



Our plan – Our future

Comments from Consultation

12th January 2013



Policies

Objectives 1-3

- A good use for the quarries would be to seal the open ends and use them as attenuation ponds with peripheral landscaping to support and encourage wildlife, eg NT and RSPB partnering
- We need more jobs for young people. Quarry workers gone who will follow? I'm in support of more industrial premises.
- 3G we need in more places than the Gaskell Field
- 3G.
- Sewage farm needs to be built before houses. Flooding also caused by more houses.
- Flooding issues and extreme excess water have not been dealt with recent new developments (Hunters Gate) Run off the fields either side Bridgnorth Road
- Create huge flood areas and excess water which tasks under properties gardens do not cope with
- Therefore the issue has not been addressed 10 years ago and more houses on this side of town will create more issues as land is concreted over. Need sorting now , not more housing
- Employment sites identified are fine but 'wood pellet' business started in the quarry without permission . Far greener would be generated electricity submersed turbines at any of the 8 or more sites of water mills in the parish.
- Support planning development that takes into account flow of surface water. MW does have flooding problems.
- I think that the active implementation of these policies and a declared intention to do this is key in gaining residents support for further development in MW
- Praise for Neighbourhood Plan and their vision and their thoughtful care for our environment.
- Adequate sewage capacity for any new development?
- **2.2 and 2.3** careful consideration should be given to any proposals to reduce retail premises by returning them to housing use as has happened with Wilmore Street.
- Overall the SG have done well with all the policies and shown that they have at least listened and tried to take residents various views into account.
- I support re use of former quarries /restoration for wildlife and bio diversity and public access BUT The use of quarries for small scale industry?
- Well done the steering group - very thoughtful policies.
- **Policy 2.1** unlikely to attract industry with Telford on doorstep . How do you propose incentive to new business.
- Why ring fence good central sites for employment when there is a need for housing in central sites?
- Would like a better range of jobs



- Increasing hard standing in the critical drainage area will increase flooding in town
- Given availability of employment land over many years there is no need for local business for a site such as this . Local based economy is more knowledge based.
- These are positive policies – they need to not just be planned but implemented combined sewers must be dealt with
- Policy 3.1 essential Policies 3.2 3.5 much to be desired.

Policy 3.5

- Surface flooding in field and gardens on Hunters Gate was very serious before and during Xmas There is still water lying now.
- The building of more houses will exacerbate the problem unless measures are put in place before building starts.
- Policy 3.5 The flood sensitive areas on Hunters Gate has changed in nature since 2007 whilst the drains were coping at the end of 2012 beginning of 2013 the surface flooding was very serious in xxxx of Hunters Gate and gardens.
- Policy 3.5 No housing should be built on flood sensitive areas until it could be demonstrated that conditions that occurred in July 2007 will not have similar catastrophic results.

Objectives 4 5 and 6

- All policies are very welcomed. Great !
- The long term future of traffic management in MW is not being addressed. The problem at the Gaskell Arms Junction must be addressed.
- Strongly support **policy 4.2 and 4.7**
- **Policies 4.1-7 all excellent**
- **4.2** Essential in order to alleviate problems of surface water flooding.
- Need new toilets on the Gaskell ground
- Stop building on sites you said wouldn't be developed
- Respect local environment take a look at the Gables, Racecourse Lane. A disgrace.
- 20 mph limit throughout town enforceable.
- Need for overall road network policy to include MW with surrounding areas otherwise we shall always have problem with HGVs
- Do not agree with 20mph limit in town. Neither do I but am concerned about excess speeds past the school.
- 20mph speed limit on all roads in MW
- Support **policy 5.2**
- I think than any new development now will take away the character of our town.
- Consideration needed to reopen railway to Craven Arms as a regional cycleway could provide catering facilities at town end.



- Poor planning control on style and material of houses built, eg The Gables on Racecourse Lane.
- Keep short stay parking and traffic access in high street
- So why have Lady Foresters Gardens been allowed to be built with little local stone. They look out of character.
- We need toilets on the Gaskell Field.
- How are traffic calming and slowing down going to be addressed in Farley, which is still part of MW and has to put up with heavy traffic at 50mph speeds. Traffic speeds should be reduced to 30mph as Farley (A4169) is part of the village. It would be nice to walk into town.
- Farley Road – 30mph – no way!
- Policies 4.2 permeable surfaces are imperative.
- Better park and little kiddie's area
- More local parking encourages local shopping and supporting our local businesses.
- 5.1-3 are all manageable policies
- Still don't think proposals go far enough to help existing traffic problems in Wenlock and more traffic calming measures are therefore required. The proposals seemed to be mainly geared towards new developments.
- Create safe cycling routes linking created cycling routes with Shropshire wide cycling routes
- **Policy 5.3** More toilet facilities needed for residents and visitors, particularly for coach parties.
- **Policies 6.1/2/3 all excellent**
- **Policy 6.1** Agreed but how does the extension of Hunters Gate fit into this bearing in mind the reports of the inspector at two previous public enquiries.
- Strongly support **Policy 6.2** Reduce speed limit to 20 mph within town
- Development of cycle ways and improve (continued) footpath.
- No matter how much you encourage cycling and walking the reality is that people use their cars so therefore need car parking facilities – without this the town will DIE
- We want to encourage visitors and shoppers but car parking for cars and buses does not appear to be addressed. Car nos would be reduced if there was a better bus service for workers going out and incomers. Service to Telford should improve, particularly to rail station.
- The current automatic toilets are not appropriate – many stories of unpleasant and embarrassing situations. Two coachloads need access to a greater number in block.
- What is need for MW is a good thought out traffic management system as the current 'free for all' situation is rubbish.
- Lower speed limits approaching the town. MW is the only town in Shropshire with no 20mph zone.
- Strongly support schemes which give pedestrians priority over vehicular traffic thereby discouraging drivers from seeking parking spaces in 'pedestrianized' areas. The one way high street seems an ideal site where this could be done.
- 4.1 As there is not enough affordable housing for young singles they are living longer with their parents and 2 parking spaces might not be enough visitor parking.



- Strongly agree with policies especially **6.1** Hope they take place and builders do not exceed them.
- Very supportive of design proposals
- **6.2** Use of local materials in sympathy with local character not evident in recent Lady Forester development.
- Objective 6 – Read pink area- Walton Grange , Sytche Close & proposal C – do not comply with this aim and should not be allowed.
- The proliferation of modern red brick boxes is entirely unacceptable – how the planning authority justify this.?
- Green tourism should be an element. Walking festivals. Cycling. Weekend visits.

Objective 7 Green and open spaces

- Very important to provide open spaces and countryside to allow for exercise and quality scenery.
- There seems much confusion about the Gaskell field despite the Public meeting. The future of this great town asset needs clarifying as a matter of some urgency.
- **Policy 7.3** is to be commended.
- Do not allow development of Gaskell field. Return ownership from Shropshire CC.
- Even Bridgnorth DC identified lack of greenspace. Nothing is in this plan next to graveyard.
- Strongly support all **7.1 – 7.4**.
- Consider strengthening the protection for the Gaskell ground through designation of Local Greenspace
- Strongly support all **7.1 through to 7.4**
- Anomaly re quarries. **8.1** Reuse to include restoration for wildlife and biodiversity **BUT 2.5** Use of former quarries for small scale light industry.
- Are the cricket pitch and bowling green public areas? If they are why are they fenced off and gates closed. Surely cars parked beside the trees compounding the earth and stressing the trees in the Gaskell fields.
- Like the intent of all the policies esp with the environment and local beauty.
- Quarry sites should be allowed to recover and NOT be used for industry
- Green tourism – support partnership. Value the access and Conservation at Wenlock Edge. Stokes Barn – festivals, poetry storytelling
- Such a shame that the timber on the school looks terrible after such a lot of expenditure on rebuilding
- Where is the play area on hunters gate and what happened to the money for it?
- Support most of the policies to create /protect open green spaces and sustainability policies still feel that the NT would be best custodians of the quarries on Stretton Road.
- **7.4** Private to whom? Each householder? 3 householders = public?



- Protection of areas such as Gaskell fields from domination of any one group ie cricket club. Open space for all residents of the town.
- **7.2** If green space is to be protected why was Lady Forester built on?

Objective 8 Landscape & wildlife

- Something must be done about the old quarries on the Stretton road. They are a truly horrible mess. The National Trust is probably the best option.
- Strongly support measures **8.1 to 8.4**. Commended.
- Support for all **8.1 – 8.4**. Wish all objectives 8.1 – 8.4 to succeed.
- Protect wildlife
- Very impressive. Good luck!
- Strongly support the retention of former quarries with relation to geology, flora and fauna
- **8.3** Even if there is no devt next to Hunters gate and attenuation pond is needed in field due to change in recent flooding conditions.
- **8.4** Vital to maintain existing woodland and hedges
- Very impressive – good **8.3** Some existing area of woodland obscure the very feature – the Edge – which is most famous. Viewing gaps and some thinning of trees would enable people to enjoy the view and sense of the edge.

Objective 9 Sustainability & climate change

- Too much green energy. Too expensive to maintain
- Wenlock has huge amounts of water and used to have 7 mills. Could hydro generation of electricity be studied as a possibility, possibly as an external project.
- Encouragement to install solar panels should be paramount – this reduces electricity consumption dramatically.
- Active support for small scale hydroelectricity. Start with 8 sites of watermills

Sites

General 10 of these dev. Sites are outside the development boundary

All sites

- Agree with Steering Group B, C, D, E, G, H, J, R, Q, P, O, M, I

Site A

- Do not include in plan



- As a resident of Farley I am concerned at the impact of this on the countryside i.e. extra traffic, noise, large groups will come to this area. Will be catering for large groups of children etc. I will oppose this development
- Unsuitable for development – ongoing pollution, major problems if leak
- Very unhappy about the proposed plan as the road is already busy. The houses in the near area will be badly disturbed with the noise of children playing and screaming if things like zip-wires etc are used. The area is full of deer, badger, foxes, birds etc which will be badly affected.
- Concerned over access from Wyke Lane to Bradley – not suitable for any extra traffic. I hope they are intending to provide new vehicular access from the main road, Wenlock to Buildwas
- Equestrian ‘yes’, anything else a very firm ‘no’
- RDA not needed. Already available in 2 locations nearby
- Has work already started on this. There seems to be ongoing development on this site. Has a planning application been submitted?
- Coppices here are full of wildlife species which need protection from intrusion, noise, traffic etc
- To much damage to nature
- If Riding for the Disabled can demonstrate a shortage of facilities in the county ‘yes’ to this ????, but road access and the proximity to a chemical works with poor environmental record must be taken into account
- Concern over environmental impact in woodland at Tickwood and of plan
- Proposed devt of Acklands coppice will spoil an extremely biodiverse area. Several protected species will be disturbed. Wildlife corridors along the Ne of Wenlock Edge will be lost and the peace and tranquillity of this wooded area will be lost forever.
-

Site B

- Do not include in plan
- Not welcome in Homer

Site C

- This represents the best solution for a sizeable development of office/workshop/housing for a number of reasons – access/ less flooding etc and could be an alternative to Site D Stretton road.
- Clearly no requirement for large estate. Area in plan should be reduced
- Huge development not needed – only a few social houses
- Smaller scale development supported – not exceeding 40 dwellings



- Access to site will be an issue. Will need access only from Bridgnorth Rd, other roads not linked to the site would create rat run through Barrow St.
- Will add significantly to flooding issues on Hunters Gate. Water already drains off fields either side of Bridgnorth road and will exacerbate the excess water which cannot drain away in corner of field already.
- Proposal C is not in line with local opinion as demonstrated by public consultation both for the Neighbourhood Plan and for the previous Town & Parish Plan. The site is also liable to local flooding.
- Again – an upgrade to the drainage will be needed to prevent any further flooding.
- Agree the site is appropriate in its location but we don't want a huge housing estate. Small number of houses of mixed sizes.
- Large scale development on this scale will ruin the integrity of the town. If fewer houses are allowed will be the beginning of the end.
- Further development would be out of proportion with the town. This would represent at development – housing estate that was too large
- Why so many houses? Should be constrained to minimum levels, say 20-40
- Development proposals too large. Max should be 40
- Potential flooding risk to Hunters Gate. Best place for light industry and housing is drainage issue resolved.
- Don't agree with sites R O P H they should put a gate on site P. And temporary car park is a very loose word.

Site D

- D is just Wenlock Estates being greedy and the capacity is not needed.
- I strongly oppose site D. It is steadily encroaching on an area of ONB. There is little or no unemployment in Wenlock. It is an ageing population. There is no call for additional workshop/office units here. Plenty of such units are vacant in Telford/ Bridgnorth and would be better utilised there. There are major access problems on the road with existing heavy lorry traffic. A thoroughly bad proposal which should be rejected.
- Site P has been available yet not used. Cannot see why we need more land destroyed for employment land that businesses are not demanding. Development of D will also further destroy rich wildlife habitats that include newts and further increase land on drainage which is already full
- More traffic on Stretton Road should be avoided. Too much heavy traffic already
- [REDACTED] My thoughts on Site D
The extension to include further land is not a surprise. Clearly the small car park site is unviable and Wenlock Estates wishes to develop further pasture land as it sold temp access to SCC. Wenlock Estates has tried to sell the 1.79 acres plus the new



proposed land for almost 10 years. No buyer until Shropshire CC came along and paid Wenlock Estates £115000. Objections are:

No demand for industrial land

By accepting this proposal land is potentially condemned to staying empty for at least another 10 years. We are in full recession.

2. Planning consent stipulates return to previous pasture.
 3. Access
 4. AONB
 5. Attenuation pond could take up part of this site saving other land.
 6. Incestuous planning application SCC – SCC could deny local people any input.
 7. Current site inhabited by young people/noisy/nuisance
 8. Where is gate that Milner Whiteman proposed
 9. This nuisance & eyesore could continue for many years
 10. No employment will be guaranteed to Much Wenlock people. People may come from Telford/Stourbridge etc & more traffic to town.
 11. Access – Already several accesses within a few yards. Stretton road already falling to bits. Gaskell Arms junction a hazard.
 12. Site is in flood plain. Industrial site is worst development for immediate run-off
- It should be made clear to Wenlock Estates that housing will not be tolerated on this site.

Site E

- Existing plan OK. Where is space for further development? Leave out.
- A suitable site for small development

Site F

- Can all planning permission be checked and any requirement enforced.
- Very unsure that the use of quarries for leisure activities is compatible with protection of geology & wildlife. Great care needed in supporting any such leisure policy.
- Quarries should green and NOT used for ANY industry, especially close to NT land



Site G

- Poor choice. Access bad. Site AONB. On a hill, can be seen prominently. Other sites (particularly C) are better. Flooding in Stretton Road an issue here and at access to Shrewsbury road.
- This is part of Wenlock Edge which should be kept from building. There are major problems present with drainage down the road. This will exacerbate that. There is no access from Stretton road from here and it will be impossible to use Blakeway Hollow for more traffic. This infill proposal is ill thought out and not appropriate to use for housing. I live on Stretton road at The Lodge.
- This site acts as a sponge for water coming off the Edge. In wet weather the hollows fill up and the water is released slowly. Any building would increase run-off with higher risk of flooding in the town. Any building on the north side of Stretton road would detract from the appeal of the Edge, especially those who use the car park. Access and road safety might also be an issue.
- Green space only
- Possible exit/entry for ring road. In appropriate area (elm tree).
- Don't agree with Site G because more houses are not necessary if you go along with all the rubbish idea for site C.
- Land floods very badly. A deep pool Dec 12. Another access onto a very busy road will be lethal. In a 30mph limit which is not acknowledged. Speed of traffic is very fast and dangerous. Area also prone to flooding. Poor visibility – can't see traffic coming out of Much Wenlock
- I object to the plan for bungalows next to the National Trust car park on land north of Stretton Road. The land has recently flooded and I believe there is possible egress to mains sewers. There are potential issues around vehicular access and loss of residents parking which can only result in frustrated residents with less parking forced to park on the road causing congestion. The development would be unsightly next to the picturesque Wenlock Edge just when we should be safeguarding our national treasures. It would mean the loss of a pretty patch of land forever replaced by more developer's new builds. Make no mistake, it is about profit and not as stated to provide a local housing shortage of bungalows. The proposal means to take advantage of the current government's determination to build on green belt. There are much more suitable sites to provide land for bungalows. These sites even have level ground. There are few pedestrians who use the road. Those that do already have a good footpath as far as the National Trust car park. Please do not ruin forever a beautiful part of our county.
- Suitable for green space not for food production. No soil and prone to flood
- Site is outside the development boundary and too near NT land
- Site is subject to serious flooding. Access onto Stretton Road dangerous and would compromise local residents' parking



- However, having read the proposals for housing and employment development we are concerned by those for Site G: North of Stretton Road. Although Wenlock Estates have been unable to identify its location, it is believed that the site is the field to the right of the entrance to the NT Wenlock Edge car park. Part of that field is known to regularly suffer from serious flooding due to both the run off from the old quarry workings alongside of it and to natural dips at other points.

In addition, the existing exit from the car park is known to be badly sited, with a number of collisions and near misses over the years, due to it being on a bend with limited lines of sight for traffic in both directions. Because of those incidents, Shropshire County Council (as was) added a number of extra warnings on the road surfaces in both directions. That action has reduced the number of incidents but has not completely solved the problem due, as much as anything, to the all too common speeding of vehicles entering and leaving Much Wenlock on the B4371. This site would have the same hazard if access was proposed to be anywhere else along the edge of the field bordering Stretton Road, as the bend continues to curve along that stretch.

As a general comment, we would again like to point out that we have been unable to obtain anything but verbal sympathy from Shropshire Council staff to our concern (shared by other along Stretton Road) that the fields bordering our property, which slope towards our rear garden and thus the house and garage, have no ditches to take run off water away. This has twice resulted in the house and garage being saved from internal flooding only by the use of sandbags and digging a drainage channel through our front garden to allow the water to flow to one side of the house and out to the road drains.

No one appears to know whether farmers are legally required to maintain ditches around the borders of their land, as is certainly the case in other European countries. In view of the changing weather patterns and the resulting predictions of even more incidents of heavier rain than currently experienced, it would be appreciated if someone can provide a definitive written statement as to the current requirements and responsibilities for public circulation to property owners and farmers.

Site H

- Agree this site not suitable for development and that greenspace near the Gaskell would be welcome.
- A site for a new health centre is badly needed for the time frame of this plan. I have not seen an alternative proposal for a site.
- Agreed! Not suitable for development. Leave as green.
- Leave as green space



- Would be ideal as additional parking location – better than Stretton Lane
- But a new Medical Centre should be a priority
- Will the police be able or willing to staff any new facility

Site I

- Too far from town
- Agree tourism but not caravans! The site is highly visible and the wonderful views up there would be ruined.
- Hideous idea
- Far too visible and too far from amenities

Site J

- Leave out
- Agree leave out. Part of attraction of MW is its pleasing visual appearance

Site K

- Exception site only confined to current residential caravan site

Site L

- Leave out

Site M

- This site is of high visibility. Access is very problematic and overlooking existing residents. I agree with the Steering group that the site should not be considered for planning.
- Agree. Not suitable for planning.
- Leave out
- Agree that totally unsuitable as residential development site due to high visibility, issues with access and would seriously overlook existing residential properties
- Agreed that not suitable for more housing
- Agree highly visible location means it is not suitable for housing development

Site N

- No allocation – overdevelopment
- Concern that enlargement of the store makes it attractive to the likes of Tesco Extra which would be detrimental to town shops.
- Concerned about the location of this development – not in centre of town so over-development – detrimental to High St



- If the retail space currently at the garage NISA were to become a convenience store for a major supermarket chain it would ruin the retail offer in the town. This would be regardless of the local shops being cheaper – we have lived near a high street where a Sainsburys convenience store though more expensive ruined the local shopping.

Site O

- Flooding issues have not been assessed. Attenuation will not stop additional sewage for a site already over capacity.
- Not appropriate – too much flooding.
- Do not let any development up Sytche or hills – spoil landscape
- This horrendously large for a development site in the town, and should not be considered for development in its entirety
- This would be a huge development and totally inappropriate
- Use Morris Corfield site for housing

Site P

- I oppose this development. This area was previously up for sale by any interested parties by Wenlock Estates. No interest was ever expressed for at least 3-4 years. It will not change. There is no call for further industrial development on this site. There is little unemployment in Wenlock for this to be viable. Plenty of existing units are empty in Telford area. If anything is contemplated the site behind marked depot could be utilised instead. There is already access there. The site should be put back to paddock as it was before. It is also unsuitable for housing. There is poor access onto Stretton road for a housing estate. Any site for housing should be along Bridgnorth road adjoining the development at Hunters Gate.
- Disagree. Needs to be put back to a field. If not gate put onto temp car park to keep unwanted nuisance out. Access to mainroad poor. Don't agree at all to increasing area to site D. Don't need industrial units in town.
- I disagree with proposal P. Why develop industrial units here. Improve transport links to areas like Telford (Halesfield, Stafford Park) and leave industry outside MW. The town cannot cope with the current flow of industrial traffic as it is.
- Totally object to developing D in addition to site P. Complete P to meet needs.

Site Q

- Support an attenuation pond as a priority. Both add to attraction of MW and help with flooding – to alleviate floods.
- Proposal Q is very much supported



Site R

- Attenuation pond. Good solution to help with flooding in town. Worried about loss of 160m of hedgeline and lots of trees. May affect wildlife – rare species found bats/dormice/great crested newts
- Agree with this provided access is maintained to existing properties and drainage sufficient to prevent localised flooding.
- Will the council pay to have the lake dredged and maintained so it doesn't turn into a swamp in 10 - 15 years time

Site S

- No need for two village halls. Just revamp Priory Hall.
- No need for further village hall – just enhance existing. Site should not be considered for any development

Scenarios

Scenario 1

- I would support scenario 1 to create affordable housing. I would not be in agreement with scenario 2
- It seems to better meet the need of local people. 2 is future expansion which does not meet local need.
- I fully support this scenario 1 proposal and reject scenario 2. Developers renege on commitment to affordable housing and if not it is very expensive. A large development on the edge of town is unacceptable.
- Please define what you mean by 'affordable'
- Property to rent for single young people on low income.
- Support scenario 1 but existing infrastructure particularly drainage and sewage must be renewed.
- You must build affordable housing or this town will become even more a middle class, older generation town and die due to younger people not being able to afford to live here
- Comments seem to have been posted for disagreement rather than agreement with responses.
- Affordable housing and no employment is a falsehood of the worst kind.
- Before any new development in this town the sewage treatment works needs to be upgraded and enlarged as not been altered in the last 40 years.
- Affordable housing exemptions are not a good thing the approach is grim with little regard for the drainage problem etc. Strong support this approach which is seeking to with the views of residents whilst providing organic development of the towns housing stock



- Small scale managed affordable housing – support this – consistent with both sustainability and growth I particularly support advantages.
- Scenario 1 preferable it will help to keep MW in scale and will not put undue pressure on existing services , particularly the doctors surgery and the school
- We have one of the best developments in the county at Hunters gate, quality of design is often more important than yes or no to building
- Strongly prefer scenario 1 – more sensitive to local views, control over development.
- Total support scenario 1 definitely not scenario 2
- One of the advantages of this approach is the existing ability to better manage the existing affordable housing stock and free up under occupied homes.
- A variety of schemes managed over a period of time gives greater flexibility and the ability to react to changing circumstances.
- Strongly support scenario 1 This is the only scenario which fully reflects the views expressed in the public consultation
- Scenario 1 is far preferable to scenario 2. In keeping with the historic development of the town
- ‘Affordable’ must be affordable for lower wages
- ‘Affordable’ what does this mean for public transport?
- I endorse scenario 1 as the right way forward for MW and its provision for local housing needs.
- Scenario 1 is the most appropriate response to the ‘needs’ of the local community I hope the town council approves this.
- As a resident of Hunters Gate I support either of these plans but what is going to happen to the provision of school places and slight worry about the roundabout in primary school exit . Agree with comment that quality is more important as quantity.
- Is this approach really going to deliver a significant number of genuinely affordable homes ?
- Small scale development will be unable to support the burden of significant numbers of affordable homes.

Scenario 2

- Scenario 2 is totally disproportionate to the town – more in keeping with Telford.
- Can’t keep depending on market development to provide affordable housing when infrastructure is not fit for present purposes. Referendum of 2007 said no to development until sewerage, flooding and traffic congestion resolved.
- there are pros and cons to both scenarios 1 and 2. Scenario 2 is not a bad suggestion as at least it keeps all the development in one area and adjoins recent newer housing so will match it. Size of devt needs to be reduced though to avoid a situation similar



to the current destruction of Lawley! Need a mix of housing types including bungalows for older people. Many of sites on Scenarios 1 eg Southfield road not suitable for devt.

- The balance of affordable housing in scenario 2 is not enough. it would also be an out of scale devt for a small town.
- Tagging 90 houses to Hunters Gate would give an estate of 150 houses, way out of proportion for a town this size and of this nature.
- Scenario 2 – if agreed then pond must be in place before devt to prevent flooding
- Scenario 2 B – pond good. Houses not so.
- 2A and 2B TOO MANY houses create more people and cars through town – roads can't cope with more traffic. Will people be bothered to walk into town from there? Can Primary school cope? What about foul and surface drainage?
- I am not in agreement with scenario 2 . This will not meet local needs. The estate it would create will not be in balance with the town . I would support scenario 1.
- Even if Scenario 2 does not happen a pond is still needed to alleviate flooding on existing Hunters Gate devt due to change in recent flooding patterns.
- Scenario 2 play area should be suitable for teenagers along the lines of the outdoor gyms seen in China etc.
- Thank you for your policies. They are sympathetic to the nature of our lovely town. Devt is inevitable and growth should be encouraged but within the character of the town
- 70 houses implies about 280 residents. Are there so many homeless in MW?
- New attenuation ponds should not be seen to open up the possibility of large scale development . They are not the total solution to the flooding problem
- Main issues
- Why ignore the residents – answers
- No to your 25 – 40 max
- Yes . No . Don't know. Total protection to prevent any risk of flooding. Development on the scale of 80 houses will increase traffic - there is no employment to sustain such numbers . MW will become a dormitory.
- Where is the market for all the development, in particular affordable/social housing?
- Population of wenlock= 2600. 80 dwellings @2 per house = 160 people = 6% increase, ie not much, so build all sooner rather than later and perhaps seek more affordable in return – but must be affordable
- Please no multiple storey dwellings
- A roundabout on the Bridgnorth on the road is very necessary for safe access to the site and the traffic calming on the approach to MW.
- Affordable homes with other mixed devt - not to exceed 40 for integration and sustainable impact on environment.



- No large devt or multi stories. Bungalows. Landscape – separate Walton Hills and new properties . Need to traffic calm on Barrow ST please. You are already struggling to sell affordable homes in housing opposite Wm Brookes school. Will any more really be affordable or middle class/retired persons housing. Young people need work and homes they can afford. They are the town’s future.
- Strongly support more affordable houses to be built here. Wenlock needs more young people and families. Needs to be proper access from devt to Bridgnorth road, NOT yet more congestion on Barrow St.
- The larger devt is too large. However, if housing quantities for year were reduced this would be more acceptable. Do not want the town’s green areas within the town as building sites. Also area adj primary school as recreational site
- I think scenario 1 is preferred in an ideal world. However, scenario 2 is preferable in reality as it is more manageable in the long term. Waiting for land to become available ie windfall would simply result in the sites you have rejected being put forward time and time again
- I am against scenario 2. I am reluctant to support it without a higher affordable housing percentage and inclusion of single level living accommodation
- This is rubbish taking 10 years to build unneeded houses. Roundabout would cause more disruption on A458
- Although the devt itself might be attractive if styled on hunters gate, its size is well in excess of that shown as preferred in the residents survey.
- This site demonstrates the lack of demand for ANY new estate housing in MW the developer obviously recognises this by spreading construction which will blight the site whilst construction continues
- We’re very lucky to live in this lovely town , let more families live here too! Bring in new people to join in this delightful community and keep businesses alive so build more houses. Like scenario2a esp with larger play area but have it at the heart of the devt. So that we can all keep an eye on our children. Anybody who objected to the hunters gate open space should never have bought a house facing the green.
- Roundabout with Scenario 2 a it will slow traffic coming in on the bridgnorth road.
- Too large for Wenlock. Smaller sites preferable
- Why can’t landscaping be shared and swept round to separate Walton Hills and this new development?
- LOCAL DEMAND minimal no need for this scale of devt. Motivated by profit.
- No multi storey will dominate landscape. Sort water issues on Hunters gate frist. Land in bottom corner floods and drains cannot cope now with more concrete. Do not allow car access via hunters gate, roads not there. Too many houses 40 max. Nice landscaping.
- I prefer scenario 1 which is more closely aligned to community needs. Scenario 2 just too big.



- The town needs to increase its size in order to maintain the current level of retail businesses. The important thing is that the devt is suitable for a wide range of age ranges and the affordable housing is really affordable.