lane had been well received by the community according to feedback from the first consultation event.
- Shropshire Council hoped to roll forward the Core Strategy with modifications through from 2026 to 2036 and had indicated that this was a possible option for the review of the Neighbourhood Plan since there was no guidance from the government about how the Plan should be reviewed.
- The Plan's review should acknowledge development in Telford and its impact on Much Wenlock.

**It was unanimously AGREED to NOTE.**

**3<sup>rd</sup> March 2016 – FC**

## **12. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MONITORING PANEL**

Members received a written update from the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Panel which was to be presented at the Annual Town Meeting scheduled to take place on 17 March 2016. The Panel was responsible for monitoring the Plan which was due for review in 2017. Now that the Plan was local policy for Much Wenlock Shropshire Council planning officers were referring to it when making planning decisions for the parish. To date 27 dwellings had been completed in the town and another 9 proposed, which indicated that the town was on target to deliver the required number of dwellings by the first review date. As well as monitoring housing delivery the Panel would review other policies within the Plan and formal indicators had been established.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED that the report be APPROVED for presentation at the Annual Town Meeting.**

**28<sup>th</sup> July 2016 – FC**

## **13. REVIEW OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR MUCH WENLOCK**

Members considered for approval that the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Much Wenlock should be reviewed in accordance with page 7 in the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Much Wenlock which states that "A review of the Plan will be carried out within three years of the making of the Plan".

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that:**

- i. **A review of the Plan should commence.**
- ii. **The local community should be invited to suggest aspects of the Plan which they feel should be a priority for the review process.**
- iii. **A public meeting would be held in the autumn to communicate and discuss the review.**
- iv. **The Planning & Environment Committee would work with the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Working Group to begin the review.**



**1<sup>st</sup> September 2016 – FC**

**19. REVIEW OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR MUCH WENLOCK**

Members considered for approval how a review of the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Much Wenlock should be carried out and by whom.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that the Planning & Environment Committee and the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Working Group would meet to consider how to engage with the community as part of the review process and make recommendations to the town council.**

**4<sup>th</sup> October 2016 – P&E**

**10. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW**

Members considered the review process for the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Much Wenlock and the discussion which had taken place at a recent meeting with the Planning & Environment Committee and the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Working Group.

**It was AGREED that the minutes from the meeting of the Working Group and the Planning & Environment Committee did not reflect any input from the Committee although the Committee had commented on various matters, including examples of when the Neighbourhood Development Plan had been ignored by Shropshire Council when considering planning applications to which the committee had objected.**

**6<sup>th</sup> October 2016 - FC**

**10. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW**

Members received a written report from the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Working Group which proposed the following for approval:

1. Review housing delivery and needs in the context of our monitoring work and the Assessor's report on the Neighbourhood Plan, with a view to reporting to the Town Council in January or February 2017 with a view to making a report to the Annual Town Meeting in March.
2. Amend the terms of reference and responsibilities of the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Working Group to enable it to lead the review process and to advise the Town Council on changes to the Plan.
3. The Monitoring (and review) Working Group should begin to engage with the community and other organisations to discuss aspects of the Plan which they consider should be a priority for the review process.
4. A bid should be submitted to Locality or other DCLG-funded groups to fund any work and community engagement required to review the Plan in 2017 and 2018.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that all of the proposals be APPROVED.**

**1<sup>st</sup> November 2016 – P&E**

**8. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW**

Members considered information concerning the review process for the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Much Wenlock. At the last Town Council meeting held on 6 October 2016 the Council agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Working Group should also be responsible for leading the review process and to advise the Town Council on changes to the Plan. With this in mind the Working Group had invited a Member of the Committee to attend its first meeting at which the Working Group would begin to address the formula for engaging the community with the review of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Members expressed concern as to whether a review was necessary, especially since the outcome of a new Neighbourhood Planning Bill had not been before Parliament and a review process was yet to be clearly defined.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED to respond to the Working Group and inform members that:**

- i. **The Committee feels that no further action should be taken until firm details were received from Parliament concerning the review process.**
- ii. **A Committee Member would not be attending the next meeting of the Working Group.**

**29<sup>th</sup> November 2016 – P&E**

**1. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW**

The Chairman reported that she was not able to attend a recent meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring and Review Working Group although a written report from that meeting was to be presented to the Town Council meeting on 1 December 2016.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED to NOTE.**

**1<sup>st</sup> December 2016 - FC**

**9. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MONITORING AND REVIEW**

Members received a written report from the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring & Review Working Group following its meeting held on 21 November 2016. The group had discussed housing completions to date, housing needs, contextual changes to the Neighbourhood Development Plan in line with planning policy, gathering local information, and practical experience of using the Plan. The housing target was well on track.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that the report be NOTED.**

**3<sup>rd</sup> January 2017 – P&E**

**9. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW**

There was no further information to consider.

**31<sup>st</sup> January 2017 – P&E**

**2. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW**

The Chairman reported that the review of the Neighbourhood Plan was progressing slowly and another meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring and Review Working Group was planned to take place soon.

**NOTED.**

**2nd February 2017 – FC**

**11. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MONITORING AND REVIEW**

Members received a report on housing from the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring and Review Working Group. The report set out current and future housing needs, an overview of the supply of affordable housing, housing supply development trends from 2013 – 2017, and scale and type of future housing developments.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that the document be NOTED and further comments should be forwarded to the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring and Review Working Group.**

**28<sup>th</sup> February 2017 – P&E**

**10. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW**

Members received information concerning the review process for the Neighbourhood Plan for Much Wenlock.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that Cllr. Mary Hill would convey the Committee's concerns to the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring and Review Working Group.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017 - FC**

**10 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MONITORING AND REVIEW**

Members received a written report from the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring and Review Working Group following a meeting with Shropshire Council. One of the senior planning officers was willing to attend a town council meeting following the local elections in May 2016 to brief councillors on how the Neighbourhood Plan should be used when responding to planning applications.

Members also received a Housing Report following the Working Group's review of the Neighbourhood Plan. No revisions were necessary and the Plan was on track in terms of housing delivery.

Concern was expressed that the designated employment land at Stretton Road was being transferred into new ownership for use as a car park. Members were informed that the Working Group had referred the matter to Shropshire Council for explanation.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that the Town Council:**

- i. Accepts the offer from Ian Kilby of a discussion and short training session on the application of the Neighbourhood Plan in planning decisions.**
- ii. Agrees the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Housing Review report subject to minor changes as NOTED.**
- iii. The Town Council publishes the Housing Review report with an executive summary of its main conclusions as outlined.**
- iv. Welcomes the commitment by Shropshire Council to engage with the Town Council on the Shropshire Local Plan review and agrees the comments on the Local Plan Review as set out in this report or submission to Shropshire Council.**
- v. Notes the comments in the Housing White Paper as set out in the report and agrees to consider a response to the Department of Communities and Local Government at its next meeting(s).**

**4<sup>th</sup> April 2017 – P&E**

**9. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW**

Members received the notes from a meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring & Review Working Group held on 20 March 2017.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED to NOTE.**

**6<sup>th</sup> April 2017 - FC**

**18. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MONITORING AND REVIEW WORKING GROUP**

Members received the notes from the last meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring and Review Working Group held on 20 March 2017.

**NOTED.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> May 2017 – P&E**

**1. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW**

Members considered how the Neighbourhood Plan would be reviewed once new councillors were in place.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that future review of the Neighbourhood Plan should be decided by the Town Council.**

**30<sup>th</sup> May 2017 – P&E**

**2. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

Members considered how the Committee would manage the Neighbourhood Plan in terms of its review and monitoring and make recommendations to the Town Council.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that:**

- i. The review and monitoring of the Neighbourhood Plan should be discussed with Adrian Cooper at Shropshire Council.**
- ii. Shropshire Council should be asked how it intends to carry out a housing need survey.**
- iii. The Committee would monitor housing development in line with the Neighbourhood Plan.**

#### 4<sup>th</sup> July 2017 – P&E

##### 9. Working with Shropshire Council

Members reflected on their recent meeting with planning officers from Shropshire Council at which a number of matters had been discussed, including the review of the Neighbourhood Plan, drainage and flooding issues, especially those relating to the new development off Callaughton Lane.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that more regular meetings with Shropshire Council would be welcomed.**

#### 1<sup>st</sup> August 2017 – P&E

##### 9. Monitoring development in accordance with the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Members considered whether there were any planning applications that needed to be included in the monitoring of housing development in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan for Much Wenlock.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that:**

- i. **Planning application 17/03490/FUL should be added to the data for the monitoring and review of the Neighbourhood Plan for Much Wenlock.**
- ii. **Shropshire Council should be asked to provide housing data to assist with the review and monitoring of the Neighbourhood Plan for Much Wenlock.**

#### 5<sup>th</sup> September 2017 – P&E

##### 10. Monitoring development in accordance with the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Members considered whether there were any planning applications that needed to be included in the monitoring of housing development in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan for Much Wenlock.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that there were no applications to be added at present.**

#### 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2017 – P&E

##### 9. Monitoring development in accordance with the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Members considered whether there were any planning applications that needed to be included in the monitoring of housing development in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan for Much Wenlock. Members also expressed concern about how applications were being dealt with for those interested in being considered for the affordable homes at Callaughton Lane.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED that:**

- i. **There were no applications to be added to the housing monitoring data at present.**
- ii. **Shropshire Housing should be asked to explain the application process for those interested in being considered for a home on the Callaughton Lane development so that the details could be conveyed to those interested.**

#### 31<sup>st</sup> October 2017 – P&E

##### 9. Monitoring development in accordance with the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Members considered whether there were any planning applications that needed to be included in the monitoring of housing development in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan for Much Wenlock. The Chairman recommended that this should be discussed further when the Committee met with Shropshire Council on 7 November 2017.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and AGREED to ask for an update on housing numbers for Much Wenlock when the Committee met with Shropshire Council to discuss the Local Plan Review and the implications it might have on the Neighbourhood Plan.**

#### 5<sup>th</sup> April 2018 - FC

##### 5. Shropshire Council Report

Cllr. David Turner gave the following verbal report:

.....

- 530 Neighbourhood Plans had been approved in local referendums. The Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan states that by 2018 it was expected that there would be a successful and positive operational relationship with Housing Associations to bring forward affordable housing, drainage issues would be addressed, and progress made on the F1 employment site, but only affordable housing and drainage issues had been successfully implemented.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> November 2018 – FC**

##### **5. Shropshire Council Report**

....

Councillor Turner referred to the new Local Plan for which the consultation period was expected to be between 29<sup>th</sup> November 2018 and 31<sup>st</sup> January 2019. The Plan indicated that 150 dwellings would be required in Much Wenlock between 2016 and 2036. 45 had already been completed, leaving 105 outstanding. The preferred housing site between the primary school and Hunters Gate would provide 80 houses. This scheme would also include appropriate flood prevention measures and consideration of a roundabout for access to the A458. Councillor Turner was pleased to see that mention had been made of the town's Neighbourhood Plan in the Local Plan.

With regard to affordable housing, Councillor Turner stated that the Town Council was committed to support the Neighbourhood Plan and to address the need for affordable housing in the town.

#### **5<sup>th</sup> March 2019 – P&E**

##### **10. Neighbourhood Plan**

Councillors noted that there had been calls to review the Neighbourhood Plan, linked to the review of the Local Plan and consultation on Preferred Options sites. Clarity was awaited from Shropshire Council on the legal position with regard to the timing and mechanism for any review of the Neighbourhood Plan. Councillors noted the very high cost of undertaking a review.

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> April 2019 – P&E**

##### **18. Neighbourhood Plan**

- a. Councillors noted activities undertaken by the "Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh 2019" group.
- b. Councillors had been investigating the legal position and were hoping to have definitive answers for the full Council meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> April. Further discussion was deferred until that meeting

#### **4<sup>th</sup> April 2019 – FC**

##### **12. Neighbourhood Plan**

Agenda item 12 b was considered first.

- a. The Chairman noted that the Neighbourhood Plan was an important document contributing to decision making across all sectors of the community by Much Wenlock Town Council and Shropshire Council. The Plan had been adopted in 2014 and extended to 2026. It would seem appropriate to review the Plan at some stage to maximise its weight in decision making and ensure its compatibility with the Local Plan planned for adoption in 2020/2021. In order to ensure the Neighbourhood Plan continued to carry maximum weight as a decision influencing document timing was critical.

It was noted that there was no legal requirement to review or update a Neighbourhood Plan. Policies might become out of date if they conflicted with a Local Plan that was updated after production of the Neighbourhood Plan. The most recent Plan would take precedence.

The Council had sought advice on the legal position and two separate bodies had confirmed that the Town Council was the Qualifying Body in Much Wenlock and only the Town Council could update the Plan.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and unanimously RESOLVED not to review the Neighbourhood Plan prior to the adoption of the Local Plan in 2020/21 and that, after that adoption, the Town Council should investigate the possible need for and means of a review.**

- b. Councillors noted activities being undertaken by the “Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh 2019” group. This was a group of local people whose objective seemed to be either to seek a review of the Neighbourhood Plan or to object to the adoption of the preferred residential development site by Shropshire Council for inclusion in the Local Plan currently under preparation.

The Chairman welcomed members of the community having a strong voice in decision making affecting Much Wenlock. He noted that the Council was there to represent the community, not to build barriers of division. Much Wenlock Town Council was the democratic voice of the community and the qualifying body to enable a review to be undertaken. The Chairman welcomed local people taking an interest in factors affecting the content of the Neighbourhood Plan but he suggested this was not the time for Councillors to actively support the Refresh Group or their objectives. In his view, active support of the group would contradict the motion the Council had just approved. However, the Chairman supported members of the community voicing their opinions and concerns to the Council or to individual Councillors to ensure that their concerns were eased.

It was noted that the volunteers involved with the group had nothing to do with the Town Council. It was thought that the name of the group was confusing for members of the public.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED that the Town Council would not participate in or support the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh 2019 group.**

#### **30<sup>th</sup> April 2019 – P&E**

##### **19. Neighbourhood Plan**

Councillors noted that the position agreed at the full Council meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2019 with regard to the review of the Neighbourhood Plan had been included in the May edition of the Wenlock Herald.

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> July 2019 P&E**

##### **11. Neighbourhood Planning**

Councillors noted an article in the Spring edition of LCR magazine on Neighbourhood Planning. This highlighted the problems that the Town Council had encountered. Many adopted plans had been overruled when developers had contested them.

#### **3<sup>rd</sup> December 2019 – P&E**

##### **9. Local Plan - Preferred Sites**

Councillors noted correspondence received from the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group (MWNPRG) regarding the above. It was noted that the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan covered the period to 2026, whereas the Shropshire Council Local Plan would cover the period to 2036 and would supersede the Neighbourhood Plan.

It was further noted that the Town Council was not the Planning Authority and that the decision on development sites would be taken by Shropshire Council. An appropriate response would be made to the MWNPRG.

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> July 2020 – FC**

##### **9. Flooding and Neighbourhood Development Plan**

Councillors considered correspondence received from Mr Orves regarding flooding problems in the town, the relationship between housing development and flooding attenuation, and the importance of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Councillor Hill agreed that errors had been made with Hunters Gate and the problems had been raised recently with John Bellis, the Drainage and Flood Risk Manager at Shropshire Council. He had concurred that it was now too late to

raise the issues with Persimmon, the developer, and that due diligence had not been carried out by Shropshire Council at the time.

With regard to future development, the Neighbourhood Development Plan specified that sites of no more than 25 houses were desirable. However, no specific sites had been identified in the Plan. Whilst such smaller sites were desirable, they were not practical.

It was noted that the Town Council could continue to ask for funding to resolve the flooding problems but could not make this happen. Money had been set aside by Severn Trent for flood alleviation but this would not be taken up in the current year and it was thought that the proposed scheme would need to be revised. Flooding problems across the town needed to be addressed.

In respect of housing development at Hunter's Gate, the only position the Town Council had taken was to reluctantly support 80 houses on the site, providing this resolved the drainage problems. Until the draft Local Plan was published, it was not known what number of houses would be included. The Council would consider the proposals in the Local Plan when it went out to consultation.

Members noted the impact of proposals for several large housing developments around Much Wenlock, such as the Power Station, Bridgnorth, Presthope and, potentially, Shadwell Quarry.

**It was RESOLVED to suspend Standing Orders to allow Shropshire Councillor David Turner to speak on this item.**

Councillor Turner stated that the responsible authority at the time of the Hunters Gate development had been Bridgnorth District Council, not Shropshire Council. He believed that the Town Council should have commented on the revised proposals for the extension to the site sooner.

Town Councillors responded that they would consider the proposals made in the Local Plan and respond to the consultation.

The Mayor advised that the Drainage and Flood Risk Manager at Shropshire Council had offered to meet residents of Hunters Gate to discuss the flooding issues.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to advise the petitioners from Hunters Gate of the offer made by the Drainage and Flood Risk Manager to meet to discuss the flooding problems and that a representative of the Town Council should attend any meeting arranged.**

**4<sup>th</sup> March 2021 – FC**

**15. Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group**

Members considered correspondence from the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group, asking for recognition of the group by the Town Council. Members concurred that dialogue with all groups was important to support informed decision making.

**It was PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to formally recognise the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group and to commit to reading correspondence submitted to the Council from the Group.**