

Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan

2024 to 2038



**Consultation Statement to accompany the Submission Version
Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan**

May 2025

**Prepared by the Much Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group on
behalf of Much Wenlock Town Council**

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Summary of engagement and consultation activities, issues and outcomes	4
	Stage I: Preparing the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan	4
	Stage II: Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation.....	17
	Stage III: Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan.....	22
3	Conclusion.....	23
	Appendix A: List of those consulted at Regulation 14 (Pre-Submission) stage.....	24
	Appendix B: Summary of comments received at Pre-Submission Regulation 14 consultation and response from the Steering Group	26

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The policies contained in the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan (the MWNP) have been developed following extensive interaction and consultation with the community and businesses within the area.
- 1.2. This Consultation Statement sets out how the MWNP has been developed and, in accordance with Regulation 14 of Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended):
 - details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - how they were consulted;
 - a summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

The Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

- 1.3. Much Wenlock Town Council is the qualifying body officially responsible for the Neighbourhood Plan. A Steering Group, comprising local councillors and volunteers from the community, was set up to lead on the development of the MWNP. Beneath this, a series of Working Groups exploring specific topics were set up, each reporting into the Steering Group.

2 SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES, ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

2.1. A high-level summary of the key milestones of the MWNP is shown below:

Table 1: High level summary of key milestones

Date	Milestone	Key activities
2023	Much Wenlock Town Council decides to review the MWNP	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Funding sought and consultancy support engaged• High level review of existing Plan undertaken to identify potential amendments and gaps
2024	Evidence and engagement Pre-Submission Version (Regulation 14) Plan published	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dedicated webpage established• Steering Group established• Working groups established• Community Survey launched• Community exhibition on review of objectives• Housing Needs Assessment prepared• Design Guidance and Codes prepared• Initial draft plan prepared for Strategic Environmental Assessment / Habitats Regulations Assessment screenings• Regulation 14 consultation carried out
2025	Regulation 16 Plan published Examination Referendum	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Submission Version Plan submitted to SC for second round of formal consultation• Plan independently examined (date tbc)• Plan finalised for Referendum (date tbc)• Plan 'made'

2.2. The sections below describe, in fuller detail, the engagement and consultation process which took place during the Plan preparation. This is divided into three stages:

Stage I: Preparing the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan

Stage II: Consulting on the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan

Stage III: Finalising the Submission Neighbourhood Plan

Stage I: Preparing the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan

2.3. Much Wenlock was one of the first parishes to develop a neighbourhood plan under the Government's Neighbourhood Plan Frontrunner programme. The first [Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan \(2013 to 2026\)](#) was formally adopted into the Development Plan for Shropshire in July 2014. It has proved to be successful in guiding planning applications and decisions relating to the parish.

- 2.4. As the plan has been approaching its end date, certain issues have prompted the need to review it. These include changes to national planning policy, change at the local authority (Shropshire Council) level and new issues and opportunities arising at the local level.
- 2.5. From a national perspective, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been amended a number of times since the adoption of the MWNP, most recently in December 2024. A number of new legislation has been brought in, for instance the Environment Act 2021, many of which have implications for planning and land-use issues.
- 2.6. In 2017, Shropshire Council started work on a Local Plan Review, to replace the existing Core Strategy (2011) and the Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (2015). Five consultation stages were undertaken as part of the Regulation 18 stage of plan preparation:
 - Issues and Strategic Options (January 2017 - March 2017)
 - Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development (October 2017-December 2017)
 - Preferred Sites (November 2018 - February 2019)
 - Strategic Sites (July 2019 - September 2019)
 - Regulation 18: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan (August 2020– September 2020)
- 2.7. During this period, a number of residents became increasingly concerned about the impact that the emerging Local Plan Review (LPR) might have on Much Wenlock and notably its heritage status. In February 2019, the [Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group](#) (the Refresh Group), a voluntary group, was established. They undertook a community consultation which highlighted support for a robust submission to the (then) forthcoming Regulation 19 Version LPR consultation. In parallel, the Town Council, which had in June that year withdrawn its support for the LPR direction of travel, welcomed a number of new councillors who were committed to reviewing the MWNP, to ensure that the policies remained up-to-date and effective. The Refresh Group, whilst separate to the Town Council (the MWNP Qualifying Body), was keen to work with the Town Council on the MWNP review.
- 2.8. At their meeting of 28 February 2023, the Much Wenlock Town Council Planning & Environment Committee considered a letter from the Refresh Group regarding the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan, urging the Council to commence a review. Councillors noted that several valid points had been made in the letter. Following consideration, the Committee resolved to recommend to full Council that a Steering Committee be formed to review the Neighbourhood Plan and to make recommendations to full Council.
- 2.9. By September 2023, a professional planning consultant had been engaged by the Town Council to support the MWNP Review. The consultant prepared an initial desk-based review of the existing Neighbourhood Plan, checking compliance with current planning policy, areas where policies could be strengthened and potential gaps for consideration. At this point, an application was made to Locality (the organisation overseeing the national neighbourhood plan support programme) for both grant support and technical support, the latter to enable a Design Guide to be prepared for the parish and also a local Housing Needs Assessment. This was actioned at this particular time as the support programme was drawing to a close for

applications for the year and the Town Council wanted to ensure that it did not have to wait until it reopened, which would not be till late spring 2024.

- 2.10. Following receipt of the desk-based review (November 2023), members of the Planning and Environment Committee met with the consultant on 4 January 2024. The scope of the review was discussed, including what matters could and could not form part of the Neighbourhood Plan. It was agreed that a wider meeting involving representatives from local stakeholder groups would be helpful to clarify some matters and to explore the involvement of residents.
- 2.11. The wider meeting was held on 7 February 2024, with representatives from the Refresh Group, the Much Wenlock Civic Society, the Much Wenlock Town Council Planning and Environment Committee and the Mayor and Town Clerk. The consultant presented an overview of the desk-based review and this was followed by a discussion about how well the current MWNP had been working, its relationship with the LPR and potential steps forward.
- 2.12. Notably the topic of housing and allocations was discussed in some depth as an area that could be pursued in the MWNP Review. The merits of allocating sites to meet local need in a neighbourhood plan were set out by the consultant, however, it was considered by those present that the numbers of homes being pursued in the parish (at the time) as part of LPR, were adequate to meeting local housing need (albeit the site proposed for allocation was itself not comprehensively supported) and there was no appetite to consider additional sites. There was also no appetite at this time to include the proposed LPR site in the MWNP as an allocation as it was not universally supported, and it was considered that the LPR process would be best route to influencing this.
- 2.13. It was agreed at the meeting that a public event should be organised to launch the MWNP Review. This was held on Saturday 9 March at the Priory Hall and those attending the 7 February meeting were invited to take responsibility for a particular topic area.

Social media post promoting the public event and the MWNP logo



Our plan – Our future

Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Review

We need your views, ideas, knowledge and skills

In 2014 the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan 2013 – 2026 was adopted and became part of the local planning framework to help guide and control development in our area. Members of the community helped shape the plan to ensure it expressed the local vision for development in our town.

It is now time to review the Plan and bring it up to date, making it fit for purpose until 2038. To help do this, we need to gather the current views and aspirations of our community. We are also looking for volunteers to become more involved with the review process.

Come and find out more!

Neighbourhood Plan Review

Public Launch Meeting – Drop-in Event

Saturday, 9th March 2024

10.00am to 4.00pm

Priory Hall, Much Wenlock

If you cannot attend the launch event but want to contribute please contact:

Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Review
Corn Exchange, High Street, Much Wenlock, TF13 6AE
Tel: 01952 727509
Email: MWNPPlan@muchwenlock-tc.gov.uk
Website: www.muchwenlock-tc.gov.uk



- 2.14. Attendees to the event were greeted and signed in to join the mailing list for updates on the NDP and to express interest to join the project team. A scrolling presentation providing general information about neighbourhood planning was shown continuously in one part of the room. The remainder of the room was set up in areas dedicated to each topic area of the plan review. Posters were printed outlining the current vision and objectives, existing policy areas (to be updated), and potential new policy areas to be added (including active travel, heritage assets and biodiversity and green space). Residents were invited to make comments on these using post-it notes and drawing on the maps provided. Specific questions about each policy area were provided as a way to prompt input. Each topic area 'lead' provided a short presentation on their area at various points throughout the session. Given the significance of flooding locally, the Civic Society was invited to show a short film about this issue ("[Understanding flooding in Much Wenlock](#)") and how planning policy might be used to address it. Refreshments were offered and at various points as well as an activity table for those attending with children.
- 2.15. The event was considered to be a success and was well attended (approximately 140 residents), although it was noted that further representation from different age groups and settlements outside the town centre should be actively sought.

Photographs from the public launch event



- 2.16. A Community Survey was launched at the event, inviting feedback on a range of topics. This was available in both hard copy (to return to selected venues around the parish) as well as online. The survey was promoted on social media, on the Town Council website, via posters around the parish and in the Wenlock Herald, [Shropshire Star](#) and on local radio.

Examples of the poster advertising the Community Questionnaire



- 2.17. Following the public launch event, at the meeting on 3 April 2024, the Steering Group was officially set up comprising both town councillors and volunteers (including representatives from Refresh and the Civic Society). A Terms of Reference was agreed (subject to minor amendments) and Cllr Dan Thomas was elected as Chair. Resident, Lesley Durbin, was appointed Deputy Chair. Other members of the Steering Group took the lead on areas such as communications and minute taking. It was agreed that a further resident (who had attended the launch event), would be approached to project management the work.
- 2.18. A [Communications Overview presentation](#) was prepared setting out recommended channels to be pursued throughout the process. It covered:
- General communication activities – that would be undertaken on a rolling basis to keep people informed of the plan and progress, for instance the development of a mailing list, drop in events, social media, exhibitions and displays and articles in the local magazine.
 - Targeted engagement – to identify the different demographic groups around the parish and the best mechanisms to engage them.
 - Topic based engagement – to identify, by theme, specific interest groups and individuals who could most helpfully input.
- 2.19. The nine objectives of the original MWNP were consolidated into 7 overarching topics, each of which would become the focus of a Working Group. Each member of the Steering Group took responsibility for a particular Working Group, with the intention that further volunteers could be gathered to support the work involved in building up the purpose and evidence base for each. The Working Groups were as follows:
- Spatial Strategy and Housing

- The Economy and Jobs
 - Reducing Flood Risk
 - Transport and Movement
 - Community Well-being
 - Good quality design, local character and heritage
 - Green and open spaces, local landscape and wildlife
- 2.20. A further topic relating to sustainability and climate change was considered to crosscut all aspects of the plan, hence it was felt that it should not be a standalone topic.
- 2.21. [Feedback from the Open Day](#) was collated along with responses to the [online survey](#). Each member of the Steering Group was provided with the comments so that it could inform their work on the policy areas. To assist this, the consultant drew up a 'Task List' setting out, by Working Group, potential policy areas (existing ones to be updated and new ones to be added) and a summary of the evidence required to underpin each. An intense period of engagement and evidence gathering took place during this initial phase of the project and this is described below.
- 2.22. **Ongoing communications:** Starting in this initial phase of the project, and continuing throughout, a range of communications activities were undertaken:
- Regular articles in local publications and other outlets: This includes the Much Wenlock Herald, a monthly publication prepared by the Parochial Church Council (PCC) of Much Wenlock and Bourton and delivered to every household. An update on the Neighbourhood Plan was included in every edition. Also, the Shropshire Bridgnorth Journal, Shropshire Star and BBC Radio Shropshire.

Examples of articles in the Much Wenlock Herald



Could you help shape the review of our Neighbourhood Plan?

Our plan – Our future

Following the launch of the Review in March, those Town Councillors and local volunteers comprising the Steering Group have been busy! Consideration of the objectives covered in the Neighbourhood Plan has been divided amongst members of that group. Those objectives - some of which may require less work than others - have been divided as follows:

Housing	Flooding	Environment
Community facilities	Economy	Climate change
Design and heritage	Transport and getting around	

The launch event at Priory Hall attracted several volunteers, and still more are now needed. If you have an interest in making a contribution, maybe from your personal experience or professional expertise, please make contact as soon as possible. It's Your Plan, and Your Future, and we can all play a part in shaping the future of our town and parish through to 2038.

If you have not already commented on the issues raised in March at Priory Hall, the survey is still open online for your comments. Simply click on the link on the Town Council's website, scan the QR code with your smartphone or go to <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MuchWenlock1>

We will continue to engage with the community and hope to arrange another consultation event soon. Watch out for news in the Wenlock Herald, on our website, and on our Facebook page.

Email: mwnplan@muchwenlock-tc.gov.uk
 Web: <https://www.muchwenlock-tc.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan-review>





Could you help shape the review of our Neighbourhood Plan?

Our plan – Our future

The Steering Group has now met a few times and are shaping revised draft objectives. The objectives covered Plan have been divided as follows:

Housing	Flooding	Environment
Community facilities	Economy	Climate change
Design and heritage	Transport and getting around	

Whilst additional volunteers have come forward, still more are now needed. If you have an interest in making a contribution, maybe from your personal experience or professional expertise, please make contact as soon as possible. It's Your Plan, and Your Future, and we can all play a part in shaping the future of our town and parish through to 2038.

If you have not already commented on the issues raised in March at Priory Hall, the survey is still open online for your comments. Simply click on the link on the Town Council's website, scan the QR code with your smartphone or go to <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MuchWenlock1>

We will continue to engage with the community and hope to arrange another consultation event soon. Watch out for news in the Wenlock Herald, on our website, and on our Facebook page.

Email: mwnplan@muchwenlock-tc.gov.uk
www.muchwenlock-tc.gov.uk/much-wenlock-neighbourhood-plan-review-2024

The current, adopted, Neighbourhood Plan: www.bit.ly/MWNPNeighbourhoodPlan



- **Logo:** A logo was created to apply to all communications activity.

The MWNP logo



Our plan – Our future

- **Website:** A section dedicated to the MWNP was established on the Much Wenlock Town Council website.
- **Facebook updates:** The Town Council Facebook page was used to issue regular updates on the project. Posts were also published on other Much Wenlock Facebook pages, such as the Civic Society Page, to promote the surveys and generally provide updates.
- **Mailing list:** A mailing list of community members, local community organisations and local businesses was maintained by the Steering Group. A system was established to ensure that all those seeking to be kept informed were added to the list and frequent updates were issued.
- **Posters, banners and fliers:** These were posted at strategic times at various locations around the Parish (including shops, pubs, bus shelters, churches) in the project, to promote the surveys, workshops and other activities. A QR code was used to enable easy access to the surveys.

2.23. **Meetings with key stakeholders:** Regular meetings with key individuals and organisations took place throughout the project including:

- **SC officers:** In the context of the emerging Local Plan, close contact has been maintained with planning officers to keep up-to-date with progress.
- **Much Wenlock Civic Society:** Regular updates to the Society to share information and gain feedback.
- **Much Wenlock Tree Forum:** Regular updates to the Forum to share information and gain feedback.
- **Representatives of Local Businesses:** The Wenlock Guild and Much Wenlock Traders Action Group.
- **The Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Refresh Group:** The Group of local volunteers who encouraged the TC to review the existing MWNP and who also engage with SC's Local Plan, to ensure alignment and consistency with the MWNP.
- **Local service providers:** including Much Wenlock Medical Practice, Much Wenlock Primary School, William Brookes School, Wenlock Estates and the Gaskell Recreation Ground Trustees.

- 2.24. **Topic-based engagement and evidence gathering:** Using the existing MWNP as a starting point and considering the feedback from the community to date and meetings with groups and organisations as set out above, the Working Groups undertook further engagement and evidence gathering during this period, which is summarised below:
- 3.1. Vision and objectives: The starting point for the review of MWNP was to ensure that the residents were given the opportunity to shape development and land use until the end of the Plan period in 2038. The existing vision, encapsulated by the line, 'Our Plan, Our Future' was considered to continue to resonate locally having been defined by the desires, concerns and aspirations of local residents and other stakeholders of Much Wenlock parish. The objectives were refined from nine to seven and additional detail added to reflect changes in local circumstances and local issues and aspirations.
- 2.25. Spatial strategy and housing: The following summary of activities were undertaken to inform the emerging MWNP policies:
- A [Housing Needs Survey for Much Wenlock](#) was prepared by AECOM (funded by the Locality Technical Support Programme). This was published in May 2024 and sets out the specific housing needs of the parish derived from information including population forecasts, local demographics, inward and outward migration, existing housing stock etc.
 - A comprehensive review of the existing policies was undertaken, which were updated to take into account new evidence and community feedback. This included introducing a new overarching spatial policy setting out parameters against which all development proposals should be considered to ensure that they are sustainable in the context of Much Wenlock. Evidence from the LPR was drawn upon to update policies in this section (noting that whilst the LPR itself is to be withdrawn, the evidence base remains in place and sound). There was a desire to ensure that new homes would be suited to the needs of all residents, hence the inclusion of adaptability within the policy.
- 2.26. The economy and jobs: The following summary of activities were undertaken to inform the emerging MWNP policies:
- A meeting with the (at the time newly formed) Much Wenlock Guild of Traders to talk through the emerging policies and set out their views on what could benefit the Town Centre, including issues such as car parking, public realm improvements, tourism infrastructure and signage. Meetings with also held with larger local employers and those in the agriculture sector.
 - A review of the employment sites locally including mapping these.
 - Consideration of how the quarry sites might best be used in the future – this topic has ultimately been included in the environment section due to the relationship with biodiversity.
 - Details on footfall in Much Wenlock.
 - Information on visitor numbers sourced from local venues, including the Guildhall.
 - A new policy has also been included in relation to visitor accommodation in rural areas. This is a key issue that was raised locally – the number of visitor accommodations

becoming 'permanent' residences and the policy builds on data gathered both locally and to inform the (now withdrawn) LPR.

- Meetings with commercial site owners to understand their future aspirations. There was much discussion in the Steering Group about how existing commercial sites should be considered in planning terms, with some disagreement about the best approach to take in terms of safeguarding them as employment sites or enabling mixed developments should employment solely become unviable. Consensus was finally made on this point and is reflected in the Submission Version Plan.

2.27. Reducing Flood Risk: The following summary of activities were undertaken to inform the emerging MWNP policies:

- A video compiled by the Civic Society on flooding in Much Wenlock inspired much debate on this topic. The Working Group reviewed the existing policies on this topic and have updated them in light of new strategic evidence being made available. A series of non-planning policy interventions to assist in stemming water flow have been included, which complement the policies. Some of these relate closely to the environment section of the MWNP.

2.28. Transport and Movement: The following summary of activities were undertaken to inform the emerging MWNP policies:

- A new policy relating to supporting opportunities for 'active travel' (walking, cycling, equestrian) has been introduced. Drawing on feedback from the community and knowledge and expertise from local residents, the Working Group undertook a 'walkabout' of the main town to identify where interventions to make areas safer and more accessible could be made and prioritised these. These sit alongside the policy and form the basis for funding or other support that may come forward.
- An audit of car parking areas was undertaken with a view to seeking to safeguard these and, where possible, provide additional space to serve visitors to the area, and notably in the context of there being no railway station locally.
- Themes were also drawn from the findings on the [Much Wenlock Town Council Resident's Survey on Planning and Traffic \(2022\)](#)

2.29. Community Well-Being: The following summary of activities were undertaken to inform the emerging MWNP policies:

- An audit of important local facilities was undertaken with a commentary about improvements needed for each.
- The community feedback provided information about additional facilities that are wanted/needed. In particular there was a desire to include a policy to protect the remaining public houses from closure and also to continue to provide publicly accessible toilets for both residents and visitors.

2.30. Good quality Design, Local Character and Heritage: The following summary of activities were undertaken to inform the emerging MWNP policies:

- The Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Area Design Guidelines ([Part 1](#) and [Part 2](#)), prepared with community input by consultants at AECOM, underpins a number of policies in the Plan.
- A new policy in this section of the plan identifies non-designated heritage assets in the parish. The Working Group undertook an audit of buildings and other structures and used the Historic England guidance to provide information about why they are considered to be important locally from a heritage/architectural perspective.

Green and Open Spaces, Local Landscapes and Wildlife: The following summary of activities were undertaken to inform the emerging MWNP policies:

- The existing MWNP identified a number of important open spaces in the parish, but did not go as far as designating any local green space. The group audited the list of spaces and, in combination with suggestions of other important areas locally, considered each against the local green space criteria as set out in the NPPF. Ten were considered to be suitable for inclusion at the Pre-Submission Version stage, although two of these have subsequently been removed following the consultation.
 - A local resident and ecologist provided detailed input into the biodiversity and wildlife aspects of the plan. This included the development of a [presentation](#) on this Objective, which was shown at one of the engagement events. A number of new policies have been included in this section, seeking to safeguard and improve landscape resources, biodiversity and wildlife corridors. This has been further enabled since the introduction of the Environment Act 2021 and also in consideration of Shropshire-wide ambitions, such as a 20% tree coverage across the area.
 - A new policy relating to dark skies was introduced, which seeks to limit the impacts of light pollution. This is something that is endorsed by the National Landscapes and other national organisations. Evidence from the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) was drawn upon.
 - Finally a new policy to ensure adequate provision of recreational open space within development proposals in response to findings (LPR evidence) that there is a deficit of such space in the parish.
- 2.31. A second Public Meeting at the Priory Hall, couched as a 'Meet and Greet' event, was held on July 12, 2024. It was promoted via social media, through the local news publications, via the mailing list and on posters around the parish.

Publicity for the 'Meet and Greet' event, July 2024



OPEN MEETING Neighbourhood Plan Review

at Priory Hall, Much Wenlock

Friday 12th July at 7pm

You will be able to view progress so far, and ask questions on the Plan's draft objectives:

- Housing
- Economy
- Flooding
- Community facilities
- Design and heritage
- Climate change
- Environment
- Transport and getting around

Please come along, bring your neighbours, and contribute to **Your Plan - Your Future**

Light refreshments will be provided.

More information is available on Much Wenlock Town Council's website:
www.bit.ly/4e7NKYu





Open Meeting with the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Review Steering Group

Friday 12th July 7pm to 8.30pm at Priory Hall

The Town Council is preparing a Review of the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan. A Steering Group comprising local councillors and volunteers from the community has been set up to guide the process.

Our current Neighbourhood Plan was formally adopted by Shropshire Council in 2014 and its planning policies have been used, alongside the Shropshire Local Plan policies, to inform planning decisions in our parish. However, there have been a number of changes to national policy since our plan was adopted. Shropshire Council are also at a fairly advanced stage of updating their Local Plan. This is why the Town Council are keen to review our Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that it continues to be up-to-date and fit for purpose.

Our Plan covers a range of topics: Housing mix, Flooding, Design and heritage, tackling climate change, transport and getting around, supporting the local economy, the environment and biodiversity, and community facilities.

We held a Community Open Day back in March, which was very well attended and provided an opportunity to gather views on where new issues have arisen and to seek feedback on the existing set of policies.

The Steering Group has been working hard since then to update the Neighbourhood Plan. The event on Friday 12 July (see advert on page 7) will provide an opportunity for you to meet the Steering Group, to hear an update on our progress, to ask questions and to provide further feedback. If there are topic areas that you would like to get involved in, we would welcome your support.

We look forward to meeting you in July.


Cllr Dan Thomas
Chair of the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

2.32. The aim was to provide an opportunity for residents to meet the members of the Steering Group (and Working Groups), receive a progress report on the various topic areas, ask questions and provide further feedback. Each Task Group lead gave a short presentation about their area and posters and maps providing information were available to view. The event was well-attended and information from delegates was recorded and added to the mailing list.

Photos from the 'Meet and Greet' event, July 2024



Follow up article in The Much Wenlock Herald



The town's Priory Hall hosted a lively meeting on 12th July when local residents gathered to hear about progress of the review of the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan. Members of the Steering Group outlined progress on the draft objectives based on previous feedback, and afterwards welcomed comments and questions on a range of topics.

Housing policies remain much the same because the original plan was sound. Small scale rural 'exception' sites for affordable homes will be limited to 20 dwellings, and market housing developments will include 20% affordable homes, both figures in line with Shropshire Council's policy. Changes include no development on known flood zones, recognition of congested traffic corridors, and alignment of infrastructure growth.

There are changes to **Sustainability** which include all new developments being suitable for all ages and abilities and allowing safe and easy access to town facilities.

Draft **Local Economy** policies seek to support existing businesses and help to attract new ones. These include those wishing to work from home, commercial sites in the parish, farming and agriculture, and our town centre businesses. There has also been community feedback about the quarries and support for them as nature, wildlife and recreation sites, which we will pursue.

The Neighbourhood Plan will propose policies to limit serious local **Flooding**. These will encourage development located away from the worst affected areas. Nature-based steps to reduce flooding will also be supported. Ensuring that water quality is not compromised by undesirable development will require cooperation with landowners and the Environment Agency.

Draft policies for **Transport & Getting Around** include ensuring that any new residential development is within a sustainable distance of the main town facilities – this chimes with the national work being done to support 'walkable towns and villages', where shorter journeys should be feasible for those willing and able. We are mapping where improvements could be made to our walking (and cycling/equestrian) route network. We will lobby for increased public transport provision and for highways improvements where affected by development proposals.

A strong response to our survey about **Community Wellbeing** revealed a call for additional community meeting space to host a range of activities and informal meeting places, and more for teenagers to do locally and for somewhere safe, covered and accessible to 'hang out'. Maintaining the leisure centre, improving the under-5s play area, and more green areas – community orchards and gardens - were also listed as important.

Good Quality Design is already supported by the Much Wenlock Design Statement, but the draft review takes this further by providing guidance to be used both by prospective developers and by homeowners considering work on their own properties. It will also provide key criteria for decision makers on planning applications. We also intend to identify 'non-designated heritage assets' - buildings that are historically or architecturally important at a local level but are not classed as officially listed.

Much Wenlock's landscape setting is one of our most prominent assets and proposals in the draft plan acknowledge and safeguard this in the draft **Green/Open Spaces** and **Landscape &**

Wildlife policies. Additional policies are intended to reduce the impact of light pollution, support for a minimum 20% tree canopy cover across the town and identify and protect those landscape views that are most valued. In addition, we want to protect those features of our natural environment that are intrinsic to our area, linking to the other policy areas.

While **Climate Change** is an international issue, we have a part to play at the local level. We want to replace the current policy on efficiency standards with a stronger one about encouraging development (new and existing) to improve their energy efficiency, insulation, reduce water consumption and so forth – this will also inform the Design section of the plan. We also intend to strengthen this policy by providing additional criteria whilst ensuring they are sympathetic to the landscape and bring community benefit.

This is necessarily a condensed and incomplete **summary** of the topics covered and the conversations between local residents at the 12th July meeting. Hopefully it provides a flavour of the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan Review. There will be a further opportunity to influence the final draft in the early autumn. In the meantime further detail of **Your Plan - Your Future** can be found on the Town Council's website: www.bit.ly/4e7NKYU

- 2.33. In September 2024, an informal draft version of the MWNP was sent to officers at Shropshire Council in order for them to undertake the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screenings. This would determine whether or not the plan would likely have significant environmental impacts. The Screening Determination Statements ([SEA](#) and [HRA](#)) were published in November 2024 and found that the MWNP was unlikely to result in significant environmental impacts.

Stage II: Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

- 2.34. The Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) consultation was held between Monday 11 November 2024 and Friday 4 January 2025. This was longer than the statutory 6-week period to allow for the festive period when people might not be available to respond.
- 2.35. To launch the publication of the Pre-Submission version of the MWNP and start of the Regulation 14 consultation period, a consultation event was held at the Priory Hall on Saturday 9 November. It was promoted across the community and approximately 80 people attended, including the MP for South Shropshire. Once again, display boards were set up, showing the different sections of the informal draft Neighbourhood Plan and members of the Steering and Working Groups were available to answer questions and collate feedback. A representative from Shropshire Council also attended, to provide updates on proposed changes to parking restrictions in Much Wenlock.

Images from the 9 November event



- 2.36. The MWNP and supporting evidence were uploaded onto the Town Council website and the consultation was advertised to the local community in the following ways:

- An online survey was created to enable people to provide feedback. Hard copies of the survey (and the Plan itself) were available on request and placed in various public spaces, together with marked “Ballot Boxes”. The boxes and surveys were placed in:
 - Much Wenlock Library
 - the Town Council Offices
 - Ryans Butchers on the High Street
 - Mrs P’s Shop on the High Street
 - Much Wenlock Primary School
 - the Spar on the High Street (surveys and flyers only)
 - the Nisa Garage on Bridgnorth Road (surveys and flyers only)

- Cuan Charity Shop on the High Street (surveys and flyers only)
 - the Pinefields Community Centre
 - Priory Hall
 - Holy Trinity Church, Bourton
 - Holy Trinity Church, Much Wenlock
- An article was placed in the Much Wenlock Herald, delivered to all households
 - Posters were printed and posted at locations around the parish
 - Social media updates were posted on the Facebook Pages of the Much Wenlock Community, Homer, Bourton, the MW Civic Society, MW & Broseley U3A
 - Articles published in the [Shropshire Star](#), The Bridgnorth Journal
 - Radio Shropshire broadcast
 - Emails were sent to all those who had joined the Neighbourhood Plan mailing list
 - Posters were put up around the parish and flyers left at a number of shops/public areas

Regulation 14 consultation example posters and Ballot Boxes



- 2.37. Paper responses were input to SurveyMonkey by a member of the Steering Group and collated with all other responses.
- 2.38. Letters were sent to the owners of the proposed Local Green Spaces as well as the non-designated heritage assets (NDHA).
- 2.39. In addition to consulting with the local community, the Steering Group wrote to statutory consultees and other organisations with an interest in the Plan. A list of the consultees contacted is contained in Appendix A and responses were received from the following:

1. Shropshire Council
 2. Environment Agency
 3. Historic England
 4. Natural England
 5. National Highways
 6. National Gas
 7. National Grid
 8. Sport England
 9. NHS Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin
 10. Network Rail
 11. Canal and River Trust
 12. Lovell Strategic Land
 13. Owner of Birchfield Garage (proposed NDHA)
 14. Owner of LGS4 Holy Trinity Green (Churchyard) (proposed Local Green Space)
 15. Owner of 1 Barrow Street, Much Wenlock (proposed NDHA)
 16. Surveymonkey responses (40 received)
- 2.40. Comments from Shropshire Council were received in late January 2025, delayed due to the LPR work. Their comments focused on whether the MWNP met the 'scope of Neighbourhood Development Plan provisions'. As such, SC considered whether the draft Neighbourhood Plan would meet the Basic Conditions as set out in the Localism Act. In summary these are:
- Compliance with national policies, guidance and advice;
 - Contribution to the achievement of sustainable development;
 - Conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area; and
 - Compatibility with EU obligations.
- 2.41. Notably, SC made mention of the fact that the LPR was at a critical stage, with a letter due to be sent to the Cabinet on 12 February about its ongoing progress. The outcome of those discussions might impact the content of the MWNP.
- 2.42. SC also noted that the NPPF had been updated in December 2024 and that this would need to be reflected in the Submission Version Plan. It would also have a bearing on future housing figures for the county as a whole, almost doubling the previous figure.
- 2.43. On the whole, however, SC's comments were supportive of the emerging MWNP and offered advice on where policies might be strengthened/clarified or brought into greater alignment with the Submission Local Plan. There were also suggestions on where duplication could be removed and additional evidence supplied to support the policy.

- 2.44. Representations received at the Pre-Submission Consultation were recorded by topic/policy and carefully considered by Steering Group members. A summary of the comments and responses agreed by the Steering Group, are set out in Appendix B. There were a number of instances where the Steering Group could not achieve an overall consensus in how to tackle a comment/issue and in these cases, the Town Council (as the qualifying body) made the final decision on how to proceed.
- 2.45. The following paragraphs provide a summary, by topic area, of the comments received during this process and how these were integrated into the Submission Version MWNP.
- 2.46. General comments: The Plan received strong support from the community and other organisations. The document has been reviewed to ensure that it meets the required accessibility standards. SC commented about the length of the document and it is accepted that it is very long. At this time, however, the SG has not moved areas to the appendix as this will be considered later in the process, likely following the independent examination.
- 2.47. It has been made clear in the document that the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Area Design Guidance forms an integral part of the plan, as opposed to simply guidance.
- 2.48. In the context of the (likely) withdrawal of the LPR, SC have since recommended that all references to the LPR are removed, which has been actioned. The evidence base underpinning the LPR remains valid, however, and references to this have therefore been retained.
- 2.49. Challenges, Vision and objectives: These were strongly supported. They have been amended to ensure continuity of text throughout the various sections of the plan.
- 2.50. Spatial strategy and housing: The MWNP does not seek to allocate sites including for housing. It was considered that this would be progressed via the LPR although there was lack of agreement within the Steering Group on the strategy being pursued by SC on this matter. In light of the LPR being withdrawn, this strategic site is no longer being actively allocated at this time. The Steering Group considered again the merits of allocating a site/s in the MWNP but felt that this would delay the MWNP review process dramatically, which would mean the other policies would not be in place. There was also a concern that it could be very controversial locally and may lead to the review being delayed indefinitely.
- 2.51. Policy MW1, therefore, is considered to be very important within the context of the MWNP as it sets out parameters that should be considered by all development proposals to ensure that they are undertaken and located sustainably. It would apply to any future site allocations and also any unplanned (speculative) development. It is not considered to restrict future growth of the parish. Minor text amendments have been made to add greater clarity, largely on the advice of SC.
- 2.52. Regarding Policy MW2, SC commented on the potential consequences of supporting 1-bedroom homes, especially for those with complex needs who may need space for a carer. The Steering Group's discussions with Housing Provider Allocations Managers suggests that their view is that a one bedroom allocation is suitable for a couple, but if a couple have special needs the Housing Provider always discusses this and tries to accommodate it. Policy MW2 seeks a mix of sizes (in terms of bedroom numbers) and would therefore meet such requirements.

- 2.53. Policy MW3 has been amended to align with the LPR evidence in terms of numbers of dwellings that may be acceptable on a rural exception site (increasing from 20 to 25). Additional detail is provided in terms of open market homes on such sites to enable viability.
- 2.54. The economy and jobs: This section was carefully considered by the Steering Group in light of the comments received. Notably there was some disagreement in how sites near to the town centre currently used for commercial purposes should be considered if coming forward for redevelopment. Some felt that such sites should be prioritised for (social/affordable) housing to optimise such provision and in areas within walking distance of the town centre. Others felt it important to try to retain the commercial element due to the lack of such provision generally in the parish, which has led to a need for many of those seeking employment to have to commute out. The policy (MW5) has been worded in a way to enable a flexible solution that could meet both needs. It sets out that should a commercial site (existing) come up for redevelopment, it should first be provided as a commercial site again (so as not to erode provision) but if not viable/possible (with criteria to demonstrate this carried forward from the existing MWNP), then a mixed use site would be supported (offering some commercial and some housing and potentially other uses, where compatible).
- 2.55. The remainder of the policies in this section were supported, with minor amendments to add clarity. In terms of Policy MW8, this is considered to be an important policy in the plan and one of the areas that has led to the need for a review of the document. It seeks to limit the development of owner-occupied second homes outside the development boundary, which has been a growing concern locally.
- 2.56. Reducing Flood Risk: Flooding is one of the most significant challenges facing Much Wenlock and the policies in this section seek to strengthen those including in the previous version of the MWNP to ensure that development proposals are fully accounting for their impacts on this matter and preparations are in place to ensure that they do not exacerbate existing problems. The policies were strongly supported by the local community who witness frequent flooding events first hand.
- 2.57. Transport and Movement: The policies were strongly supported. Minor factual amendments have been made to the text.
- 2.58. Community Well-Being: The policies were strongly supported with positive feedback. Some additional information was added to the supporting text, to reflect comments and provide additional detail and clarity.
- 2.59. Good quality Design, Local Character and Heritage: As noted previously, it has been made clear in the document that the Design Guidance for Much Wenlock forms an integral part of the neighbourhood plan. Policy MW19 on design was strongly supported. Some minor amendments were made to Policy MW20, which is considered to be an important policy, notably in the context of the (likely) withdrawn LPR and with the Future Homes Standard yet to be brought in. Policy MW20 is a new policy identifying non-designated heritage assets. The list of assets has been compiled following significant work by the Task Group leading on this area and each owner was written to about the policy proposal. Some letters of support were received. The policies in this section of the plan will assist in celebrating the heritage of the town and wider parish.

- 2.60. Green and Open Spaces, Local Landscapes and Wildlife: The policies in this section were widely supported.
- 2.61. Policy MW21 (Local Green Space) was well supported on the whole. It has sought to designate a number of valued spaces in the parish, which had previously been described as important open space, but not officially designated as local green space. Comments were received on two of the spaces: Holy Trinity Green (Churchyard) and William Brookes School Open Space:
- **Holy Trinity Green (Churchyard)** – the owner requested that the space not be included as a local green space, considering that it is already adequately protected. The Steering Group were content to remove it for this reason.
 - **William Brookes School Open Space** – a number of comments were received from the community in support of this area being included as a local green space. It is owned by SC and leased (100-year lease) to the local Scout Group, who use it for outdoor activities. The space is located next to the Gaskell Recreation Ground and other responses received have suggested that it could, in future, provide additional parking space to serve that broader community asset. The Steering Group were unable to come to a consensus on this matter and it was agreed that the Town Council, as the qualifying body, should make the ultimate decision on how to proceed. They decided to remove the area as a local green space but to identify it as an important community facility. It was considered that this would offer the most flexibility in terms of how this space might be used in the future.
- 2.62. An additional policy has been added following the consultation focussing on renewable energy. This had previously been included with the Design section of the plan, but it was felt that it was significant enough to warrant its own policy. It seeks to provide criteria against which any renewable energy schemes in the parish should be considered in planning terms.

Stage III: Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan

- 2.63. Following the changes made to the MWNP as a result of the Regulation 14 consultation, the Submission Version was formally submitted to MW Town Council, who approved it at the Full Council meeting on 3 April 2025.
- 2.64. Following MWTC's approval of the MWNP, it was submitted to SC who, once satisfied that the correct set of documents have been received, will undertake the Regulation 16 consultation. The document will then proceed to Independent Examination and, assuming a favourable outcome, to referendum.

3 CONCLUSION

- 3.1. The Steering Group has undertaken a very thorough engagement programme in order to develop the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan. It has set out a comprehensive vision and objectives and guiding principles. In developing the policies to achieve the vision and objectives, the Group has actively engaged with a wide range of stakeholders and the Plan has evolved accordingly.
- 3.2. Feedback from the Regulation 14 consultation has enabled the Plan to be shaped into its final version, to submit to SC.
- 3.3. This report fulfils the requirements for the Consultation Statement, set out in Regulation 15(2) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended).
- 3.4. Gratitude is extended to everybody who has contributed to the Plan's development, either as a valued member of the Steering Group and Working Groups or those who have taken the time to contribute their views and opinions. This has been invaluable in helping to shape the scope and content of the Neighbourhood Plan.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF THOSE CONSULTED AT REGULATION 14 (PRE-SUBMISSION) STAGE

- Local Residents
- Local Businesses
- Local organisations
- Owners of the proposed non-designated heritage assets
- Statutory Consultees:

ORGANISATION

Shropshire Council - Planning
Environment Agency
National Highways
Natural England
Historic England
NHS Property
Homes and Communities Agency
National Grid
Severn Trent
Sport England
SSE
Western Power
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
canal trust
EE
NHS Property Services
CPRE
National Trust
United Utilities Water PLC
United Utilities
Severn Trent Water Ltd
Network Rail Town Planning Team LNW
Vodafone & O2
Mobile Operators Association (MOA)
Environment Agency
Forestry Commission (England) North West & West Midlands Area
Natural England
Oil & Gas Authority
English Heritage
Rail Freight Group
Mineral Products Association
NHS
West Mercia Police
Arriva Midlands

Network Rail
Highways England
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
Highways England
Scottish Power
Canal & River Trust
Defence Infrastructure Organisation MOD
Severn Trent Water Ltd
Homes and Communities Agency
Clee Hill Safeguard
Office of rail regulation
Green Shropshire Exchange
Virgin Media
Wales and West Utilities
BT (as a temporary measure)
Shropshire Wildlife Trust
Shropshire Community Health NHS Trust (SCHT)
National Gas Transmission
NHS Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin
Cadent Gas
Shropshire Hills National Landscape
Adjoining parishes councils
Cressage,Harley,and Sheinton
Buildwas
Church Preen, Hughley & Kenley
Easthope Shipton and Stanton Long
Morville
Barrow

Local Green Space owners:

LGS1	Railway Walk	Shropshire Council
LGS2	Windmill Hill	Wenlock Estate
LGS3	Gaskill Recreation Ground	MWTC
LGS4	Holy Trinity Church Green	Holy Trinity Church/Diocese of Lichfield
LGS5	Southfield Road green space	Shropshire Council
LGS6	Havelock Crescent	Shropshire Council
LGS7	Hunters Gate	Shropshire Council
LGS8	Old Cemetery, Bridgnorth Road	MWTC
LGS9	Allotments Southfield Road	Wenlock Estate
LGS10	William Brookes School green space	Shropshire Council

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PRE-SUBMISSION REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION AND RESPONSE FROM THE STEERING GROUP

Representations (Reps.) were received from the following:

1. Shropshire Council
2. Environment Agency
3. Historic England
4. Natural England
5. National Highways
6. National Gas
7. National Grid
8. Sport England
9. NHS Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin
10. Network Rail
11. Canal and River Trust
12. Lovell Strategic Land
13. Owner of Birchfield Garage
14. Owner of LGS4 Holy Trinity Green (Churchyard)
15. Owner of 1 Barrow Street, Much Wenlock
16. Surveymonkey responses

Comments are listed in Table 1 by paragraph number / policy, with general comments at the end.
Summaries have been taken from responses, and any typos within them have not been corrected.

The original responses (in full) have been supplied to SC.

Table 2: Summary of responses to the Regulation 14 consultation

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
1.	1	General	Consider housing allocation in the NDP.	Discussed based on current situation with regards Local Plan Review. Agreed to continue without site allocations.
2.	1	General	The MWNDP progresses it may become necessary for the MWTC to revisit the Shropshire Hills National Landscape Management Plan as it is currently under review and the new Management Plan will cover the period of 2025-2030, which lies within the proposed lifetime of the draft MWNDP.	Noted – agreed to make reference to this in Section 1.
3.	1	General	Plan is very long – could it be reduced in length? Some sections might be better placed in an appendix or within the Plan's evidence base (paragraph 4.46-4.52, 4.58-4.624, Figure 18, 4.96). Others might be included in a Parish Plan or submitted for inclusion into the Much Wenlock Place Plan (Figure 12, Table 6, 4.94, 4.97, Table 7, 4.112). We suggest that Table 5 (Natural Drainage Solutions) be moved to an appendix, perhaps with the solutions namechecked within the MW11 policy box. Plus host as one pdf as opposed to a number of pdfs.	This was discussed and it is agreed that the Plan is long, however the group will consider the layout post Examination, once the final text is in place.
4.	1	General	There is some repetition across policies which could be addressed, for example, section B in policy MW15 (<i>Improving opportunities for community and cultural facilities, sport and recreation</i>) appears to be covered by policy MW22: (<i>Recreational open and play space</i>).	This has been reviewed and consolidated.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
5.	1	General	There are some occasions where we believe that text would be better placed within the policy boxes rather than the justification sections (paragraphs 4.119, 4.179) to ensure that the user can implement the policy against a new development effectively.	Review.
6.	1	General	The MWNDP takes an excellent approach to referencing national and local policy, with a 'Conformity Reference' accompanying every policy. Additionally, hyperlinks have been used to quickly take the reader to relevant documents. This approach is not comprehensive however and we suggest that hyperlinks be embedded throughout the document.	Added in.
7.	1	General	Occasionally, a clearer reference to the evidence base would be useful. For example, paragraph 4.2 of MW1 refers to there being a number of vacant agricultural sites in the neighbourhood plan area, yet it is unclear where the supporting data can be found. Policy MW5 (Commercial development) outlines the essential criteria to allow a change of use on or withing Site EMP1, an existing Employment Site or commercial premises but does not evidence how these criteria have been generated. Policies MW5, MW6, MW7 and MW16 all outline different appropriate marketing periods for vacated commercial premises spanning between 6 to 18 months but it is unclear how these periods have been calculated.	Reviewed. The main vacant site is EMP1 (largely). It was considered that other sites may become vacant over the period of the plan so better not to be too specific as this could date the plan quickly.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
8.	1	General	On a handful of occasions more guidance would be beneficial, for example paragraph 4.124 relating to MW17 (Public toilet provision) could include a link to national guidelines for designing out vandalism in public spaces. MW9 (Supporting flexible workspaces and opportunities for homeworking) A iii could explain how it will seek to ' <i>enable microbusinesses</i> '.	Reviewed and added in guidance examples.
9.	2	General	In the absence of the allocation of specific sites for development within your plan area, we have no comment to make.	Noted..
10.	3	General	In the absence of the allocation of specific sites for development within your plan area, we have no comment to make.	Noted.
11.	4	General	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Noted.
12.	5	General	<p>In relation to the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan, our principal interest is in safeguarding the operation of the SRN, the nearest routes of which are the A5 and the A49 located approximately 9.5km north and 12.5km west of the plan area respectively. The scope and scale of proposed development identified in the current Shropshire Local Plan (accounted for within the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan), is modest and shall not have any significant impact on the operation of the SRN.</p> <p>Considering the limited level of growth proposed across the Neighbourhood Development Plan area, as well as that already delivered within the Local Plan period, we do not</p>	Noted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			expect that there will be any significant impacts on the operation of the SRN.	
13.	6	General	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission's assets which include high-pressure gas pipelines and other infrastructure. National Gas Transmission has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	Noted.
14.	7	General	An assessment has been carried out with respect to NGET's assets which include high voltage electricity assets and other electricity infrastructure. NGET has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area	Noted.
15.	8	General	General advice provided	Noted – check referencing
16.	9	General	Having reviewed the documentation provided, I can confirm that, from a GP Estates perspective, the ICB is generally in support of the proposals. However, it is worth noting that, at the appropriate time, the ICB will be submitting a request for developer contributions (either in the form of s106 or Community Infrastructure Levy [CIL] funds) for the proposed development at Hunters Gate (120x dwellings) which is mentioned both in the Much Wenlock proposals and in the Shropshire Local Plan. This development, if it goes ahead, will add additional pressure to the medical practice which is already struggling for the required clinical space it needs to service the local population.	Noted and TC also informed as there is no provision in the Place Plan for this.
17.	10	General	General guidance provided.	Noted.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
18.	11	General	I have checked our records and can't see that we have any Trust assets within the Town Council/Parish area	Noted.
19.	12	General	Whilst we support the Neighbourhood Plan Review, it is imperative this is kept under review and monitored so that it aligns with emerging policy from both a national and local perspective. They have submitted their proposals for a site on land to the rear of the Cemetery and north of Oakfield Park	Noted.
20.	12	General	Implementation: Whilst we support the Neighbourhood Plan Review, it is imperative this is kept under review and monitored so that it aligns with emerging policy from both a national and local perspective. This is particularly important in consideration of the recently revised National Planning Policy Framework and the updated Standard Method for calculating Housing Land Supply with the latter document increasing the housing requirement for Shropshire by 86% (from a standard method of 1,070 dwellings per annum ('dpa') to 1,994 dpa). We therefore suggest clear reference is made as to when any Review would be undertaken considering changes at both a national and local level.	Noted. Reference to any future review is included in the Implementation Section.
21.	16	General	Thank you for this thorough presentation of policies and opportunities for engagement.	Noted.
22.	16		Do not permit over development and bear in mind the brook through Bourton does flood though this is documented in the flood risk parts of the document.	Noted.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			Additionally many local farms use HGVs to convey livestock etc along narrow roads making walking, cycling and riding difficult, let alone car use.	
23.	1	Section 1	We would suggest changing references such as 'Core Strategy CS5 or its successor' (MW1 paragraph 4.2) to reference the relevant policy in the draft LPR i.e. ' <i>Core Strategy CS5 or SP2 in the Draft Shropshire Local Plan</i> '. Given the draft status of the LPR is important to ensure that when a reference to a policy is made to the LPR, a corresponding reference is made to the Core Strategy or SAMDev as appropriate. As 'The Planning Policy Context' section lays out the policy hierarchy clearly there is no need to restate this in the body of the Plan (4.65).	Amended
24.	1	Section 3	Objective 4 – remove capital S on safeguard.	Amended.
25.	1	4.5	Amend reference to Bourton being a community cluster.	Amended.
26.	1	Policy MW1	Regarding the growth of the neighbourhood area, Shropshire Council has noted that Policy MW1 paragraph A.vi requires that ' <i>development growth must relate to and be in line with growth of infrastructure.</i> ' To better reflect both local policy and the proactive and positive approach to planning required by the NPPF, the wording of this policy could echo policy S.13.1 of the SAMDev : ' <i>Development should be phased appropriately to take account of critical infrastructure delivery.</i> '	The SG discussed and preferred to retain as is given lack of clarity about how 'phased appropriately might be interpreted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			Shropshire Council considers that LPR policy DP25 (Infrastructure provision) combined with the <i>Land adjoining the Primary School and Hunters Gate, Much Wenlock (MUW012VAR)</i> contained in the LPR provide a sufficiently robust policy basis for managing the delivery of essential infrastructure to support development.	
27.	1	Policy MW1	B.ii. Typo – will not with	Amended
28.	1	Policy MW1	Consider replacing <i>brownfield land</i> with <i>previously developed (brownfield) land</i>	Amended throughout
29.	1	Policy MW1 4.2	Does ' <i>proposed growth strategy</i> ' refer specifically to the Shropshire Economic Growth Strategy? Suggest ' <i>strategic approach</i> ' to conform with LPR SP2.	Amended as suggested.
30.	1	Policy MW1 4.2, bullet 3	More clarification needed on the term ' <i>home-working</i> ' here. Does this refer to both domestic dwellings and commercial co-working spaces?	Added further definition. Suggest refers to the former.
31.	12	Policy MW1	<p>Whilst we agree with the principle of supporting (and delivering) Sustainable Development, we disagree with Part B of the Policy.</p> <p>As currently worded, the Policy is restrictive and is at odds with not only the drive to deliver housing in sustainable locations which is at the forefront of the Government's directive but also Policy SP4 of the emerging Shropshire Local Plan ('eSLP').</p> <p>Further, part B (as drafted) ignores Shropshire's Council's assessment of sites and that of Site MUW006 (Land to the</p>	<p>This is noted, however, the development boundary is in place to restrict sprawl into the open countryside. Part B of the policy refers to the development boundary in the adopted Local Plan and is considered to be robustly evidenced.</p> <p>The NDP is not allocating sites for development, as this was being undertaken via the LPR. The likely withdrawal of the LPR means that sites will not be allocated strategically at this time but the</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>rear to the cemetery and north of Oakfield Park, Much Wenlock) that was rated as 'Good' in both the Overall Settlement Sustainability Conclusion and Overall Black Country Contribution Sustainability Conclusion that supported the eSLP. In part, the conclusions made by the Council are linked to how the Site would seamlessly connect into the existing pattern and form of development and offer opportunities to enhance existing services alongside improved public footpath connections to the Town (all of which would be within the 10-minute walk of the Town Centre which is shown at Figure 5 of the revised Neighbourhood Plan).</p> <p>In summary, the way in which the policy is drafted will not only limit the delivery of housing but will also reduce the benefits that are associated. In particular, the ability to deliver not only much needed housing (of all types and tenures), but also, development that can assist with a solution in providing mitigation to address the existing issues of flooding that is experienced in the Town through the provision of a flood attenuation scheme that can be delivered (alongside residential development).</p> <p>This goes to the heart of sustainable development and in taking the approach as proposed by Policy MW1 (B), it ignores the drive for locating residential development that is sustainable. This is intrinsically linked to the spatial strategy and ensuring there is a mix and range of sites allocated, delivered in the right locations, supported by the necessary infrastructure.</p>	group continue to not wish to allocate sites. The policy instead sets out overarching principles that all development proposals should seek to deliver.
32.	1	Policy MW2	Remove duplication in the conformity reference	Removed.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
33.	1	Policy MW2	Include a hyperlink to the Strategic Market Housing Assessment.	Added in
34.	1	Policy MW2	<p><i>‘Residential development that could reasonably be expected to meet the needs of older people (by virtue of its size and location) should demonstrate how it has reflected the Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation (HAPPI) principles and the guidance contained in the RTPI’s “Dementia and town planning: Creating better environments for people living with dementia”’.</i></p> <p>This policy goes beyond Policy DP1 (Residential Mix) in the LPR which requires M4(3) (wheelchair user dwellings) on 5% of sites of 5 or more dwellings and M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings) on a further 70% of the dwellings or the Core Strategy which references only the Lifetime Homes standard. If these additional requirements were mandatory this might create issues around viability. However, given that they are not, Shropshire Council can support the inclusion of this policy.</p>	Noted. There is an older population in the parish, and it is vital that homes are future proofed to meet needs as people progress through different stages of life.
35.	1	Policy MW2	Proposes to maximise delivery of affordable housing to address historic shortfall. The Policy DP3 of the LPR requires 20% of all new housing to be affordable, however Shropshire Council appreciates the opportunity offered by the neighbourhood planning system to allow for negotiation on affordable housing delivery and is therefore content to accept this policy approach. It should be noted however that such affordable housing delivery is	Noted. The HNA prepared for the Parish is considered to justify this approach

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			contingent on viability. Shropshire Council also notes that part A(ii) of MW2 stipulates that ' <i>all new residential development within the neighbourhood area must provide a quantity of affordable housing</i> '. While it is open for Neighbourhood Plans to take this approach, the requirement must be supported by appropriate evidence.	
36.	16	Policy MW1	In strongly supporting MW1 I have difficulty in reconciling Shropshire Councils proposal to build 120 houses on a single site within their Local Plan. to my mind this proposal does not satisfy any of the criteria set out for sustainable development.	Noted, however we have no influence over strategic sites, only non-strategic, unless it relates to design etc.
37.	16	Policy MW1	I agree with the policies in this section but am concerned about more housing creating flooding issues and being built in unsuitable places.	Noted- hence the flood policies later in the document.
38.	16	Policy MW1	It is essential to support brownfield site development over development on high grade agricultural land to meet the housing targets set by Shropshire Council	The NDP does seek to do this, as does the NPPF.
39.	12	Policy MW2	Whilst we agree with the policy, reference should be made to development meeting the up to date needs as set out in the most recent Housing Needs Assessment. This will then ensure development delivers the type and tenure of housing that is required. In terms of the level of affordable housing, it is imperative that the Neighbourhood Plan accords with Policy DP3 of the eSLP in securing a level of 20% for development in south Shropshire.	Reference is made to the MW HNA. Clause A ii requires this.
40.	16	Policy MW2	MW2 very happy with current development. We need more social housing in balance with the AONB	Noted.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
41.	16	Policy MW2	Policy MW2 - which means discouraging ever more building of very large and ostentatious homes which spoil the rural atmosphere and do not provide for town inhabitants.	Noted. The policy seeks as far as possible to influence the delivery of the types of homes needed locally, based on local evidence (the HNA)
42.	16	Policy MW2	It is most important to ensure that housing meets local needs for people at all stages of their lives.	Agreed and noted. The plan endorses homes to suit people over their lives (e.g. HAPPI standards).
43.	16	Policy MW2 (and MW4)	There should be a greater emphasis on Social Housing to keep a balance of ages in the town - New Government proposals promote the possibilities of compulsory purchase of brownfield sites for this purpose	Noted and this is supported but often subject to viability. The NDP supports rural exception sites which could help to deliver such homes.
44.	16	Policy MW2	MW2. we do need more affordable houses and more three bedrooms most families have two or more children and struggle with size of two bedroom houses.	Noted – hence the HNA backed up this policy.
45.	16	Policy MW2	Care should be taken in specifying one bedroom housing. People with complex needs often have disrupted sleep and that needs a peaceful bedroom for a partner/carer	<p>SG discussions with Housing Provider Allocations Managers suggests that they think that a one bedroom allocation is suitable for a couple, but if a couple have special needs they always discuss and try to accommodate. Their answer to was that at some point we have to trust their judgment in how and to whom they allocate.</p> <p>The SG wish to retain the policy as is. It is not suggesting all 1-bed, rather a mix, that could address this need should it arise.</p>
46.	16	Policy MW2	I support the need for some smaller affordable dwellings but there needs to be a balance with bigger homes included as the town needs to continue to attract a diverse population including people with disposable income who	The HNA provides the guidance on what is needed.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			are more likely to spend in the local shops and maintain / grow a vibrant economy.	
47.	16	Policy MW2	I do not feel enough help is given to local people to remain living in the town. The Shropshire Council policy of sending people from other areas is disgraceful when local people are in need of local housing	Noted.
48.	16	Policy MW2	Much Wenlock needs more homes; the town must grow and develop. On housing, it seems the plan is trying to limit homes to small-scale sites when we need big developments which bring in money to make a difference to our infrastructure	The NDP is not seeking to allocate sites – that is being undertaken by SC. Agree there is merit in the infrastructure that larger sites can bring. This policy deals just with infill though.
49.	1	Policy MW3	Policy MW3 (Rural Exception Sites) places a limit of 20 dwellings on exception sites which does not conform with the 25 dwelling expectation in LRP DP4. This policy is therefore not in conformity with the Development Plan strategic policies.	Amended to 25 to align with LPR DP4 (although withdrawn, the evidence base for the LPR remains valid as per SC Committee Meeting – reference in the MWNP).
50.	1	Policy MW3	States that <i>'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'</i> . LPR DP4 requires that <i>'Affordable exception schemes are developments consisting of 100% local needs affordable housing'</i> . The exception is cross-subsidy exception schemes where 30% open market housing can be permitted in order to support 70% affordable housing. We suggest that the policy makes this distinction clear.	Added the detail as proposed in red on the left to make policy clearer.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
51.	16	Policy MW3	Every piece of land at town edges which is encroached on alters the nature of the town for ever and that integrity can never be regained.	Noted.
52.	1	Policy MW4	<i>Within the development boundary, and within Bourton, housing infill development will be supported where they it contributes positively to local character and where they helps to meet local housing needs.</i>	Amended typos.
53.	16	Policy MW4	<i>MW4 unable to make a decision as unable to locate criteria while completing the survey</i>	Added into the policy.
54.	16	Policy MW4	Any conversations or building of dwellings must have adequate car parking spaces	Agreed.
55.	16	Policy MW4	By infill of green or brown space will I feel be detrimental to the integrity of this uniquemedieval town. We MUST retain its uniqueness although we need to allow its viability as a thriving community.	Noted, however infill is considered acceptable in the development boundary.
56.	16	Policy MW4	Its vital that when sites near to the town centre become available there should always be a presumption that the site must be considered for redevelopment for social housing to meet local needs. Too many social tenants, who often do not have cars, are currently obliged to live too far from the facilities of the town centre. The policies of the new central government are relevant. Once implemented they would apparently allow for the compulsory purchase of such grey land to enable the building of social housing.	The commercial sites policy sets out that should a commercial site (existing) come up for redevelopment, it should first be provided as a commercial site again (so as not to erode provision) but if not viable/possible, then a mixed use site would be supported (offering some commercial and some housing – where compatible and that housing would be particularly supported as affordable housing)

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
57.	16	Policy MW4	The center of the town is already at saturation point and cannot take anymore infill. Shropshire Council Planning and Developers need to address infrastructure challenges first before making any decisions on the number of houses.	Noted, however infill is considered acceptable in the development boundary.
58.	1	Policy MW5	Occasionally the level of conformity is unclear. For example Policy MW5 (Commercial development) does conform with LPR SP13 in its approach to only supporting the loss of employment land or premises where this is evidence by a contemporary market assessment and a comprehensive marketing exercise but the LPR policy stops short of requiring that <i>'Should the site be redeveloped into uses that do not comprise wholly commercial space, additional commercial land should be identified in the Local Plan to ensure that there is no overall net loss of commercial employment land in the parish.'</i>	Discussed – our policy effectively going slightly above the requirements of the Local Plan, although the LPR is now withdrawn.
59.	1	Policy MW5 Obj 2 box, 5 th check point	<i>supporting new mixed use developments where an existing commercial site is demonstrated to be unviable</i>	Amended typo.
60.	1	Policy MW5	Paragraph 4.33 of Policy MW5 (Commercial development) states: <i>'The policy notes that 0.75ha of land at site EMP1 (Stretton Road) is allocated for employment use in the Shropshire Core Strategy and the LPR carries this forward, with a requirement for 2ha of employment land to be delivered in Much Wenlock. Should such a use not be viable on this site, alternative commercial space will need to be considered in the LPR to ensure that adequate commercial</i>	This site, whilst allocated for employment, has seen no development of this use for some years. The commercial sites policy sets out that should a commercial site (existing) come up for redevelopment – including this one - it should first be provided as a commercial site again (so as not to erode provision) but if not viable/possible, then a mixed use site would be supported

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<i>employment land (up to 2ha as per the LPR require[ment]) is provided in the parish.</i> This issue would be better addressed through a separate discussion with Shropshire Council.	(offering some commercial and some housing – where compatible and that housing would be particularly supported as affordable housing). This would potentially assist in unlocking this site which is currently partially vacant and underused.
61.	1	Policy MW5	<i>Policy MW6 should read Policy MW5.</i> <i>B iv: the proposals and their HGV traffic generation would not have an unacceptable traffic impact on the wider town and the capacity and operation of its highway network, paying particular regard to HGVs;</i>	Amended. Amended.
62.	16	Policy MW5	<i>We should have full protection on land like Travis Perkins and Wenlock Motors, protect these sites at all costs.</i>	See previous responses on this and the approach taken by the policy. The policy takes a balanced approach. It seeks to safeguard employment sites but remains flexible to mixed use sites (where the proposed employment and housing are compatible) to assist in unlocking sites and optimising what can be delivered.
63.	16	Policy MW5	I live on Stretton Road near the Wenlock car park actually in one of the cottages which have been proposed as a non- designated heritage asset. My worry is about the piece of land marked out for business development off Stretton Road. At the moment there is a lot of very large and heavy lorries on this road. I would like to know what the weight limit is for this B road. As it is also a link road to Church Stretton there is a	The policy includes a clause on traffic impact, should a proposal for redevelopment come forward. This will help to mitigate against impacts. The policy can only influence future applications though, it cannot enforce what is currently there – that would be achieved through a mechanism other than the neighbourhood plan (e.g. police, LPA enforcement)

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>lot of traffic already and most of it goes over the speed limit. As some of us have to park on the road as we do not have driveways, the road is restricted to single lane traffic when it goes past the houses. So if there is likely to be further business development there would need to be additional speed restrictions put into place. The police monitoring never seems to make a difference as a lot of the traffic is commuting traffic and before 9 am. Most police don't arrive until after the bulk of traffic has been.</p> <p>I would support the business development on condition something is done about the speeding traffic and it is made clear that parking outside these houses is for residents only. Preferably no more than 2 cars per property.</p>	
64.	16	Policy MW5	Need to bear in mind food production and value of land	Noted. The development boundaries are in place to direct any development to the most sustainable locations, which would serve to safeguard productive land beyond.
65.	16	Policy MW5	MW 5 Travis Perkins should be encouraged to move to an industrial site. This area should be for residential use as it is near the town	Noted however the Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating sites and cannot compel an existing use to move elsewhere. As previously noted, the policy takes a balanced approach to new mixed uses going forward.
66.	16	Policy MW5	Assume that the policy is in line with typical UK GOV standards.	The policy confirms to national and Local Plan policy.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
67.	16	Policy MW5	Given that there has been no demand for the site that has been designated for decades it seems ridiculous to safeguard sites like Travis Perkins and Wenlock Motors which would be ideal for housing. What jobs is Wenlock expecting to arrive when Telford is so near? Their development for housing would be much better than the site identified by SHR	The site is not wholly safeguarded. The policy accepts that sites may no longer be viable as wholly employment sites, and in that case, mixed use (including housing) would be considered acceptable. The Town Council is, however, keen to try and retain employment sites where possible due to the lack of these in the parish, which has led to the need to out-commute.
68.	16	Policy MW5	Providing there is MORE space allocated for community use. Huinter's Gate green space is a great and inspiring example of this. Seeing young people using and enjoying that space is a great asset to that part of the town so far from The Linden Field.	This has been added to the policy.
69.	16	Policy MW5	I think that existing commercial land should not be safeguarded when its present use ends if it could, for example, be used for affordable homes and other homes to meet local need. This option should be available, in particular, on land within walking distance of the High Street.	See Ref 67.
70.	16	Policy MW5	Where brownfield sites, in the vicinity of the town centre, have been identified and where there has been no take up, such sites should be reassessed for potential housing sites.	See Ref 67.
71.	16	Policy MW5	In the twenty years we have lived here no general units have been built on the Employment Land Sites at the edge of town or on the unused half of the old Smithfield site. Converted farmyards have provided units but virtually all farmyards in the town have been converted to residential use including recently the stables to the old Barclays Bank.	See Ref 67.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			The exception is some buildings behind the High Street on the opposite side of the road to Salon10. People living in the town centre support the shops, accommodation for older residents on Smithfield might be the best support for business in the town.	
72.	16	Policy MW5	Land has been available for commercial use for decades without it ever being developed. Such land ought always to be made available for social housing close to the town centre. Those living closest to the town centre make the fullest use of its retail and other services. Those forced to live on the margins of the town more frequently drive to make use of services and facilities outside the town. Designating and preserving land for commercial/employment use ought to be limited to the many local quarry sites where residential use is not an option.	See Ref 67.
73.	16	Policy MW5	A full consultation needs to be undertaken to identify any new commercial sites in the town as I am not aware of any additional site being proposed. Such sites should meet strict criteria to ensure the sites do not affect existing development.	See Ref 67. The MWNP is not seeking to allocate sites.
74.	16	Policy MW5	We must protect our employment sites for employment purposes at all costs	Noted. See Ref 67.
75.	16	Policy MW5	MW5 ii b Sole use for housing should be supported, where the need for housing can be demonstrated through the Housing Needs Assessment Report . For example Travis Perkins distribution centre brings no advantages to the	Noted – See Ref 67.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			town whatsoever, it adds nothing to the economy, nothing to job creation and has dangerous movement and access of HGVs, pollution and noise in a residential area.	
76.	1	Para 4.32	there is are only a modest amount of existing commercial/industrial spaces	Amended
		Para 4.33	(up to 2ha as per the LPR requirement)	Amended
		4.37	Consider replacing greenfield land with previously undeveloped (greenfield) land	Amended
77.	1	4.40	<i>A transport assessment would be the most appropriate way of so doing.</i>	Amended punctuation
			<i>Development proposals on all commercial sites will need to be able to demonstrate that they do not have an unacceptable impact on HGV traffic movements in the town, paying particular regard to HGVs.</i>	Amended.
		4.41	<i>This approach will help to protect and create local jobs, reduce commuting patterns reduce out-commuting, and promote a sustainable local economy.</i>	Amended.
78.	16	Policies 6-9	These policies are robust and would suit our town	Noted.
79.	16	Policy MW6	Enhancing the Town Centre ONLY if it is completely in keeping with Wenlock as it has survived. I think Protecting the town centre is infinitely more important.	Amended.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
80.	16	Policy MW6	Parking arrangement must be implemented, not merely 'presented'	Amended.
81.	16	Policy MW6	Strongly support the need for a shared space in the High St / junction by the Guildhall to create a safer environment for all road users.	Infrastructure to include possible shared space is included in Policy MW14 Clause B.
82.	16	Policy MW6	F. Excessive traffic and parking not allowed in town centre residential area, but is apparently allowed on the A4169, also residential. Contradiction here?	This policy is just related to the town centre. Car parking elsewhere is dealt with under a different policy.
83.	1	Policy MW7	<p>MW7 (Promoting sustainable rural tourism) could encourage the re-use of historic buildings, forming a proactive partner policy to MW6 (Enhancing the town centre).</p> <p>Add hyperlink to <i>Shropshire Visitor Strategy</i>.</p> <p>Use Class C1 hotels</p> <p>B ii: <i>the proposal should seek to promote the production and consumption of local produce and materials.;</i></p> <p>B iii: <i>including the Shropshire Hills National Landscape and its setting; and</i></p> <p>B iv: <i>there are demonstrable economic and social benefits to the proposals; and</i></p>	<p>Included,</p> <p>Added.</p> <p>Added.</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Added.</p>
84.	16	Policy MW7	A bank would be nice and also a taxi company	Noted. The policy cannot bring specific businesses, but by supporting a viable centre, this

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
				may have a positive impact on attracting new businesses.
85.	16	Policy MW7	Should be accompanied by a requirement of use off street parking I have reservations about the growth of air b/b and similar at the expense of available smaller properties available for long-term residential or for purchase and being rent or for purchase and being especially suitable for first time buyers	Parking permits on MW car parks for households with no off road parking is currently available through Shropshire Council.
86.	16	Policy MW7	Include cycle racks in the square for the many leisure and locals who cycle here.	Cycle storage and racks in town centre square and car parks add to policy MW13 c i.
87.	16	Policy MW8	Too many holiday lets in rural areas re Sheinton. This detracts from the village community	Noted – this is the reason behind MW8.
88.	16	Policy MW8	NOT If this involves properties which are unoccupied for large parts of the year otherwise and stand empty. Should be a directive on all visitor accommodation that it must be occupied for 4/5of the year	There isn't a legal mechanism to require this.
89.	16	Policy MW8	Beware low winter occupancy of any holiday provision	Noted.
90.	16	Policy MW8	The viability of this town does appear to depend on its attractiveness to visitors. Having longer Museum and Guildhall opening hours as well as more venues that will offer late afternoon early evening food for families would be good. Sometimes I see visitors wandering around look in for things to do, even on Bank Holidays. Incidentally as a town we must clean our pavements and edifices of buildings from bird droppings, dog urine and poorly retriever dog faeces [though this is in part due to the poor and pitted surfaces of the pavements throughout	Noted, much of these ideas fall outside planning policy, but will be considered by the town Council.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			the town]. A crossing place in the High Street would be an improvement as there are too many large vehicles that park obscuring the ability to see vehicles from the top of the High Street by the Undertaker. DOUBLE yellow lines by The Square and the clock. Car parked here obscure the view from the junction of High Street and Wilmore Street.	Policy MW12 includes proposals for improved walking/cycling locally.
91.	16	Policies 6-9	The future viability of Much Wenlock as a vibrant service centre depends first on more people living in the town being able to work within its limits and make use of its services and second upon a greater footfall of visitors who find the town an attractive place to visit or holiday.	Noted – collectively the policies seek to encourage this.
92.	16	Policy MW8	There should be a policy to secure homes for local people, and premises for local business rather than encouraging conversion to Airbnb use.	The policy is included as this is currently enabled at a national level. The policy is seeking to restrict what is possible.
93.	16	Policy MW8	It is important that local housing is not bought up by outsiders to be used as Airbnb's is often smaller properties that might be attractive to first time buyers. They tend to be less used in the winter, so local shops will suffer from lack of customers.	Noted. We have little evidence on this.
94.	16	Policy MW8	Much Wenlock has an increasing number of 'Airbnb' lets and these are causing problems for residents who rely on on-street parking and now have to fight for their space. Any future applications for change of use to Airbnb should be scrutinised with this in mind and only lets with off street parking allowed.	Noted.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
95.	16	Policy MW8	Increased visitors to the town is good however parking for visitors and people staying in Airbnb accommodation is already creating problems. Any further accommodation being proposed for letting should be scrutinised for parking for guests and only those with off road parking should be agreed.	Noted.
96.	1	Policy MW9	MW9 (Supporting flexible workspaces and opportunities for homeworking) could encourage the re-use of historic buildings, forming a proactive partner policy to MW6 (Enhancing the town centre).	Included.
97.	1	Policy MW9	MW9 (Supporting flexible workspaces and opportunities for homeworking) might also include a reference to communications infrastructure, as mentioned in Table 7 which in turn links to the Much Wenlock Place Plan.	Included.
98.	16	Policy MW9	not sure where any units can be provided but strongly support new housing with homework facilities.	Noted.
99.	16	Policy MW9	As a director of Gather, a cowork in Ludlow, I've witnessed first hand the impact our space has had on people living and working more rurally. To have a space where you can connect to others for a period of time per week has impacts on mental health, productivity and connection. We've had a lot of comments from people who have moved from more urban areas stating that a space such as ours has been the difference between them settling in the area and moving on - these are all professionals	Noted.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
100	16	Policy MW9	MW9 I emphasis the need for car parking provision during the day	This is included in the policy in terms of impact on capacity of local highways network.
101	16	Policy MW9	MW9: Better mobile phone signal is essential.	Included reference to this.
102	16	Policy MW9	Mobile phone signals are poor and non existent where I live since a mast was switched off years ago by the provider when held to ransom by the landowner.	Included reference to this.
103	1	Policy MW10	Clause D iii of MW10 (Flooding and drainage) – how enforceable would this be if adopted. It states: <i>'parking spaces and driveways associated with new development will be required to have permeable surfaces'</i> . This is not a requirement of the Development Plan strategic policies.	Given the significance of flooding in Much Wenlock, it is considered that a stringent policy is required. Noted on the permeable driveways and however it is considered imperative that all steps are taken to mitigate flooding.
104	12	Policy MW10	Strongly agree. Whilst we strongly agree with the Policy, to assist with positive place making and planning, we want to highlight the importance of supporting development that can offer solutions to assist with providing mitigation to address the existing flooding issues in the Town. We therefore suggest additional wording should be added at Criteria A as follows: "Sites which can deliver flood mitigation and reduce runoff to the Town alongside securing wider benefits, including but not limited to, residential development/net gains in Biodiversity/formal areas of open space, should be supported" .	Noted. Added.
105	16	Policy MW10	Dii Parking spaces and driveways shall be maintained in perpetuity and such areas should not be developed	Noted. This would require a legal agreement / covenant.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
106	16	Policy MW10	It is madness to hand over responsibility for a flood alleviation scheme on any new development to the developer! What could possibly go wrong?	The policy is as stringent as we can be within the limits of planning policy.
107	16	Policy MW10	Any new developments especially on sites known to flood should be designed by a totally independent company who are not affiliated to the developer or the County should be proven to work before agreement is given to the building of additional properties.	Noted.
108	16	Policies 10 and 11	These policies are vital to the future of the town, its people and its businesses. This requires the widest degree of cooperation from all those involved, locally, by Shropshire Council and agencies within the Severn flood basin.	Noted.
109	16	Policies 10 and 11	Reduce hard surface areas. DO NOT BUILD on the slopes of the town basin. Anywhere! Incidentally do we have enough fresh water supply in this town? Especially when we consider new homes and businesses! I believe water has to be tankered in by Severn Trent.	Noted.
110	16	Policies 10 and 11	The statement "Restricting development to locations least likely to increase flood risk" is commendable and should be retained. This statement conflicts with the site allocated in SC's Local Plan. The site is within an area defined as a Rapid Response Catchment by the D of E and by replacing high grade agricultural land with impermeable materials must increase the risk of flooding significantly in what has been a site prone to flooding in the relatively recent past. I expect that developers will claim to be able to mitigate such risks but seemingly without any consequences should they fail: the onus then falls on	Noted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			householders and the authorities to pick up the problems left behind. Stringent conditions should be imposed, as part of the planning process, to ensure that a comprehensive drainage scheme is designed under the developers control and endorsed separately as being feasible and practicable by two independent professional organisations who are experts in Hydrology, prior to any planning approval being granted.	
111	16	Policies 10 and 11	These policies are essential	Agreed and retained with minor additions.
112	16	Policies 10 and 11	The additional tree planting, suitable hedge planting/ creation of rain gardens to create soak away areas is essential regardless of any building and future development to manage the existing housing and town inhabitants.	Noted – it is also supported by way of the biodiversity policies.
113	16	Policies 10 and 11	All new development within the Rapid Response Catchment has the potential to increase the flood risk to existing properties. Existing home and business owners should not be exposed to such additional risks. It is hard to justify any additional development that gives rise to significant costs falling upon the community as a whole (Through Council Tax or Water and Drainage Charges) rather than upon those who develop, or own, new properties. If the true costs of remedial measures against rising flood risks were to fall on developers it seems most unlikely that any new development within the Wenlock 'bowl' would ever be contemplated as being financially viable, let alone commenced.	Agreed, the overwhelming responses are to argue for good flood mitigation before any development takes place.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
114	16	Policies 10 and 11	A strategic and rolling maintenance program needs to be implemented to reduce the risk of flooding wherever possible.	Noted – this falls outside planning policy, but is noted in the Plan.
115	16	Policies 10 and 11	Flood problems may have been sorted in the town centre ,but not the cemetery oakfield or Callaughton lane	Noted. The policy applied to the whole area.
116	16	Policies 10 and 11	There is only a limited amount that can be done to mitigate flash flooding by sustainable means. The existing drainage needs to be maintained, possibly improved, and designed such that it does not get easily blocked by debris	Noted and added in.
117	1	Policy MW11	There appear to be missing references from this section. NP objectives: 3; Shropshire Core Strategy (2011): CS16; CS18 SAMDev Plan (2015): MD11; Local Plan Review: DP10; DP19, DP20, DP21, DP22 NPPF: 158, 165-175	Added in,
118	12	Policy MW11	Strongly agree. We strongly support the policy as this is imperative to secure positive and good place making.	Noted
119	16	Policy MW11	V pleased with your expansion. Flood risk Plan aim No.3 The prior assessment. Please ensure that all plans are viewed and assessed by an independent drainage and flood risk expert. Failures so far include : Hunters Gate, Callaughton new property	Noted
120	16	Policy MW11	if this can be achieved I suspect it will be so expensive any developers will largely wriggle out of any provision of affordable or Social Housing. To keep the town alive	Noted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			Strongly support meeting some housing need in the town centre on brownfield land	
121	16	Policy MW11	E 'and any bio-diversity and archaeological considerations' The medieval water management and engineering in the parkland should be included. The Priory stone work is affected when the water table is high.	Added
122	16	Policies MW12, 13, 14	<p>It is, strictly speaking, speculative to talk about the effect of nearby, mooted developments on Much Wenlock. Three thousand homes at Buildwas and Tasley strategic sites plus's significant development in Cressage and in Much Wenlock itself will create greater parking demand on the town; increased visitor and shopper numbers will necessitate extra parking provision.</p> <p>The plan should support plans for extra car parks that satisfy normal weekly demand and also higher demand on event days.</p> <p>I favour the area adjacent to the current scout hut as a potential parking and drop off area, satisfying school and Gaskell Field needs as well as incoming commuter and shopper needs. It is currently an underused piece of land. It is an area that should, at least, be retained as a community asset This can be done sensitively using "grasscrete" construction and planting of suitable grass and herb cover. Further visitor parking provision could be provided as a condition of larger housing developments, including CIL/S.106 funding from the strategic developments.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>There was some disagreement in the SG about how this space should be considered in the plan. Some wished to see it safeguarded as a local green space, while others were concerned as to the restrictions this might apply which could impact how that space is used in the future. Ultimately, it was the Town Council who made the final decision, releasing it from the LGS policy but retaining it within the community facilities policy as an important local amenity. This was felt to ensure that it could be used flexibly, potentially as a green space serving e.g. the</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
				Scouts, but offering potential for parking provision at, for instance, peak times. It is noted that Shropshire Council's green infrastructure strategy for MW identifies this area as an open space. Note also that the Scout Group has a 100 year lease on a third of the area.
123	1	Policy MW12	<p>Policy MW12 (Improving walking, cycling and equestrian opportunities) could make reference to community transport or carshare schemes which are mentioned in LPR DP28 (3c).</p> <p><i>A: and the public transport network,.</i></p> <p><i>C: and retain and/or providing provide hedgerows, trees and soft verges wherever practicable.</i></p>	<p>Added in reference.</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended.</p>
124	12	Policy MW12	<p>Strongly agree:</p> <p>Whilst we strongly agree with the policy, sites which are located within sustainable locations (see Figure 12 in the revised Neighbourhood Plan) and offer opportunities to deliver upon the objectives (of the policy) through enhancement of existing, cycle and pedestrian routes (see table 6 which lists out the improvements for Much Wenlock's walking network that includes proposals for Bridgnorth Road) alongside securing possible traffic calming measures, should be supported.</p>	<p>This is noted. The newly introduced 40 mph speed limit on A483 has slowed speeds on approach to the town from Bridgnorth direction.</p>

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
125	16	Policy MW12	More cycle rails please only by the museum High St should be pedestrianised.	This is noted in Policy MW13 c i.
126	16	Policy MW12	We need more sidewalks along Stretton Road. Heavy large vehicles are dangerous as Much Wenlock has a quite narrow structure	Noted. It is difficult to retrospectively deliver these in a historic town setting, but Table 6 sets out potential areas for improvement.
127	16	Policy MW12 (and 14)	Address vehicles parking - blocking sight lines blocking passing points, Barrow St, corner of town square ,St Mary's lane. Damaging verges, Stretton Road, Havelock is a an example. Blocking pavements Blocking dropped kerbs.	This is largely an enforcement issue.
128	16	Policy MW12	<p>The area by the primary school and the secondary school are particularly dangerous places for people to be at critical times of entry and egress of the students and parents. A crossing is deperately needed on the junction area of the A458 and Stretton Road/Southfield Road. As too is a crossing / warning sign at Newtown Farm for walkers [as we are trying to encourage tourism which will include people who enjoy walking].</p> <p>Additionally a crossing is needed on the main road by The Sytche.</p> <p>The Gaskell junction issues are well documented.</p> <p>Additionally there is a dangerous junction where people park very close to, or opposite on StMary`s Road ,St Mary`s Lane and Racecourse Lane obscuring the view left from 13 / 26</p> <p>Racecourse Lane. People have a tendency to speed when cutting through Racecourse Lane to the junction on to the</p>	These are within table 6. The comment justifies the need for these issues to be carefully addressed.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>A458 without regard for pedestrians or children -as it is the access road the the Primary School.</p> <p>The newly constructed Callaughton estate has no footpath from the crossing on the A458 to the estate.</p> <p>Parking on estate roads is an issue for people who live in them, eg Hodgecroft, road towards the George Shutt, St Owens Road, The Paddock, etc as often the roads are narrow and when vehicles are parked opposite driveways it can cause irritation, block access for emergency vehicles etc. Normally FalconStor car park is empty!</p> <p>Recently there has been no cleaning of the highways or street edges which attracts other detritus such as waste and dog excrement, twigs etc which can impact on the functioning of the drains. Additionally it is very slippery for people walking and added to the uneven surfaces of the pavements, narrow pinch points of pavements etc creates a greater hazard for pedestrians and gives an air of decay around the town.</p>	
129	16	Policy MW12	Reference is made, in passing, to Public Transport in Much Wenlock. I feel a much greater emphasis should be made on the provision of bus services. If people are encouraged to use local buses it will result in fewer car movements thereby helping to ease congestion.	The MWNP cannot influence the provision of public transport as it is undertaken privately. By including this section, and acknowledging the shortfalls, there is scope for the Town Council to lobby for additional services.
130	16	Policy MW12	A one way system through the Town is essential especially in Sheinton Street.	Noted – there is information about this in the NDP, but it sits outside the scope of planning policy.
131	16	Policy MW12	Much Wenlock is not a town that can take all the heavy traffic, we are a throughroad from Wales right down to M5	Noted. It is considered that a bypass is unlikely to be achievable in the current climate and would

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			.,a bypass is a must Bridgnorth has one so does Shrewsbury. Traffic does not need to go near their towns.	require significant investment (which would potentially need to come in part from major housing development), which is not supported.
132	16	Policy MW12	It is fashionable to promote cycling, but there appears to be very little cycling activity among the local community. I think horses are best kept out of town centres and busy roads	Noted.
133	16	Policy MW12	MW12D we need to be careful what we wish for. The mix of horses and bicycles is not often harmonious Pinch points and low gates can help reduce 'furious' riding	Added 'segregated'.
134	16	Policy MW12	The town's pavements are in such bad condition in some locations that it is difficult for older or disabled residents to access the town's amenities and shops. Improving pavements should be a high priority.	Noted. This is a maintenance issue for the TC to take up with SC.
135	16	Policy MW12	current pavement conditions are a barrier to many older residents who cannot cope with the uneven surfaces and camber especially Barrow Street. MW13 provide more disabled parking in the town centre. The High Street should be parking exclusively for disabled motorists and cyclists.	See above.
136	1	Para 4.9	Typo: <i>New development proposals in the - parish,</i>	Amended
137	16	Policy MW13	I live on Stretton Road near the Wenlock car park actually in one of the cottages which have been proposed as a non-designated heritage asset. My issue is that for the 4 houses here we already have limited parking and it is difficult enough trying to park at times when some of the residents have 2 cars (i only have	Noted. Parking is a challenge and the policy seeks to go as far as it can to protect existing and promote new where it can be achieved sustainably.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			one), and they have lots of visitors. There has been the odd occasion when I need to park across a driveway of a neighbouring property in order to park anywhere near my own house. I already have health issues plus a dog with mobility issues and she needs to be carried to the house. So it doesn't take much to make parking a real nightmare. If other people were to start parking here it would be untenable.	
138	16	Policy MW13	MW13 Implement means to restrict pavement parking so these pavements are clear for wheelchair users MW14 Consideration to be given to restricting thoughtless parking at pinchpoints and junctions which impact on sight lines for other drives and cause congestion	Noted – these are largely enforcement issues and sit outside the scope of planning policy. The Design Guidance would assist in safeguarding against this in new development.
139	16	Policy MW13	Public car parking should better signposted and more sensibly priced. Better public transport and better footpaths would reduce pressure on car parking. MW14 Developments not only in the town but in the wider local area are being permitted without due attention to this issue which adversely affects the health and safety local people.	Added into the supporting text – an action for the Town Council.
140	16	Policy MW13	the latest parking restrictions proposed by the County Council and recently out to public consultation run contrary to this policy	Noted.
141	16	Policy MW13	Bi this may need to be clarified is accessibility to the High St anticipated by vehicle, on foot or both?	Added 'by foot'
142	16	Policy MW13	need another car park to enhance the offering of the town for big events	Noted – the plan is not allocating sites, but the policy sets out how this could be supported.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
143	1	Policy MW14	Delete as repeats the purpose. <i>This policy seeks to ensure that development proposals fully assess both their potential impact and their cumulative impact on the key junctions and roads in Much Wenlock that already experience safety or congestion problems and actively seek ways to mitigate this.</i>	Deleted text
144	12	Policy MW14	Whilst we strongly support the principle of the policy, we suggest ' supported and ' should be added in part B so it reads: <i>Development which provides new transport infrastructure or improves existing transport infrastructure should be supported and designed to maximise use by pedestrians, those with mobility impairments and cyclists.</i> This will then allow a clear objective to be set by the Town Council and one in which can be measured through delivery/implementation.	Added word 'supported'
145	16	Policy MW14	MW14 Improvements at the Gaskell Arm's Junctions are crucial in view of the proposed new housing developments in Ironbridge . Much Wenlock and Tasley/Bridgnorth(1000+120+1500 new houses) when this junction is already a considerable problem for vehicle users	Noted.
146	16	Policy MW14	Much Wenlock is already maintaining more road metal and street signs than it can afford at a cost to the visual environment. Much Wenlock is old, it should be celebrated as such. This is not to keep the town embedded in the past, but to maintain a perpetual vigilance as to what is being done and whether it could be done better. If the inhabitants of today don't start defending the encroachments on the town and promoting its heritage value, one day they will turn around and realise the integrity of the town and its history is gone forever,	Noted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
147	16	Policy MW14	Much Wenlock is too congested. Too many large lorries travelling through the town and surrounding roads. The speed limits need addressing. A by pass is urgently required.	Noted. Speed limits are enforcement issues, although traffic calming measures are discussed in this overall chapter. See previous comments on bypass comment (Ref 131).
148	16	Policy MW14	Sythce Lane not Sycthe close forms a junction with the A4169	Amended.
149	16	Policy MW14	Public parking needs to be free for at least one hour to allow more people to shop in the town	Noted – this falls outside planning policy.
150	1	4.107	Remove capital t on town	Amended.
151	1	p.64 Obj 5	Providing providing new public toilet provision to cater for local and visitor needs.	Amended.
152	16	Objective 5	It should be stated that Much Wenlock's leisure and cultural facilities serve an area and population far greater and wider than the town itself and the statement about such provision in relation to town size should be deleted. Particular mention should be made of the importance of retaining and enhancing these facilities for maintaining physical and mental wellbeing and commercial viability within the town and surrounding areas. Extra mention of the Leisure Centre and the threat of closure and the adverse effects of such a move would be helpful.	Added in a new sentence.
153	1	Policy MW15	A i-iii: Remove 'and' after each clause. Remove 96 from conformity reference	Retained. Removed

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
		p.65 and 69		
154	12	Policy MW15	Whilst we strongly agree with the policy and in particular part B, specific reference should be made to how new residential development can deliver upon the objectives of this policy.	Noted – contribution could come in the form of either direct delivery, provision of space for a facility of developer contributions.
155	16	Policy MW15	Edge Arts Centre is much appreciated	Added.
156	16	Policy MW15	There are available buildings in the town which could be imaginatively utilised as community space for the benefit of a variety of different age groups - a coffee bar for teenagers - a hub for young families- an advice centre, a place for local crafts. There are willing volunteers who could be asked to support such ventures. A community centre where people could meet and swap ideas and all were welcome would be great.	Noted – the Town Council could explore these as options.
157	16	Policy MW15	There are already opportunities for community and cultural facilities	Noted. The policy seeks to safeguard these.
158	16	Policy MW15	Our cultural programming has proven extremely popular for coworkers and beyond. Again, it brings local culture into the day to day, providing more connection with the immediate environment and others in your community, making working from home more sustainable.	Noted. It is good to acknowledge synergies between the policies.
159	16	Policy MW15	Table 7 Ref 7 probably unhelpful to quote a ?? change that is likely to change during the life of the plan	Noted.
160	16	Policy MW15	C Existing Play and recreational locations should not be lost in order to create unjustified parking areas.	Noted – see Ref. 122
161	16	Policy MW16	Public houses can only exist if they are commercially viable	Noted.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
162	16	Policy MW17	External CCTV for toilets , neighbours might be prepared to have recording devices sited in their homes.	Noted.
163	16	Policy MW17	The provision of ideally free public toilets is vital for residents and visitors alike.	Noted.
164	16	Policy MW17	If not vandalised we do have decent public toilets. However a new set on the side of the town near the Linden Field or Bull Ring or even on the Stretton Road may be useful for visitors. Obviously this additional provision would be in an ideal world and the local pubs and cafes do provide amenities for visitors.	Added.
165	16	Policy MW17	Without improved public toilets visitor numbers ar likely to reduce.	Noted.
166	16	Policy MW17	I am always impressed with the cleanliness of the public conveniences across the border in Wales. Spotless loos in Welsh tourist towns and villages, Much Wenlock really could do better.	Noted.
167	16	Policy MW17	there are already 2 public toilets in Much Wenlock	Noted.
168	16	Policy MW17	provide better signage to the facilities.	Added.
169	16	Policy MW17	Love policy MW17 in particular, the toilets are old	Noted.
170	1	Policy MW18	Clarify title of Policy MW18. Character and Design of development/ CHARACTER OF DEVELOPMENT	Amended.
171	1	Objective 6 box p. 70	<i>All future development will be well designed and will aim to:</i>	Amended.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>✓ respecting the scale, style and setting of the historic townscapes of Much Wenlock (in particular the unique characteristics of the 'bowl' setting) and Bourton.</p> <p>✓ making make sure that in Much Wenlock and Bourton, the use of building materials is in keeping with those used in their respective Conservation Areas. Elsewhere, new developments should use materials which respect their setting and rural environment.</p> <p>✓ ensuring ensure that any development or change be of the highest quality design.</p> <p>✓ ensuring ensure that new developments will include gardens of an appropriate scale to the property.</p>	
172	1	Policy MW18	B I to iv: remove the and at the end	Amended.
173	12	Policy MW18	We strongly support the principle of the policy as this is fundamental in delivering upon the objectives of sustainable development.	Noted.
174	16	Policy MW18	How did house on corner of Racecourse Lane. St Marys Lane get that massive addition to the old house, passed by planning. Looks like a city dweller imposing their ideals counter to the character of Much Wenlock	Noted – the Design Guidance will help to ensure that development is contributes positively to the character of the town
175	16	Policy MW18	The area behind the Library really could be far more attractive and the doughnuts for the commemoration of the Olympic Games dumped there made part of the area rather than abandoned. It could have some planters as could the ones near the top of the High Street car park that could make a more attractive area.	Noted – Town Council to explore this further.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
176	16	Policy MW18	whilst I agree with this, my main priority would be to provide environmentally aware, green design as stated in MW19	Noted – this policy is largely around character of design. It is read in conjunction with MW19.
177	16	Policy MW18	Emphasize that good quality design can enhance the energy efficiency and contribution to mitigating climate change of older traditional buildings without causing them damage.	Noted – see comment above.
178	16	Policy MW18	MW18 Bviii off road bin storage should specifically include 'off footway'	Added
179	1	Policy MW19	Clarify title of Policy MW19. <i>Energy efficiency and mitigating climate change/ ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND DESIGN</i> <i>D i: remove and from the end</i> <i>Conformity – add LPR DP19</i>	Amended Retained as considered to be important that all elements of the policy are met. Added.
180	12	Policy MW19	We strongly support the principle of the policy as this is fundamental in delivering upon the objectives of sustainable development. Further, this is a fundamental design aspect of the buildings we build, and the holistic approach taken to the development and delivery of our sites.	Noted.
181	16	Policy MW19	Is the council putting for EPC B Energy efficient measures are cheapest in the construction phase.	Such requirements are set out in Building Regulations.
182	16	Policy MW19	A and B This should go further , solar glass, solar roof tiles, solar panels, instead of tiles on new build where ever they don't conflict with other codes be mandatory	Amended.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
183	1	4.142	Check reference to <i>Paragraph 018-039</i> in The National Planning Practice Guidance. The reference ID for this section online is shown as 18a-005-20190723.	Amended.
184	1	Policy MW20	Remove 'and; from end of each clause	Retained.
185	12	Policy MW20	strongly support the principle of the policy.	Noted.
186	13	Policy MW20	Letter from the owners of Birchfield Garage – see below this table	Noted. Concerns to be taken up by the Town Council in relation to vandalism.
187	15	Policy MW20	Letter from the owners of 1 Barrow Street – see below this table	Noted. Minor text amendments made.
188	16	Policy MW20	Much Wenlock attracts visitors who come to see the attractive old buildings. Preserving these is very important, and their appearance should not be spoiled by unattractive local development. First impressions are important when attracting passers by, so development on the roads into the town needs to be sympathetic to the town. Callaughton Ash is not, but is fortunately not very noticeable when approaching from Bridgnorth	Noted.
189	16	Policy MW20	the plan goes a bit mad in it's inclusion of heritage assets, if some of these went, I can't see anyone would care	Noted.
190	1	4.141	Remove superfluous space	Amended.
191	14	Policy MW21	LGS4 Holy Trinity Green (Churchyard) I am not aware of any churchyards in the Diocese of Hereford being designated as LGS so I have had to carry out wider research in order to make a reasoned response.	This was discussed by the Steering Group, who agreed to remove the space as a proposed Local Green Space.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>My understanding is that designation as LGS does not confer any rights of access over what currently exists. Nor does it affect the question of ownership of the land. For the sake of clarity, it is important to record here that the church and churchyard of Holy Trinity Much Wenlock are vested in the incumbent (Parish Priest) and his or her successors in law. The property is, therefore, in local ownership, rather than that of the Diocese of Hereford. Churchyards, such as that at Much Wenlock, have a special status, being consecrated ground. This brings them under the jurisdiction of the diocesan consistory courts. The question then is whether the designation of a consecrated churchyard (as, for example LGS) has any legal effect in the present context. Churchyards enjoy a special and unique status owing to their legal consecration. We would question whether the power to designate an area as LGS extends to a churchyard.</p> <p>The churchyard at Much Wenlock is, in our view, already sufficiently protected by other local or national designation or policy, being in a Conservation Area and lying adjacent to a highly significant listed building.</p>	
192	16	Policy MW21	<p>Remove “William Brookes School Open Space” MW22:</p> <p>There is poor recreational provision to the east and south of the town.</p> <p>.</p>	See Ref 122.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
193	16	Policy MW21	The land in front of the scout's hut should be a parking facility for the Gaskell recreation ground	See Ref 122.
194	16	Policy MW21	Also need to protect from damaging vehicular access	Noted. This is an enforcement issue.
195	16	Policy MW21	Please request no parking on all green spaces you list and generate invoices for restoration if ignored many countries do this	As Ref 194.
196	16	Policy M21 and 22	PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW chalets on the old Shadwell Quarry site. This could so easily be a wonderful green and eco space for the area adding it onto The Windmill Hill and joining with the Bull Ring. It could become a fabulous planting opportunity for trees and wildlife as well as recreation space for the community. Chalet dwellings as of the same type as at Presthope detract from our town. Additional the old Railway line offers a circular walking and cycling route from and back to Much Wenlock. Will it ever be possible to be able to join the Broseley Road with the Bull Ring for Walkers? If so could there be signage on the Broseley Road?	This refers to policy MW23. Noted.
197	16	Policy MW21	Protecting and extending local green spaces is a necessity in our ever changing climate and decreasing insect/bird/animal life. I would like to see the additional areas for local green space designation incorporated into the plan and an extension of the wildflower meadow on the Linden Fields and other areas around the field treated in the same way. Potential place for a different kind of 'wetland' planting would be on the entrance to	Noted – these are projects for the Town Council to consider with community groups.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			the Linden Field near the Scout hut, in the dip by the hedge as it gets very boggy there. Also around the hedge by the play area. I recognise that maintaining the hedge each year has caused issues but if it is taken out in the future could it be planted with wetland soak away plants similar to the attention ponds?	
198	16	Policy MW21	LGS4 - I am not sure that Holy Trinity church green can be regarded as local green space	Noted and after discussion, this has been removed from the proposed LGS list.
199	16	Policy MW21	The church green and Williams Brookes School Local Green Space shouldn't be on there. These policies are strong	These spaces have been removed.
200	16	Policy MW21	Typo above ME21 should read MW21	Amended.
201	1	Objective 7	<p>SC supports the inclusion of Section 7 and the signposting offered by the blue 'Potential Action' boxes, though these could be kept very brief. There is some duplication of information and we suggest that paragraphs 4.35 and 4.98-4.100 be removed as this information is better located in Section 7.</p> <p>Remove 'creating' from the green box (2nd point)</p> <p>✓ <i>Taking opportunities taken to create linkages between sites, address green and pedestrian gaps in existing networks, create of creating new foot and cycle routes, and wildlife biodiversity corridors.</i></p>	<p>The SG suggested to retain here as those paragraphs relate to movement.</p> <p>Removed.</p> <p>Amended.</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>✓ identifying opportunities to increase potential new green and open spaces for enjoyment of the local landscape and countryside are identified.</p> <p>✓ undertaking sympathetic management of the countryside and natural outdoor environment in and around the parish is undertaken to enhance the quality of the landscape, improve local biodiversity and provide other benefits to the community's quality of life.</p>	<p>Amended.</p> <p>Amended.</p>
202	1	Policy MW22	<p>...in line with or above the standards...</p> <p>i-v – put 'is' at start of each</p> <p>Add a hyperlink to <i>Shropshire Council's Quantity Standard</i>.</p> <p>Include a hyperlink to <i>Shropshire Council's Open Space Interim Planning Guidance</i>.</p>	<p>Amended.</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Added in.</p> <p>Added in.</p>
203	12	Policy MW22	We strongly agree with the principle of the policy and support the need for on-site delivery. This is a fundamental objective of successful place making and design.	Noted.
204	16	Policy MW22	Much Wenlock definitely needs better public open space provision particularly on the south side of the town.	Noted.
205	1	4.158	<i>To ensure the MWNP can be used to support better designed play provision whilst remembering that play is not just for children. To add new equipment that provides</i>	Amended text slightly. The text is taken straight from SC Green Space Strategy for Much Wenlock.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<i>greater variety of play experience, to make a space more inclusive or accessible – whether that is wheeled access friendly or suitable for neurodiverse users.</i>	
206	1	Policy MW23	Add hyperlink to <i>Building with Nature 12 Standards</i> . Add in LPR DP12 to conformity references.	Added. Added.
207	12	Policy MW23	We strongly support the principles of the policy as it aligns with those set by the Environment Act.	Noted.
208	16	Policy MW23	Define Green and Blueinfrastructure	This is in the Glossary.
209	16	Policy MW23	love continuity ambitions	Noted
210	16	Policy MW23	again protecting and expanding areas for wildlife is a necessity. I would support more green corridors between sites, a much reduced hedge cutting (flaying) regime , particularly when hedgerows are in fruit for over wintering birds and more planting of woodland corridors between areas. Also I would like to see road verges being left with wildflower planting instead of being cut around the entrance to the town. I suggested this to the TC in spring 2023 when reporting back from the Middle Marches Land trust conference about 'doable' conservation initiatives.	Noted.
211	16	Policy MW23	Coates quarry does not appear with other quarries on Fig 22. The policy references to some quarries eg Shadwell and Farley may need strengthening . Both are currently the subject of long standing enforcement orders by the LPA	Amended map.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
212	1	4.165	Remove extra 'l' before large	Amended.
213	1	4.169, 4.171 4.172	Add hyperlink to <i>Shropshire Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy for Much Wenlock</i> . Within 'the town'; <i>Encouragement of regenerative farming to protect groundwater, improve soil health (with implications for water and carbon storage).</i>	Added. Amended.
214	1	Policy MW24	Clarify title of Policy MW24.. Landscape and environment/ MANAGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT Add in DP12 to LPR conformity ref.	Amended. Added.
215	16	Policy MW24	There should be provision to oppose large scale photovoltaic and wind turbine developments within the entire MW area. This does not prevent active promotion of rooftop PV and heat pump installations	A new policy has been separated out from earlier to include criteria against which to consider such proposals.
216	16	Policy MW24	encourage hedges and trees in development. Inexpensive as whips	Noted.
217	16	Policy MW24	It would be nice to have the vision to be a flagship.	Noted.
218	1	p.96	Amend typo in para numbering (8.1)	Amended.
219	1	4.184	Extend hyperlink so that it covers the whole text of <i>Guidance Note 01 The Reduction of Obtrusive Light and</i> Extend hyperlink so that it covers the whole text of <i>Guidance Note 08 Bats and artificial lighting</i>	Amended.

Ref	Who ?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
220	1	Figure 23	Add units to key.	Amended.
221	1	Policy MW25	The provisions of Policy MW25 (Dark Skies) are not required by the Development Plan strategic policies and it is unclear therefore how enforceable this policy would be in practice.	The Development Plan is largely silent on this matter. Policy MW25 adds additional local detail, supporting the use of specified guidance to minimise light pollution. It aligns with the approach taken in the National Landscape, for which the parish is in/in the setting of. Retained.
222	12	Policy MW25	We support the policy as this forms a key aspect of the design process.	Noted.
223	16	Policy MW25	long way to go to achieve for Much Wenlock	Noted.
224	16	Policy MW25	There is ever more light pollution often not necessary	Noted.
225	16	Policy MW25	None in MuchWenlock itself or nearly enough for oldies	Noted.
226	16	Policy MW25	A real conservation of energy against/ involving light pollution could reduce the impact of the town on the night sky. I would like to see the Council grasp the nettle ,take up the challenge and promote Much Wenlock as an environmental example for the rest of Shropshire. Other areas, particularly in the South of the County are already working to make environmental gains.	Noted.
227	16	Policy MW25	We have quite an aware area of light use but it would be good to have a lights-out policy on any businesses/public buildings not in use during evenings.	Noted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
228	1	Design Guidance and Codes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 4.131 states that '<i>The Design Guidance and Codes for Much Wenlock form part of formal policy for the MWNP</i>'. This information is crucial to the MWNDP review process and should be highlighted in the <i>Introduction</i> section as well as in the <i>Purpose</i> section of Policy MW18 (<i>Character and Design of development/ Character of Development</i>). Shropshire Council considers the draft <i>Design Guidance and Codes</i> to be in general conformity with the Development Plan strategic policies. MWTC might consider incorporating further guidance from this document into the body of the Plan, for example the concept of a 'SuDS train' from C2 could be transferred to M11 (Sustainable drainage design and management). We also suggest that guidance be included in the <i>Design Guidance and Codes to support section B ii of MW20</i> (Conserving heritage assets), advising on how new development can '<i>make a positive contribution to the visual appearance of the main highway approaches into Much Wenlock town</i>'. Shropshire Council is currently working on a high-quality design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This document will be consulted on early 2025 and, once adopted, will be a material consideration in decision making in both area with and without adopted neighbourhood plans. MWTC will be invited to comment on the draft SPD and Shropshire Council will welcome their comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added to the introduction section. Added in cross-referencing of the Design Guide to the main Plan as suggested. Noted. Action for the TC.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
229	16	Design Guide	Very well done	Noted.
230	16	Design Guide	Prepared by an outside body it is a little generic but generally acceptable	Noted. The body visited the area and met with the Steering Group to discuss and evolve content.
231	16	Design Guide	Design Guidance page 44 Towns Growth Infill Forester Avenue	Amended.
232	16	Design Guide	These look good to me and seem to be well-researched	Noted.
233	16	Other comments	To improve lighting in Back Lane, Queen St and Bull Ring Area	Noted.
234	16	Other comments	The main objection i have is the extension of double yellow lines supposedly to improve pedestrian safety which is nonsense. This is harmful to the aesthetic nature of the town and will blight the conservation area and other parts of the town	Noted – this sits outside the scope of the MWNP as it is an enforcement issue.
235	16	Other comments	I hope this is the last consultation. There have been so many without progress. Whoever said this form would take 10 minutes to complete clearly hasn't tried to complete it.	Noted
236	16	Other comments	I am greatly in opposition to infill, especially the selling off and building overly large homes in gardens - as has been the case by the top of St Owens's Road. Additionally the building of garages that are clearly future proofing a change of use for a future dwelling! Small cottages with huge two storey garages alongside should be monitored. This town is unique and should be retained as such. Sprawl, infill, buildings that are too large for plots, the encroachment of eg The Lady Forester Nursing Home	Noted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>into the woodland behind, chalet homes on the old Shadwell Quarry all squeeze the town. Schools need space around them, Building an estate by the Primary School, or additional accommodation blocks at The William Brookes School is in my opinion not good. The Linden Field gets so much use. We need more outdoor space for our community in order to alleviate pressure on that we already have. Making our town a pleasant place to walk in and around we do need to do something about the pedestrian access to The William Brookes School and The Lady Forester Care Home. Walking along that pavement with huge lorries passing and cars on wet days is unpleasant, adding a pavement or hard core path on the bottom of Windmill Hill could help. Also a footpath running parallel to Sheinton Street to join the bottom of Sytch Lane and Southfield Road.</p> <p>A vast undertaking of an improvement of the surfaces of our streets and pavements.</p> <p>I am unsure of the ruling now about Right to Buy, we did have some bungalows built on the corner of New Road that I believe were sold off to their occupants many years since. With the new shared ownership housing and rental homes my question is it feasible to build and then sell, family sized homes when we are so short of space to build in this town? Perhaps if this is still possible the rules should be changes. I believe it is good to be able to retain some of the local young people with their families within the town and am pleased the plan acknowledges this. However with Council owned property we get people from far away who are re</p>	Noted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			located for various reasons, they do not often fully appreciate living in a community that takes pride in its location causing friction amongst thie neighbours. Can this rule be challenged? Please value the older residents who have time, money and energy to look after our town, spend their money locally and appreciate what they have in a unique and special place.	
237	16	Other comments	Olympian Heritage of Much Wenlock ought to have been given greater focus !	
238	16	Other comments	To what extent have sources of finance been identified, should positively seeking sources of finance be included in the plan	The TC will set out priorities based on the findings of the engagement and projects identified in the MWNP.
239	16	Other comments	If on street parking is being considered and perhaps reduced please consider disabled parking.	Noted.
240	16	Other comments	Overall, it is a good effort by the steering group, but they should resist becoming NIMBY 'sand allow the town to grow. Younger people would actually like to buy homes in Wenlock instead of being shoe horned into renting affordable homes	Noted.
241	16	Other comments	It is comprehensive.	Noted.

