

Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan

Record of comments made at Pre-submission Consultation

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
28 September	1	Alan Stanley (Resident)	<p>Please apply pressure for the development of a link road between Wolverhampton Road and the Tong Road, Shifnal.</p> <p>The new housing developments are going to create a traffic congestion problem in Shifnal Town Centre.</p> <p>Very soon the residents to the South of the Town (Wolverhampton Road, Park Lane, Brimstree Drive etc) are going to realise that the quickest way to the M.54 Motorway is via Upton Lane.</p> <p>This is a very dangerous lane, especially when negotiating the return journey and the right turn from Upton Lane onto the A 464 Wolverhampton Road.</p> <p>If this issue is no addressed then someone will be killed in a road accident.</p> <p>This link Road should have been built as part of the contract with the developers of the new houses on Wolverhampton Road - they should have paid for and developed this link road before being given permission to build their houses,</p> <p>If this link road is not feasible the Upton Lane itself should be widened and made safe to use - especially at Upton Crossroads</p>	Link road out-of-scope of Neighbourhood Plan. Otherwise covered by policy TM1 but additional wording agreed..	Additional wording to para 6.7, first sentence, to read: "and particularly the junction of Wolverhampton Road and Upton Lane".
28 September	2	Malcolm Rolling (Resident)	<p>Shifnal is almost encircled by public rights of way and quiet lanes. There are a few gaps some of which could be bridged by making routes through the new housing developments. If a Shifnal orbital walking and cycling route could be developed and linked to the new walkways proposed this would be a plus for tourism and a novel approach encouraging all to enjoy access to the countryside thereby becoming healthier in both body and mind</p>	Noted. Covered by Policy TM2	None
29 September	3	Derek & Lorraine	Support the proposed Neighbourhood plan for Shifnal	Noted.	None.

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
		Saffhill (Residents)			
30 October	4	Sport England (Statutory)	Standard printed response with comments about Neighbourhood Plans in general. No specific comments about the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan. Held on file.	Noted.	None.
5 October	5	Matthew Mason (Resident)	<p>Comment 1 Whilst I agree with most aspects of the plan, I have to raise concerns about the overall lack of consideration for traffic management and safer roads. There is very little mention of the introduction of a shared space scheme within the Town Centre. I fear that Shropshire Council is adamant that traffic lights are installed by the railway bridge resulting in greater pollution and an unsightly traffic junction. I also have great concerns regarding the speed of traffic on most routes into Town and the disregard for the lorry bans in place. We really need an aggressive policy of road changes including wider pavements, more crossings and effective forced speed calming, particularly on Aston Road and Church Street. I believe that many of the issues around 'attractive shopping' and 'visitor economy' ride very much on Shifnal's ability to actually be a safe place to shop. The pavements are far too narrow and the roads too wide creating disconnected shopping areas. Traffic Management really needs to be looked at in more depth and moved forward as soon as possible before someone gets killed from speeding traffic in our Town.</p> <p>Comment 2 I am a resident who lives on Aston Road and I would like to raise a few concerns regarding the road itself and how I feel it could be improved in terms of supporting more traffic. Aston Road is a main through route for traffic heading for the industrial park and is used on many occasions for traffic diverted off the M54 to cut out additional journey time travelling up to the A5. Add to this the sheer volume of new houses at Aston Fields and Coppice Green Lane in the future and Aston Road has become</p>	<p>Covered by Policy TM1.</p> <p>Improvements to traffic management in Aston Street and Lawton Road to rear of houses in Aston Street are included in a Section 106 Agreement, so</p>	None.

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>almost unbearable at rush hour and late into the night. The main problem stems from traffic speeding in the direction towards Town in order to pass the parked cars by the Anvil Inn. I have witnessed cars and lorries driving at speeds in excess of 50 MPH to avoid stopping here. This has resulted in some very near collisions. The problem is compounded by the lack of any speed limit signs on the approach into Shifnal.</p> <p>The street is treated like a racing track and HGVs constantly flout the ban on heavy traffic during the night.</p> <p>I think that the plan should seriously consider a traffic calming scheme along Aston Road in the form of Speed humps, flashing signs, etc. Possibly a mini-roundabout at the Train Station junction would support increased use of the station and slow traffic down here as well. This would not only decrease the speed of traffic but discourage the use of through traffic and support the growth of Shifnal at this end of Town.</p> <p>My other major concern is with the junction of Aston Street onto the High Street and I hope that the plan to introduce shared space is brought forward as a matter of urgency. The increase in housing warrants a real need for improvements along Aston Road.</p> <p>Thank you for your time</p>	<p>will be carried out.</p> <p>Mini-roundabout suggestion has been raised by Transport Action Group with Highways Team drawing up the scheme for Town Centre Enhancement.</p>	
11 October	6	John Harris (Resident)	<p>Congratulations! A comprehensive and detailed document. Let's hope that it will carry some weight as far as future developments are concerned, though given that it cannot contradict what is in the Shropshire Core Plan I have my doubts.</p> <p>I would like you to consider the following points:-</p> <p>(a) Page 40, Section 9.6 states that the cricket club plays in local leagues. I would add that the tennis club has men's and women's teams in the Shropshire summer and autumn leagues – and play at the indoor centre at Telford in the winter. The tennis club also has a very strong junior section. The Men's 1st Team won the Shropshire Premier League (i.e. are County Champions) in 2014 and 2015. These points are relevant when referring to local sports clubs.</p>	<p>Agreed that reference to tennis club and teams be added to the text.</p> <p>Maps will not be changed as the tennis and bowls clubs are technically part of the cricket ground.</p>	<p>Additional wording to para 9.6, last sentence: "and the tennis club has teams in the Shropshire summer and autumn leagues and a strong junior section."</p>

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			(b) The maps on Pages 41, 42 and 57 label the 'cricket' ground. The area concerned not only has the cricket club – the tennis and bowls clubs are there also.		
12 October	7	Peter & Constance Hassell (Residents)	<p>I have the following comments on the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2026</p> <p>2.16 I agree that encouraging traffic movement away from the car, so why locate the new medical practice at the extreme end of the town? I have urged the location should be central, fair to everyone and avoid unnecessary car usage. I have many times, suggested there is still one location of sufficient size left in Shifnal for the new medical Centre – next to the Village Hall where blood donations take place. This could be achieved by re-locating the existing commercial premises to the Lamledge Lane Employment Zone where it belongs.</p> <p>2.19 Shifnal is one of the most recreationally deficient settlements in Shropshire so why not change the publicly owned vacant police station to recreational purposes rather than another eating place or similar?</p> <p>Vision for Shifnal – why not pedestrianise the town centre, from the post office to Aston St? This would encourage residents and visitors to shop and dine in a traffic free zone.</p> <p>6.4 Enforce a 20mph speed limit to the central part of Shifnal including St. Andrews Primary, Curriers Lane and Idsall schools.</p> <p>6.16 The existing bus services are chaotic. These need to be rationalised with input from Shifnal residents and not controlled by Arriva and Banga, each trying to outwit each other with no respect to users.</p> <p>6.20 Again re-locate the existing commercial premises (the former GWR cattle yard) to Lamledge Lane Employment Zone where it belongs. This will together with improvements to Station Drive, provide much needed additional car parking in Shifnal.</p> <p>9.13 I have pointed out that appropriate safety measures are undertaken where flood management ponds are proposed and risk assessments are carried out as in the case of the Thomas Beddoes Court development where deep ponds are constructed near</p>	Covered by Policy TM1, otherwise out-of-scope of Neighbourhood Plan.	None.

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>proposed children's play areas.</p> <p>Further comments: One additional comment I would like to add concerning the provision of disabled parking nearer to the shops and post office. I have suggested the service road in front of Patons could be marked out for at least six disabled spaces. PS It is really important I feel to get the Proposed Medical Centre in the right location to be fair to everyone living in Shifnal, avoiding unnecessary car usage. The site I have always advocated next to the Village Hall, could be acquired by the good will of all concerned and funded by the developers at Haughton Road and Stone Drive who safeguarded their land for this purpose.</p>		
17 October	8	Roger Morton (Resident)	<p>Can something be done to stop our village looking "run down" by removing illegal advertising signs attached to signposts and on pavements etc. for businesses currently such as the car wash and flea market. If every local business advertised in this way it they whole place would look down market so please take action before this disease spreads.</p> <p>Also Shifnal farm services now has so many items on the pavement outside their shop front and with so many more motorised invalid cars using the pavement together with pedestrians, on a busy day which seems more often these days, it becomes quite congested and people have to walk on the road in front of the shop to get past each other, one day an accident is going to happen on the road. So please ask them to be kind and not take up so much pavement space with their wares so that we can all walk past in safety.</p>	Noted. Out-of-scope of Neighbourhood Plan.	None.
20 October	9	Lindsey Potts (Resident)	I am against the loss of further greenbelt. I do not think it is in keeping with the town. The schools, doctors and roads can not cope with the demand	Noted.	None.
19 October	10	Marilyn Morton	Thank You for putting together, this very full and precise document. It is extremely well done. Hopefully in time you get to	Noted.	None.

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
		(Resident)	achieve all the goals. I do hope EVERYONE makes a comment, whatever their views, otherwise Shifnal will become like the Dinosaurs.		
20 October	11	Anna Hay (Resident)	I agree with the plan and would want to protect existing greenbelt around Shifnal town boundaries.	Noted.	None.
20 October	12	Judy Polak (Resident)	<p>I would like to express my concern that more housing will be approved on the outskirts of our town, I believe that our rural identity is being taken away from us, Shifnal is growing too quickly and will no longer be a small, friendly market town.</p> <p>Further to my recent comments regarding Green Belt, I would also like to comment as a pedestrian and the increasing problems I encounter on a daily basis trying to cross roads. Areas of particular concern are 5 Ways island, Park Street and the pedestrian lights at the junction of Market Place, Cheapside, Aston Street. There seems to be a total disregard for pedestrians in Shifnal by motorists who speed through Shifnal</p> <p>Further to my recent comments regarding Green Belt, I would also like to comment as a pedestrian and the increasing problems I encounter on a daily basis trying to cross roads. Areas of particular concern are 5 Ways island, Park Street and the pedestrian lights at the junction of Market Place, Cheapside, Aston Street. There seems to be a total disregard for pedestrians in Shifnal by motorists who speed through Shifnal</p>	Covered by Policies SL1 and TM1.	None.
20 October	13	Jayne & Robert Owen (Residents)	<p>Robert and I have just read through the Pre-submission Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan and would like to congratulate all involved on a highly professional, detailed Plan which should serve the community of Shifnal for many years to come. The scale of the task has been immense and full credit is given to all the hard work and commitment of the team. We have identified only a few minor points which are offered for your consideration:</p> <p>Para 2.11 - "These sites (Haughton Road, Coppice Green Lane, Aston Street, Stanton Road, Wolverhampton Road Phase 2) are</p>	Agreed changes to be made to relevant paragraphs. Agreed that photos need not be captioned	Para 2.11: amend wording to delete "medical site, Park Lane" and insert "the former medical centre site within the Thomas Beddows estate and the

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>scheduled to provide a further 1,167 dwellings." The Redrow site south of the Wolverhampton Road does not appear to be listed and we are unsure about the reference to "the medical site, Park Lane".</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1 - Challenges - the necessity to create new recreational areas and green spaces appears in all other sections but is not listed as a "challenge".</p> <p>Paragraph 5.20 - we think the provision of extra care facilities may have been deleted from the Uplands application.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.1 Table - Non Policy Actions - add Shropshire Council as a partner to the Linear Park proposal.</p> <p>Is it worth considering labelling some of the wonderful photographs that are in the document. In many instances it is clear what is being illustrated but in some, to non-locals, it may not be clear.</p> <p>Once again, our congratulations to you all.</p>	<p>Para 5.20. There is still a valid application for this development.</p>	<p>Uplands off the Wolverhampton Road".</p> <p>Para 3.1 insert new bullet point: "The need to create new recreational areas and green spaces".</p> <p>Para 5.20: no change</p> <p>Para 11.1: make requested change.</p>
20 October	14	Marylyn Silver (Tong Parish Council Clerk)	<p>We are not directly affected by the issues but would request that an appropriate speed limit is observed in Stanton Road.</p>	<p>Out-of-scope of Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>None</p>
21 October	15	Yvonne Corfield (Resident)	<p>I have lived in Shifnal for 47 years and have been horrified by the changes over the last few years. I am fully aware that more housing is needed countrywide but 1600 extra homes in Shifnal is disproportionate in my opinion. Already Shifnal is struggling with its infra-structure and that is before the proposed 1600 new homes are built or occupied. As far as I am aware no extra facilities have been made at schools or doctor surgery. Shifnal is in danger of no longer being a small market town and becoming an extension of Telford.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
21 October	16	David Carey (Resident)	<p>I support the Neighbourhood Plan and desire to see the greenbelt protected. Any development towards the west needs also to be protected to ensure a geographical distinction remains between Shifnal and an encroaching Telford.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
24 October	17	David Curtis (Resident)	<p>The Plan is a fantastic review of what we in Shifnal want and don't want over the next decade as the town grows by 50%. Having read it carefully, I wholeheartedly support it and all its policies and comments which have obviously been gathered from those town folks who care about the future of their town and surroundings.</p> <p>I would prefer "specifically" instead of "directly" in the policy relating to Cycle and Car parking, to read:"car parking, specifically to serve Shifnal....." Similarly, improved disabled access will be" encouraged", rather than supported although, I appreciate that this is not an aspiration that can be met in the short term.</p>	Agreed to change Policy TM5 in respect of first comment only.	Amend Policy TM5, first sentence, to delete "directly" and insert "specifically".
25 October	18	Cllr Brian Jones (Resident and Shifnal Town Councillor)	<p>This is an excellent piece of work, however I think one crucial issue has been overlooked; through traffic.</p> <p>The profile lacks something I believe has never been done; a traffic analysis. It is likely that much of the peak period traffic has no relation to the town and is simply driving through as a convenient short cut. Since highway design has always made provision for transit,for example, from Telford to Wolverhampton, planning should aim to deter the use of Shifnal as a convenience. It should feature as an objective.</p>	Covered by Policy TM1	None
25 October	19	Jim Aulton (Resident)	<p>Congratulations to all involved with this document the outcome of which will affect the lives of thousands of people for years to come.</p> <p>I have no criticisms at all of "The Plan" but would ask that more emphasis is put on road safety, particularly on the approach to Shifnal town centre via Park Street which is still seen as a race track by many motorists coming into that side of town. The new 30mph signs adjacent to the Thomas Beddows development clearly aren't working and it is remarkable that there are not more accidents on this stretch of road. Thanks and good luck.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Out-of-scope of Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	None
26 October	20	Susan Podmore (Resident)	<p>I support the plan.</p> <p>I feel that recently there has been enough new housing in Shifnal. In particular I agree that the existing Green Belt around the town</p>	Noted.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			should be retained and that if further development is necessary it should be focused within the settlement boundary of the town		
26 October	21	David Edwards (Shropshire Council)	<p>I am writing in my capacity as Flood and Water Manager at Shropshire Council. From a flood risk perspective, the Plan is a great way to help raise awareness in the town and set further policies with regard to new development.</p> <p>Section 2.20 could go further in that the last sentence could read "It is also important that new developments are designed to ensure that satisfactory arrangements are made to reduce the impact of flooding or drainage issues in the town.</p> <p>Again, Section 3.3 could go further to say that new development should be used to reduce flood risk.</p> <p>In Section 9, Flooding and Drainage, the Objective could be strengthened to require any new development to reduce flood risk rather than simply not increase it.</p> <p>Policy EN3. The first bullet point could be strengthened by replacing 'minimise' with 'reduce'</p>	Agree to proposed changes	Amend Sections, Objective and policy EN3.
26 October	22	David Hunter (Resident)	I have read the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan and generally agree with the proposals, but I feel that a greater emphasis on protecting the existing green belt around Shifnal should be put into the plan. Protecting the existing green belt around Shifnal will help protect the character of the town	Noted. Agreed that Policy SL1 does not need changing.	None
26 October	23	Miranda McCartney (Resident)	I fully support all areas of the plan. Thank you to everybody who worked on the plan. It is a tremendous achievement.	Noted	None
26 October	24	R. Rowley (Resident)	I have looked at the Neighbourhood Plan and agree broadly with the contents thereof. Certainly I am of the opinion that the current settlement boundaries should remain. However I have little faith in Shropshire County Council to retain the Green Belt when it carries out its review of the Core Strategy given that permission for	Noted.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>permanent residential development in Shifnal has been given despite the national policy presumption against such developments.</p> <p>Regarding traffic, with all of the new development there will inevitably be an increase. Thorough traffic impact surveys should be carried out before permission for development is given. To alleviate some of the problems perhaps the plans for the Shifnal by-pass should be dusted off and looked at again. Also, I would suggest that parking restrictions should be put in place in Aston Street (by the Anvil) and in Innage Road at peak times to aid traffic flow.</p> <p>There are always traffic problems associated with the school run so I would ask the three schools to get parents to agree that if they live in Shifnal they will not use a vehicle to bring their child to school.</p> <p>With the new development in Haughton Road that will inevitably bring more cars heading for Junction 4 of the M54 for the safety of pedestrians I think that a footpath needs to be provided alongside the brook between Haughton Lane and where the footpath starts in Haughton Road. There will also be more traffic on Haughton Road with people going to the proposed Healthcare Centre.</p> <p>With regards to the Healthcare Centre, I find the proposed location very disappointing for the people living at the Wolverhampton end of Shifnal who will now have to travel a lot further if they need to visit a doctor. I recall that when it was proposed to have a new Centre at the Wolverhampton end there were petitions saying that it was too far for the people at the other end of Shifnal to travel and that it should be in a central position. I believe that it should be in a central position and that this should be looked at. The current surgery could be rebuilt with a first and even a second floor to give more room. Lifts could be installed to enable patients to access such floors. Of course with the increase in population Shifnal needs more doctors so unless we can get these there isn't much point in having a new facility.</p> <p>Finally, regarding the commercial side of Shifnal, we need a good</p>	<p>Parking restrictions out-of-scope of Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Covered by Policy TM2 and para. 6.10.</p>	

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			mixture of retail outlets. Whilst I understand that landlords can let premises for whatever use they wish to subject to planning regulations I find that Cheapside does not give a particularly good impression of the town. In a block of eight retail units we have a mini-market/post office, cake shop, chemist, bookmakers and four food outlets.	Covered by policy EC1	
26 October	25	Vivienne Glews (Resident)	I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan and appreciate the time and effort that must have been put into it by the committee on our behalf.	Noted	None
26 October	26	P.V. Raymont (Resident)	I agree with the plan. The Green Belt must be protected. There is a need to improve traffic flow through the town by reducing on-street parking at critical points	Noted	None
27 October	27	Maureen W. Raymont (Resident)	I am in full agreement with the Shifnal Plan especially protection of the Green Belt.	Noted	None
27 October	28	Robert Alton (Resident)	I support and endorse the plan. I would emphasise the importance of keeping the green belt. Shifnal has already suffered at the hands of developers and an inept planning authority which has had total disregard for the infrastructure and existing facilities of the town. The character of the town must be maintained and no more large-scale housing development must take place.	Noted	None
27 October	29	Robert & Milly Hay (Residents)	I support the plan	Noted	None
28 October	30	John McCartney (Resident)	<p>The situation with the medical centre is dire. It is essential that a site is allocated regardless of location. However, unless it is situated centrally, many people with mobility problems will find themselves at a grave disadvantage.</p> <p>Traffic problems have recently been highlighted by the work going on at the Railway Inn. With little increase in the volume of traffic (compared with that to which we will be subjected when all the developments are finished) the traffic jams have been quite</p>	Noted	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>unacceptable.</p> <p>With regard to the existing town boundary and the green belt, these should be retained at all costs. It is essential that Shifnal retains its market-town character as far as possible and doesn't become subsumed into an ever-expanding Telford</p>		
28 October	31	The Coal Authority (Statutory Consultee)	<p>Thank you for the notification consulting The Coal Authority on the above NDP.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing.</p> <p>As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined deep coalfield. However although the Neighbourhood Plan area is on the deep coalfield, no surface coal resources or mining legacy features are present in the plan area. Therefore The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make at this stage.</p> <p>In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality it will not be necessary for you to provide The Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Please use this letter as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements.</p>	Noted	None
28 October	32	Shropshire Area Ramblers	This is a very well-produced and comprehensive document, setting out many ways to improve the lives of Shifnal residents, current	Noted.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
		(Local Organisation)	and future. As Ramblers we are always pleased to see people encouraged to walk, rather than drive, to the shops, doctors' surgery, school etc. And identifying routes for this is a useful step. All these routes are historic paths, probably in existence before most of Shifnal's houses were built, but none is a designated public right of way and therefore not the responsibility of the highway authority (ie Shropshire Council) to maintain. Ways will therefore have to be found to keep them clear of undergrowth and adequately lit, otherwise the public and especially children will not use them, which would be a pity.	Covered in Non Policy Actions - `Walkway proposals`.	
28 October	33	Department for Health (Statutory Consultee)	Local planning is not a matter in which the Department of Health would become involved. Planning is the responsibility of local NHS Organisations. The contact details of NHS England (Midlands & East) and Shropshire CCG are below.	Noted	None
28 October	34	Marion Law (Resident)	I would like to congratulate the Steering Group on producing a professional, attractive document with many points of interest. I especially found the brief history of Shifnal very interesting. Identifying routes to walk is of special interest to me, and I hope that these can be signed, maintained and lit so that people feel confident to use them. All the Policies listed are clearly beneficial, though I would personally prioritise Transport and Movement – the need to improve the flow of traffic through Shifnal at peak times; Health and Leisure – especially a new health centre; and Environment – maintaining the Green Belt so that Shifnal continues to have a rural feel, and maintains its distance from Telford. I recognise that all these highly desirable Policies listed will need funding, especially the non-commercial ones affecting people's quality of life, but all are important to keep Shifnal a desirable place to live as the population increases with the development of new housing.	Noted	None
29 October	35	Michelle Gough 1st Shifnal Scout	I'm responding on behalf of the 1st Shifnal Scout group. I have read through the document and many of the ideas that were put forward from our young Cubs and Scouts to Chris have	Noted. Town Park within Thomas Beddoes	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
		Group (Local organisation)	been noted in the document. The main worry of the children was open space for them to use which was local to their own homes. Looking at the plan there does not seem to be any new additional open green space near to the Thomas Beddoes development which is a concern for those children who have to cross busy roads to get to other areas which are located at the other end of the town.	Phase 2 development included in the Plan. Policy LE3.	
30 October	36	Adrian Marsh, St Andrews CE Primary School (Local organisation)	As head teacher at St. Andrew's CE Primary School, I fully support the Shifnal Plan. In particular, the views of all of our pupils have been sought, listened to and included within the recommendations. Shifnal is in the process of great change and the Plan ensures that the views of all of the town's inhabitants have been valued. It will ensure that all parties involved in the town's future adhere to the wishes of the people who live there.	Noted	None
30 October	37	Alison Harris (Resident)	First, thank you for all your hard work – you have done an amazing job. I think the Plan is excellent and I hope the ideas in it can come to fruition, especially the Town Park and walkways. Shifnal could remain a lovely place to live and become better still. My fear is that money restrictions and government over-arching plans for housing will prevent some of the aims being achieved	Noted	None
30 October	38	Robert Ennion (Resident)	The development plan appears to be comprehensive and well thought out, and I am in agreement with it. My only complaint is, that as a resident of Shifnal for some 39 years, I was not informed officially of its existence, I was informed by word of mouth by another resident. Not an ideal situation, a 'mailshot' to all residents would have been a much better way to obtain feedback on the plan.	Noted. Mail was delivered to all residents in the NP Area three times during the development of the plan.	None
30 October	39	Rosemary Moore (Resident)	Seems a good piece of work. Go ahead.	Noted	None
1 November	40	Paul Williamson (Resident)	The plan is well thought out and covers the main areas of frustration and concern amongst the majority of Shifnal residents that I know and have spoken to about the document. The need to maintain Shifnal as a small town in its own right and not merely become an annex of Telford is crucial and the town I feel has now	Noted	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			reached its capacity at this time for expansion and population increase. The most vital issue is to maintain the Green belt that currently surrounds our wonderful town, this has been slowly eroded in the past decade with new housing being developed on the boundary of the town and within its confines. The need for housing nationally is clear but Shifnal more than any other of its peer towns within the county has provided sufficient land for development and its population expansion has now reached the limits of what Shifnal can absorb without the identity and character of the town being lost.		
2 November	41	Darren Driscoll (Resident)	The Shifnal Plan is a well thought out, thorough document which clearly reflects the needs and desires of the local community. I fully support the plan as it stands.	Noted	None
2 November	42	Brian Murray Crown Green Bowls Club (Local Organisation)	On behalf of Shifnal Crown Green Bowls club Management committee and its members we would like to state we fully support Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan. The Importance of maintaining and retaining Local Green Spaces and giving the community an active opportunity to play sport whether tennis, cricket and crown green bowls is vital to our community and our local heritage	Noted	Para 9.6. in first sentence insert, `crown` before `bowling green`.
2 November	43	Rachel Powell, Live at Home Scheme (Local Organisation)	<p>I am manager of the Live at Home Scheme, which support older people living in Shifnal. I have spoken with our members who have verbally given their views. In the main I and the members agree with the plan. They all understand that changes have to be made.</p> <p>We have discussed the need to be able to access the shops and other facilities, like church, doctors and coffee shops</p> <p>Older people are wary of shared space for traffic and pedestrians, but very much favour a pedestrian area between the Butchers and Patons garage. It was felt this would be excellent if one way flat disabled parking could be situated in front of Patons. It is quite a walk down from the Aston street carpark if you have severe mobility issues.</p> <p>Please note disabled parking does not always require the space to</p>	Traffic issues covered by Policy TM1.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>be as big as some, but does need to be flat(not on a slope) and turning round can be difficult.. A mini round about or one way in and one way out maybe worth considering?</p> <p>More benches and flowers would hold on to the village feel in this pedestrian area, and satisfy a lot of older people.</p> <p>A hand rail, effective lighting and resurfacing would greatly improve Aston street car park.</p> <p>Pathways were discussed and I agreed that these linking Church and grave yard etc should be flat with sufficient lighting and possible hand rail? With Half for pedestrians and half for cycles and mobility scooters.</p> <p>Getting an appointment at the doctor is as hard as getting to the doctor. It was suggested that the surgery have pensioner appointments on one day so the Shifnal Shuttle could be used for transport (paid for by surgery). The shuttle cannot do individual runs but a group in one time block may be worth suggesting?</p> <p>Our groups are held at Trinity Methodist Church in Victoria Road. We do use the Shuttle, but parking for that and individuals and volunteers is a nightmare. A layby type pull-in specifically for dropping off for the mini bus and volunteer drivers would be ideal. But a wider road would also resolve the volunteer parking.</p> <p>Home owners should have access to private parking and not fill up the roadway.</p> <p>On a personal level I believe that changes are needed and if planning like this which considers all, is continued all decisions will be made with enough thought. No one adjusts to change</p>	<p>Town centre benches and passageway issues out-of-scope of Neighbourhood Plan but referred to Shropshire Highways team for consideration within the Town Centre Improvements scheme. Pathways covered in Policy TM2</p> <p>Cycle routes</p>	

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>immediately, but all will eventually.</p> <p>I would love the idea of a safe cycle route around the village. I do ride a bike but do not like the traffic and that puts me off. We would get more cycles if paths were easier, without potholes and lit!</p> <p>If a one way system is put into place would this allow space for a cycle /scooter lane?</p>	covered by Policy TM3.	
2 November	44	Pam Hinton (Resident)	<p>I would like to say that I am whole heartedly opposed to any future development in Shifnal.</p> <p>I think with the current developments, we are providing sufficient housing and as stated, no future developments should be agreed. If Shifnal were to grow any further, we would no longer be a town in its own right, we would become part of the larger "city" of Telford.</p> <p>I decided to live here 31 years ago because I liked the fact, and was proud of the fact that no matter which way out of the town you went, you went into beautiful countryside but now we have started to lose these lovely areas.</p> <p>Please preserve our town, I have two teenage daughters who are both distressed about the future of Shifnal, they love where we live and fear it is becoming spoilt and are wondering what it will be like when they are adults, fearing we are being forced to live in Birmingham!!!!</p> <p>The road systems cannot cope with the traffic and are becoming extremely dangerous and it is not acceptable to take up any further "green areas" to make the roads larger!</p> <p>Let`s stop once the current building taking place is complete, please, no further development of Shifnal.</p>	Noted	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
3 November	45	Cllr. Stuart West (Shropshire Councillor)	This is a message to indicate my full support for the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan. I have read it and the updates and concur that Plan is totally indicative of the way I want Shifnal to move forward into the future. A superb document, my thanks for all concerned in bringing this to fruition.	Noted	None
4 November	46	Pam Day (Resident)	I support the policies included in the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan and recognise the hard work and careful thought that has gone into its development. In particular, I think that it is essential to have an improved Medical Centre to meet the needs of the growing population. I also feel strongly that there should be no further housing developments once those that currently have been approved are completed, as the basic physical and social infrastructure are unable to cope. In particular, it is vital that the green belt around Shifnal should be maintained with no change to the present settlement boundary, to prevent Shifnal becoming part of a Greater Telford. We want to maintain the integrity of Shifnal as a market town. This is why green belts were originally established.	Noted	None
4 November	47	Shifnal Townswomen Guild (Local organisation)	Shifnal Townswomen's Guild support the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan and appreciate the hard work that has gone in to developing this plan. Members are particularly concerned that the issues surrounding the Medical Centre should be resolved quickly and they agree that there needs to be improvements to pedestrian route around the town. They are concerned about the number of vacant, unused and derelict buildings in the town at the moment and also strongly feel that the existing Green Belt should be retained.	Noted.	None
4 November	48	Chris Cole, Network Rail (Statutory Consultee)	Thank you for offering myself the chance to comment on the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan document. Network Rail continues to engage with Shifnal Forward Transport Action Group regarding Shifnal station. As part of Network Rail's Long Term Planning Process (LTPP), the	Noted	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>West Midlands and Chilterns Route Study is currently ongoing. It is tasked with considering the Conditional Outputs from the Market Studies and assessing them against the current network capability to identify gaps, and potential options to form a strategic approach for the future use of rail.</p> <p>The Draft for Consultation for this document will be available in Spring 2016 for a 12 week consultation period on the Network Rail website, where comments from the industry and wider stakeholders will be welcomed and any further work undertaken.</p>		
4 November	49	Adam Farrington, Headteacher Shifnal Primary School (Local Organisation)	I would like to express my support for the plan. The issue of traffic congestion around the school gates at Shifnal Primary School and consequent safety concerns definitely need to be addressed. I believe that facilitating less congestion at busy times by encouraging children walking to and from school is an excellent idea. Therefore, the plan for the provision of and improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes into and around the town is crucial – especially for children walking from the new development on Coppice Green Lane to Shifnal Primary School.	Noted.	None
6 November	50	Kevin Turley (Resident)	Please can I put forward my support towards the Neighbourhood plan. The only comment I would like to raise is I would like to see bungalows promoted as a need in future developments.	Noted.	None
2 November	51	Historic England (Statutory Consultee)	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Neighbourhood Plan and we have no adverse comments to make but would like to make the following observations.</p> <p>Historic England considers that the Plan is well researched and demonstrates extensive community involvement whilst clearly identifying a range of likely pressures arising from extensive new housing development beyond the historic market town core. Most, if not all, of those pressures have the potential to impact negatively on the historic environment and we, therefore, warmly</p>	Noted. Support for Policies appreciated. Suggestions on future of historic buildings noted and will be passed on.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>welcome the emphasis placed on the conservation of Shifnal's distinctive market town character and on the importance of good, locally responsive, design.</p> <p>Historic England accordingly commend and support the clear and comprehensive "Vision for Shifnal" as set out at paragraph 3.2 of the Plan and the objectives set out in paragraph 3.3, particularly those for the Green Belt, Housing and Character and Conservation which most closely reflect our remit. We also strongly support the associated Policies SL1; HG1; CH1 and EC2.</p> <p>The latter two policies focus on identified issues and problems arising within the Shifnal designated conservation area relating to the poor condition of some historic buildings including vacancy and inappropriate signage and adverts on historic shopfronts.</p> <p>It is the experience of Historic England that these are precisely the sorts of issues that might well also be addressed through the preparation for adoption by the Council of an up to date (within the last 5 years) conservation area character appraisal with management proposals. We also note in Table 11.1 in relation to Non Policy Actions the suggestion that the Town Council with the Business Community might undertake survey work in relation to problem historic buildings and consult with owners.</p> <p>In paragraph 7.6 of the Plan there is also reference to such a proactive approach assisting in levering in funding from eg Historic England or the Heritage Lottery Fund. Particularly salient in both these respects is that it is normally a requirement that up to date appraisal and management documentation exists before an application for conservation area based grant funding will be considered by either Historic England or (in our experience) the Heritage Lottery Fund.</p> <p>In this context we would recommend that the Town Council opens</p>		

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>discussions with the historic environment team at Shropshire Council (as your local specialist heritage advisers) to explore the potential of a collaborative approach being taken to the future production of an appraisal with management proposals. This may then assist in substantiating a bid for funding that could help to realise the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I hope you find these observations helpful and please contact me if you require any further information or clarification.</p>		
6 November	52	Andy Mortimer, Policy Manager, Shropshire Council Planning (Statutory Consultee)	<p>Myself and Eddie have managed a brief look through the consultation draft of the Neighbourhood Plan this morning and still have some detailed concerns in relation to certain policies as well as some broader comments about the Plan's potential progress through examination in particular and the links with the Council's Core Strategy and SAMDev documents. See comments below. In addition this response does not prejudice our ability to make any further representations at the formal submission stage if necessary.</p> <p><u>Broader Comments</u></p> <p>We would welcome more reference to the linkages with higher level policies in the Core Strategy and SAMDev – in our view it would be better to have this in bullets or a small box after each policy rather than hidden in appendix B which is also somewhat light on the cross references in certain places, particularly the LE and EN policies of the NP. This also highlights our earlier views when we expressed concern at the degree of duplication between NP policies and those in the Core Strategy and SAMDev e.g. NP SL1 and SAMDev MD6 and S15; NP HG1 and CS6 and SAMDev MD2</p> <p>There is also a degree of repetition between the NP policies themselves e.g. TM1 and TM2; TM3 and TM5 and LE1 and EN2 –</p>	<p>Agree to most of the changes requested. Do not consider that there is unnecessary duplication of policies with higher level plans, or that policy HG 2 is unworkable. Whilst some policies may be difficult to deliver, do not consider that this merits their deletion especially as they reflect strong views received from the local community.</p>	<p>Agree to amend glossary; add flexibility clause to HG2 and textual change; amend Green Belt section; amend policies TM1, TM2, LE1, LE2, EN2, EC6 and EC7; delete policy EC5; amend para 10.22.</p>

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>not necessarily critical in itself but could be avoided.</p> <p>The Glossary needs to be expanded particularly to refer to use classes</p> <p>We are concerned that some policies may be difficult to defend at examination where there is insufficient evidence to justify the policy e.g. HG2: Housing Mix – what is the justification for ‘at least 20%’?</p> <p>This will be picked up by developers during the formal consultation phase and is likely to be scrutinised in the examination process.</p> <p>There is also a question over the potential implementation and enforcement of a number of policies, in particular the transport policies bearing in mind this is a land-use planning document and an Inspector may not see these as deliverable through the Plan.</p> <p><u>Detailed Policy Comments</u></p> <p><u>Green Belt</u></p> <p>Para 4.1 – At the SAMDev hearings the Inspector clarified that safeguarded land is not Green Belt so that area of safeguarded land outside the settlement boundary is not within the West Midlands Green Belt. See the SAMDev Inspectors Report at para 251.</p> <p>Para 4.2 – This is not quite the case – the Local Plan does not state “that no such review is proposed within the period of the current Core Strategy which is the same as that for the Neighbourhood Plan (2026)”. Local Plan periods overlap and you’ve correctly pointed out in para 4.6 that the next Local Plan Review will include a review of Green Belt boundaries, indeed this has been highlighted by the Local Plan Inspector in her Report. There will be a review of Green Belt boundaries in the next Local Plan – this will take place in the next 2 years and be in a new adopted Local Plan by 2018/19, well before 2026.</p>		

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>As currently worded para 4.2 is misleading and should be amended or deleted. There may not be any subsequent changes to the boundaries around Shifnal but this is a matter for the review to determine.</p> <p>Para 4.3 – Development can be allowed in safeguarded land as long as it doesn't prejudice future use as shown in policy SL1.</p> <p><u>Housing</u> Policy HG2 – As well as the comment above, the 2nd part of this policy doesn't work on sites of less than 13, and is pretty much unworkable anyway where the resultant proportion of units is not a whole number. This needs to be rewritten as it will be an issue at examination both in terms of implementation and delivery.</p> <p><u>Transport</u> Policy TM1 – Not sure if the 3rd para is really policy for the NP. It seems to be restating the Transport Strategy. Policy TM2 – First bullet point requesting financial contributions - how is this to be implemented/enforced, and as worded, a 50p contribution would suffice!</p> <p><u>Leisure</u> Policy LE1 – 2nd bullet referring to 'quality' - how is this to be assessed and implemented? This also applies to Policy EN2. Also the penultimate sentence referencing National Policy, Core Strategy and SAMDev applies to all development and any NP policy so why mention it here? (And LE2)</p> <p><u>Employment</u> Policy EC5 – This is more restrictive than SAMDev policy MD9. Again this requires justification through evidence and I would question the degree to which this can be implemented – could this approach be defended at a planning appeal? Policy EC6 – Final sentence requires some additional definition for the terms 'incubator/start-up businesses' and 'flexible terms'.</p>		

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Para 10.22 – Para 143 of the NPPF is concerned with the sustainable use of minerals and in the 8th bullet point refers to safeguarding best and most versatile agricultural land and conserving soil resources in the context of restoration of worked minerals sites. This is not relevant in the NP context and would be a matter for the Minerals Planning Authority anyway. The National Planning Policy Framework expects local planning authorities to take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. This is particularly important in plan making when decisions are made on which land should be allocated for development. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. Para 10.22 should be re-written accordingly or deleted as it can add nothing to national policy.</p> <p>Policy EC7 – See above – but cannot state categorically that “planning permission will be refused” notwithstanding the comment above the Planning Authority is Shropshire Council who have to balance all the material considerations accordingly.</p>		
8 November	53	Rev Chris Thorpe (Resident)	I had some feedback from the churches suggesting that there might be a little more in the history section about them – I promised to feed it back to you!	Noted	None
8 November	54	Jane & Jonathan Pierce (Residents)	We agree wholeheartedly with the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan and trust that the long-established pleasant character of our small, historic market town will be retained as a result of it. We hope that the plan, in particular, will support the maintenance of the settlement boundary and that no further developments are allowed to encroach onto Green Belt land.	Noted	None
8 November	55	Susan Gracie (Resident)	<p>I support the policies in the plan. I am particularly keen to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure that there is a new medical centre 2. Invest in highways work to improve ever increasing traffic problems. 3. Keep the existing green belt to ensure that Shifnal remains a 	Noted	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
8 November	56	Tim Day (Resident)	<p>separate town and doesn't get ever closer to an expanding Telford.</p> <p>I would like Section 4 Para 4.1 of the Plan to reflect the statement made by the SAMDev Inspector in paragraph 251 of her report. This states</p> <p>Shifnal is surrounded by the metropolitan Green Belt, which is tightly drawn on the town's western side, to protect the openness of the countryside between Shifnal and Telford. On the town's northern and eastern sides a significant buffer of 'safeguarded land' exists between the town and the Green Belt. This is safeguarded for the town's long term future development. It is the Council's intention that it is to be treated as Green Belt; in other words that its openness is preserved. However the policy wording implies that development that is not inappropriate in the Green Belt may be acceptable. However such development could still potentially prejudice the future development of this land. The key consideration is that no development should be permitted that would prejudice the future development of the land, whether it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt or not.</p>	Noted. Agreed to revise the wording of section on Green Belt to take account of part of these comments along with the comments from the Shropshire Council Planning Officers at Ref. 52 above in this schedule.	Changes as per Ref. 52 above re the Green Belt section
7 November	57	Jan Park (Resident & Business owner)	<p>I am both a business owner (15 years) and resident of Shifnal and I welcome the NP. My main area of concern is around the current lack of planning in relation to facilities, services and the traffic. I feel it is important that the town can offer the residents, both old and new, the services they need to avoid the town centre becoming boarded up. The town centre enhancement scheme is vital to the town to encourage more people to walk and cycle and slow the traffic. We have many empty buildings that people want to occupy but owners are not willing to let, this must be addressed. Having driven around many of the new estates with deliveries of flowers I also feel that the design of the buildings needs to be monitored carefully. Finally, much more provision of green space is required, Shifnal is very poorly served with outdoor facilities and this must be addressed.</p> <p>A great piece of work.</p>	Noted. Covered by existing Policies.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
7 November	58	Jan Park (Shifnal Forward Economy Group)	<p>The Economy and Tourism group at Shifnal Forward have considered the NP and would like to offer support for the plan. We were particularly keen to see the provision for a Linear Park and a Historic Trail included in the plan, these are projects that we have already made progress with and appreciate the support from the NP. We are also keen to see the re development of the town centre with the slowing down of passing traffic being a major priority. Within the planning allocation, land must be made available for employment if we are to avoid being a commuter town. Employment land has been lost with the current developments and provision for starter/incubation units should be addressed. Crumbling empty building continue to be both an eyesight and a missed opportunity for bringing additional trade and employment into town.</p> <p>Jan Shifnal Forward</p>	Noted. Covered by existing Policies.	None
7 November	59	Jan Park (Shifnal Business Forum)	<p>Shifnal Business Forum would like offer support for the NP. We consulted with our members (50 +) who are all business owners in Shifnal and their main areas of concern have mostly been addressed in the section of Non Policy Actions within the plan. The members feel that to keep the 'market town' alive and to provide for the vast increase in population, we need more retail on the high street. There are many empty retail units in the town that could provide an enhanced shopping experience and additional employment. There are also concerns regarding the high quantity of retail units being used as offices and fast food outlets which does not help the situation. Members feel strongly that these issues should be addressed by the TC and SCC.</p>	Noted. Covered by existing policies.	None
5 November	60	Judy Leach (Resident)	<p>I was very impressed with the neighbourhood plan, a credit to all who worked on it, just wish it had happened a few years ago. My thoughts would be to increase bus services especially on Sunday, properly designed bus shelters and walking areas increased in and around the new developments. (Curriers Lane to Admirals, the walk before you go through the Tunnel from Taylor Wimpy site turn right to Lamledge Lane are two of many we could have.)</p>	Noted. Covered by existing policies.	None.

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Make Shifnal a Cycling haven some of our paths are large enough to take a Cycle lane and if the new town traffic scheme is completed Cycling must be looked at, also reduce car speeds to 20 mph throughout Shifnal</p>		
7 November	61	Gillian Steed (Resident)	<p>As a local resident I fully support these policies and if enacted they should protect the greenbelt and local green spaces, improve transport links, which is essential with the number of new housing developments, as is a new Medical Centre to cater for the rise in residents. My compliments to those who have worked so hard to produce this Neighbourhood Plan and enhance the character of the town whilst acting to maintain its lovely community feel.</p>	Noted	None
3 November	62	Bob Haddon (Shifnal Flood Partnership)	<p>The Shifnal Flood Partnership Group (SFPG) fully endorses the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan and considers it a very important asset to help reduce and assist in counter measures with regard to flooding in Shifnal.</p> <p>The potential high risk in certain areas of Shifnal which are verified under the flood modelling tool operated by Shropshire Council, proves the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan is vital in helping existing flooding issues.</p> <p>At present all developers use the Wesley Brook as the only means of carrying surface water away from Shifnal which is incorporated into their attenuation schemes. With the amount of development which is in progress and the amount which is planned for the future, it is critical that Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes (SUDS) are incorporated and maintained to cover the life expectancy of the development by developers i.e. maintenance, mechanics and long term responsibility, taking into account climate change.</p> <p>Shifnal finds itself with regard to flooding due to climate change a serious risk. Shropshire council and Telford and Wrekin have already insisted that all developers, when submitting plans on SUDS should at least provide betterment plus 30% and brownfield sites betterment plus 50%. This needs to be incorporated into the neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Agree to include reference to reducing flood risk. Comments on SUDs noted but detailed SUDs guidance already provided in Shropshire Council Interim Guidance on Surface Water Management</p>	<p>Agree to amend Plan to refer to reducing flood risk. No change on SUDs.</p>

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>The extremely serious flooding which occurred in June 2007 was not considered to be measured as a 1 in 100 year flood scenario. In the likely effect of flooding to the 1 in 100 year scenario, flooding would be even more catastrophic than in June 2007.</p> <p>Chairman Shifnal Flood Partnership Group</p>		
3 November	63	Sue Mitchell (Resident)	<p>Feed back</p> <p>More footpaths required to get walkers out of town, especially north and east of Shifnal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coppice Green Lane to Admirals. 2. Thomas Beddows to Lamledge Lane along south side of railway. 3. Through Uplands from Park Lane to main road (A464). 4. Provide bins on paths. 5. Resurface the rest of Upton Lane from Upton Mill to main road (A464) and provide a bridleway within the field for pedestrians (this would discourage some traffic from going through town). 6. Improve Upton Cross Roads (it's an accident black spot). 7. Move St Andrews school parking to main road (A464) to relieve congestion at peak times, (this should have been done when the Uplands were developed). 8. More conservation areas that the public can access. 9. Change to parking outside Patons (make it legal). 10. Sort out empty properties on Shrewsbury Road. 	Noted. First points covered by Policy TM2, points 6 & 9, covered by Policy TM1, otherwise out-of-scope of Neighbourhood Plan.	None
2 November	64	John & Chris	We fully support this submission, especially regarding the	Noted	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
		Bailey (Residents)	protection of the Green Belt. This acts as a 'ring fence' for the town and as such is very important. Our thanks to you all for producing such an in depth and comprehensive submission. We are sure the time given to this has been well spent and your effort will be rewarded with success.		
2 November	65	Bernard Hlland (Resident)	<p>Some comments on the Shifnal Plan, as invited on the website. I realise that it is probably too late to incorporate any changes in the final submission, but I offer my comments in case any are of relevance or any use in future discussions with the County Council.</p> <p>1. GREEN BELT. It is particularly important to provide safeguards for the green belt around Shifnal in view of the town's close proximity to Telford. Industrial units have already been built on the south-east side of the A464 bypass at Nedge Hill. Telford edges ever closer.</p> <p>2. HOUSING. I agree with the policy of providing so-called "affordable" housing, although in reality such developments only remain "affordable" until the first time they are sold at market value. But there is an ongoing need for smaller properties (especially 2-bedroomed - experience convinces me that one-bedroomed properties are of little real use or value to first time buyers or downsizing owners).</p> <p>Although I agree with the plan's support for provision for elderly residents, I am a little concerned by the emphasis on Care Home places. Many older people do not need the degree of care provided in a "home" and I feel there should also be mention of the need for managed housing, for people who are still able to look after themselves, but who would benefit from the extra security of having an on-site Warden to "keep an eye" on them.</p> <p>6 TRANSPORT. Car Parking is a problem, although it is difficult to see what can be done within the land available in the town. The Church Street area</p>	Noted. Covered by existing policies.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>is a particular issue since the redevelopment of the (private) Jerningham Arms car park, and the lack of parking must be having an adverse effect on businesses and residents in this part of the town.</p> <p>The station car park (which a few years ago was practically unused) is now full before 07:30 each day, largely with passengers avoiding the charges at Telford Central. Cars are not only occupying and blocking the approach road, but are now increasingly using the town centre car park. (this is not anecdotal - I have commuted from Shifnal to Birmingham since 1986 and have not only seen the changes but also talked to many people who have confirmed the reason why they now travel from Shifnal). There is some additional room at the station on the site used by Network Rail as a ballast and equipment store - perhaps some discussion might be opened with London Midland about the practicality of using this area? There is also quite a lot of parking available at Cosford, closer to the M54 than Shifnal is - while I would not expect LM or Telford & Wrekin to support people transferring here from Telford Central, it might be worth some dialogue based on accommodating expansion of the commuter market? The problem is only likely to get worse if the frequency of peak-hour services to and from Shifnal increases - I understand that there will be an additional morning Birmingham service from December which is likely to attract more transfers from Telford.</p> <p>One location an additional pedestrian crossing is needed is in Market Place, between Latimers Wine Bar and the station entrance, which can get very busy at peak times, and can also be less than safe in view of it's proximity to the junction with Bradford Street.</p> <p>I note there is no mention in the plan of the "shared space" in Bradford Street, and I hope that the proposal has been quietly dropped. Although it may just be a fashionable passing "fad",</p>		

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Shared Space does work in some particular circumstances, but Bradford Street is the shortest through route between the A464 and the A5, and drivers would continue to use it as such even if they had to dodge pedestrians on the way. I really can't see that it would be safe, particularly as the number of elderly residents increases.</p> <p>Bus improvements are undoubtedly expensive, but publicity for existing services seems poor and, in my experience, many people are unaware of the routes (and their times) that do exist. Could the Bradford Street notice board be used to better effect, or maybe the bus operator persuaded to make a direct mail shot as was done some years ago?</p> <p>8 HEALTH. As has been mentioned many times before, Haughton Road is not an ideal site for the new health centre, but I guess the deal is done now. Perhaps more benefit would be derived from some competition in the market - a second practice to provide an alternative to the current one, which has a rating of only 3.5 on the NHS Choices website. The majority of the complaints still concern the difficulty of getting appointments; with only three regular doctors this is hardly surprising, and will not get any better as the population rises.</p> <p>9 GREEN SPACES. No problem with the green spaces identified, but why no mention of the Churchyard? Is this properly protected from development?</p> <p>9 DRAINAGE & FLOODING. Ah, that old chestnut again. I would, ideally, like to see stronger wording in the plan, placing responsibility on developers to ensure adequate provision for storm water disposal, and, specifically, prohibiting further use of the Wesley Brook for this purpose unless improvements are carried out to the watercourse. Too often in the</p>		

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>past developers have just used the stream as a convenient and cheap means of disposing of run-off water, and, as the owner of the last house in the town before the brook goes off towards Evelith, I see the results every time it rains. There is little spare capacity when it is really wet, and it is about time developers (who presumably make a healthy profit from their activities) took more responsibility through Section 106 or similar planning provisions.</p> <p>That's about it, hope there is something there of value to you. Thank you all for your hard work, and for your involvement in the plan. Good luck!</p>		
1 November	66	Peter Bradley (Resident)	I support the plan, particularly the intention to protect playing fields and the suggestion S.T.F.C. should be more Community based.	Noted. Covered by existing policies.	None
31 October	67	Sue Richards (Resident)	I agree with the points in the plan and support the aims of the plan.	Noted.	None
27 October	68	Anne Furlong (Resident)	<p>I support the general policies in the neighbourhood plan. With the big increase in population of Shifnal it is essential that measures are taken to improve key services and infrastructure. High priority should be given to a new medical centre as at present doctors and nurses are under great pressure and it is difficult to get appointments. The safety of the community is a concern due to the increase in traffic and measures need to be taken to deal with this. The current boundary of Shifnal, which is surrounded by the Green Belt, should be retained as it is a major benefit to the community for recreational use and their general well being. Shifnal should remain a separate town and not move to become part of the Telford conurbation.</p>	Noted.	None
25 October	69	Clive & Pat Pygott (Residents)	<p>Please add my wife and myself to the list of supporters of the final content of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We can only hope that the point has at some time been made that Shifnal seems to have been allocated more than a pro rata share of new housing compared to other small towns and villages in Shropshire.</p>	Noted.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Let's hope that money will be available to improve the Wesley Brook on its passage through Shifnal, apart from considering it simply as a flooding risk.</p> <p>We always look at the Brook and wonder how it would look in a small French town. Waterways in France seem to be considered as worth caring for and almost always look much better than our section of the Wesley Brook.</p> <p>If we were younger, we would certainly call for volunteer workers to join us in an improvement scheme. With volunteers, it need not be expensive.</p> <p>We would like to express our thanks to all of the individuals who have devoted time and energy to work on the Plan over a long period.</p>		
20 October	70	Sue & Steve Buckley (Residents)	<p>Overall we agree with the Shifnal Town Plan and the vision they have for the future of Shifnal. Our main concerns are the level of traffic and the 'junctions' we have in Shifnal which were never meant to cope with the volume of traffic we have through our town.</p> <p>The car parks should definitely cease to be free after three hours to prevent commuters, coach parties etc using our car parks as there are no spaces for people who are shopping and remaining in the town.</p> <p>Empty buildings are an eyesore and need looking at. The shop? next to Blue Florists has been derelict for years and spoils the lovely row of shops we have there.</p> <p>Please - NO MORE HOUSING. We have had more than our fair share and the Doctors for one cannot cope with any more</p>	Noted. Covered by existing policies.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>residents. Have you tried to get an appointment when you are unwell?</p> <p>Well done to the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan Group who have presented a viable action plan for the future of Shifnal and I hope they have the support from other bodies in seeing their ideas become reality.</p>		
20 October	71	Roger Preece (Resident)	<p>The proposed plan makes a lot of sense, It is important that development is now constrained to the town boundary and does not encroach further into green belt and thus turning a nice market town into an urban sprawl. Large dense housing developments such as Beddows on Wolverhampton road are awful in design and detrimental to Keeping our market town personality. It would be nice to think that the infrastructure needed of roads, health, schools will be completed in line with the enormous increase to population. We live in hope!</p>	Noted.	None
17 October	72	Mr G.R.Dawes (Resident)	<p>I would like to see some provision made for walkway access to the new medical centre from the development at Coppice Green Lane. e.g. via Admirals farm.</p>	Noted.	None
17 October	73	Ken Poole (Resident)	<p>Just read this document with interest. While I agree that something needs to be done, it is going to take at least 10 years before anyone of it does any good if ever. I will then be in my 70's if I live that long.</p> <p>It is now that something needs to be done in regards to traffic, parking and the like. It is something that should have been tackled yesterday, not tomorrow, why is that I wonder?</p> <p>You can widen pavements, narrow roads and make them one way all you like, but unless you do something about the amount of through traffic (namely HGV and Agriculture vehicles and the like) from travelling through Shifnal, you will always have this problem.</p>	Noted.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Until you do something about the idiots who speed and park on double yellow lines, on pavements blocking drives and Fire hydrants and the like, nothing will improve. I see nothing in this document that is going to tackle the issues that I have raised here.</p> <p>There is no provision in this document to ease the traffic burden, nor is there anything about enforcing traffic regulations.</p> <p>Nothing will ever get done here in Shifnal, either no one cares enough, or there is no money or whatever. Shifnal will always in my life time, be the accident waiting to happen. I have personally written to every Tom Dick and Harry that I can think of over the last few years, all to no avail.</p> <p>All I get is an email or phone call telling me that you need to report it to the Police, the Police tell you its the Council, and its passed around this county like the air currents.</p> <p>Until someone gets off their behinds and stand up and faces the problem and has some backbone, nothing will ever get done that matters.</p> <p>We all care about our schools, our parks and the like but no one ever seems to care about the traffic and safety of pedestrians, the elderly, the young and disabled alike.</p>		
7 October	74	Derek Corfield (Resident)	<p>I consider that the comprehensive Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation document will meet the aspirations, and hopes, of the majority of Shifnal people.</p> <p>I have spoken to many people about it, and the first thing that they mention is the vital need to retain, and protect, the existing green belt around the town.</p> <p>Recent housing development in Shifnal has exploded, with the 1,600 new homes built, being built, or planned.</p> <p>I haven't heard of anyone in the town who didn't expect Shifnal to</p>	Noted.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>take its fair share of new housing, but the figure just mentioned, seems disproportionate to the number of new homes being built elsewhere, in the county.</p> <p>The current surge in Shifnal housing development is NO not an excuse, or reason, to accede to pressure from land-owners, builders and Shropshire Council, to seek green belt land for yet more housing.</p> <p>The figures already mentioned don't even include new homes on so-called (and very conveniently called) "windfall" sites, some of which contain quite a few homes.</p> <p>I, and I know many townsfolk, demand that Shifnal retain its character as a reasonably-sized, historic market town, instead of the threat of becoming a sprawling mass of homes.</p> <p>The current population, including many who have moved to new homes in Shifnal in the past two years, have invested heavily, for a future in Shifnal. Surely this fact entitles them to consideration in the matter.</p> <p>I haven't even mentioned the impact that any future excessive housing development would have on the infrastructure.</p> <p>Problems, which, I know, the report has addressed, have already been created by the current programme of building.</p> <p>I applaud the plan's objective of bringing numerous vacant properties back into use, and dealing with some unsightly disused properties.</p> <p>Shropshire Council planning department intends to begin a review, in 2016, on Shifnal's green belt.</p> <p>The town, through the town council, Shifnal Forward, the SNP group, should strongly resist any tampering with our current green belt.</p> <p>Let us keep Shifnal recognisable as Shifnal.</p>		
29 September	75	Steve Pendree (Resident)	<p>The aims/targets are just words that look good and keep appearing over the years but nothing actually happens. Well into the current development phase of 1300 houses,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many dwellings for the elderly (ie bungalows) have been 	Noted.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>built? – None</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What improvements have been made regarding GP service provision? – None • What improvements have been made to traffic & transport routes? – None <p>We need these things now, not by 2026.</p> <p>Based on past performance I have absolutely no confidence whatsoever that anything of benefit to existing Shifnal residents will materialise from this plan. There was an opportunity before the current development phase began to achieve some of these objectives but sadly that has now gone. All we have are fancy words.</p>		
29 September	76	Kenneth Poole (Resident)	<p>I have just read the planned changes and one which makes me smile is: The road network should be improved to accommodate the extra traffic generated by recent housing developments. My comment is, what about the extra traffic? What about NOW! let alone in the future. Our town roads cannot cope now let alone if and when new housing is built.</p> <p>We have too much traffic passing through Shifnal now from HGV 1 lorries and tractors etc. downwards. A large percentage of it has no business here in town, they are just passing through, using it as a short cut to wherever.</p> <p>We need positive action, we need positive planning and we need someone up there who will take care of this town.</p> <p>It is too little too late I fear. Shifnal needs something maybe a ring road or bypass to take some of this traffic away from the town not through it. New housing is not going to help the situation, fiddling here and there, trimming this pavement, painting or</p>	Noted.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>removing a few lines here and there won't help.</p> <p>You mention about parking, what about existing car parks? they are not maintained as it is now, folk park where they want now, we have no traffic enforcement in this town. It is a mess and the worse place that I have ever lived experiencing this type of problem and what makes it worse, no one seems to care.</p>		
6 November	77	United Utilities (Statutory Consultee)	<p>Thank you for your email and links to the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>You may be aware that we work closely with Shropshire Council to understand future development sites so we can facilitate the delivery of the necessary sustainable infrastructure at the appropriate time.</p> <p>It is important that United Utilities are kept aware of any additional growth proposed within your Neighbourhood Plan over and above the Council's allocations. We would encourage further consultation with us at an early stage should you look to allocate additional development sites in this area in the future.</p> <p>If you wish to discuss this in further detail please feel free to contact me.</p> <p>Rebecca Pemberton Planning Analyst Developer Services and Planning Operational Services United Utilities</p>	Noted.	None
6 November	78	Natural England (Statutory Consultee)	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 23 September 2015. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England does not consider that this Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this</p>	Noted.	None

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>consultation. The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document. If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.</p>		
8 November	79	Barton Willmore (on behalf of Gallaghers and Taylor Wimpey	<p>Response held on file.</p> <p>It is our view that the SNP is in general conformity with the Core Strategy albeit, we consider some revisions are required. Those points relating specifically to the Neighbourhood Plan are as follows.</p> <p>1. Design is clearly a subjective matter and whilst we support cross reference to good design quality (5.3), we do not support explicit reference to development sites where subjective views on poor quality design are portrayed. The residents of this development are now a firmly established part of the community and we do not consider it appropriate to seek to downgrade their homes in any way.</p> <p>2. With regard to Policy HG2 (Housing Mix) as drafted, this policy applies to both market and affordable housing. It must be noted that the affordable housing mix for any site is, in the main, dictated by Shropshire Council and not a developer. The Council being the party which holds the most up to date information on affordable housing need. In this case therefore, the balance of the overall mix for the site could be skewed if, for example, the Council request a greater proportion of larger properties within affordable housing mix, thus driving the private housing mix to comprise smaller units in the main. This has the effect potentially of failing to provide accommodation within the town for families or</p>	<p>Noted but expressing the views of the community on the design of new housing developments being built in the town.</p> <p>Policy HG2 has been amended, after discussion with the Shropshire Council Planners, to include a statement about offering flexibility for an alternative dwelling mix where new evidence is</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Agreed to amend Policy HG2 to include statement which enables alternative mix based on clear new evidence.</p>

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>development it is not considered an appropriate location for such a use. There are ample areas around the periphery of the site which are more likely to remain undisturbed and would thus form a more appropriate nature reserve area. We request that 'bullet 2' is removed from Policy LE3.</p>		
6 November	80	Environment Agency (Statutory Consultee)	<p>I refer to your letter of the 23 September in relation to the above Neighbourhood Plan (NP) consultation. We have reviewed the submitted document and would offer the following comments at this time. As stated in the consultation document Shropshire Council has produced their SAMDev (to be adopted late 2015) which sits alongside their adopted Core Strategy (2011) and seeks to ensure that proposed development in the County is viable and achievable.</p> <p>To complement the above it is hoped that the Shifnal NP will offer robust confirmation that, specific to matters within our remit, development is not impacted by flooding and that there is sufficient waste water infrastructure in place to accommodate growth for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p>We note that there are no specific sites allocated within the NP although the above mentioned SAMdev does identify preferred housing and employment sites. These preferred sites are located wholly within Flood Zone 1, the low risk Zone.</p> <p><u>Flooding and Drainage:</u> Shifnal has historically been impacted by flooding from the Wesley Brook, which runs through the town. As stated in the plan Shifnal now has its own Flood Partnership Group which, in part, considers the impact of new development on flooding and drainage issues in the town. Paragraph 9.12 confirms that the Group, in partnership with Shropshire Council and ourselves, are actively looking at schemes to improve flood protection and reduce flood risk in Shifnal. It is therefore important that this is reflected in the NP submission and that there is a sufficiently robust flood risk Policy to ensure that any development is safe, will not increase flooding to third parties, and will offer flood risk betterment where viable.</p>	Accept change to title and inclusion of reference to reducing flood risk. As no land being allocated, it is not considered appropriate to refer to sequential test approach. Other comments noted	Amend title to policy EN3 and amend relevant sections, objective and policy EN3 to refer to development seeking to reduce flood risk in the town.

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>We welcome the inclusion of Policy EN3 (minimising the impact of flooding from development) but would recommend the it re-titled to offer a more positive view that flood risk betterment can also be achieved within the town.</p> <p>We would recommend the Policy be re-tiled Flood Risk Management which confirms that the impacts are considered but also indicates that flooding can be managed to also offer improvements to existing problems. In conformity with both National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) and Shropshire Councils Core Strategy (CS18 – Sustainable Water Management) we would expect adherence to a sequential approach with all built development being located within Flood Zone 1, the low risk Zone, in the first instance. We would recommend that reference to this is included in your Policy, for example, as such:</p> <p>Development should be subject to a sequential test approach and accord with National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) and Shropshire Council’s Core Strategy (Policy CS18 - Sustainable Water Management). In the first instance we would expect development to be located within Flood Zone 1 (Low Risk). Where development is deemed necessary within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (in accordance with the Sequential Test) we would expect proposals to demonstrate that they are safe and will not increase flood risk to third parties, with flood-risk betterment provided where possible.</p> <p>The above seeks to ensure that all built development is located within Flood Zone 1 in the first instance but that, in accordance with the NPPG and Shropshire Councils own flood risk Policy, where it is sequentially demonstrated that such development has to be within Flood Zones 2 or 3, any proposals will be safe and not increase flood risk. It also promotes the opportunity to offer flood risk betterment where viable.</p> <p>We would question the rationale and need for the second</p>		

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>paragraph relating to development within flood attenuation areas.</p> <p>The two points relating to culverts and open watercourses are similar in content and could be combined as one Policy point i.e: Proposals will demonstrate that development has avoided the loss of open water courses through culverting with existing culverted sections opened up where viable.</p> <p>Whilst conformity with the Core Strategy is vital with regards to development and flood risk there may be scope to add a locally specific flood risk policy point to address any flood risk issues the Parish has. There may be specific points that could be included to consider, for example, channel improvements to the Wesley Brook to improve conveyance and actively reduce flood risk.</p> <p>Discussions with Shropshire Council and their land drainage team may identify further such flood risk improvements. Since the imposition of the Flood and Water Management Act the management of surface water falls under the jurisdiction of the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), in this instance Shropshire Council.</p> <p>Foul Water Drainage: With regards to foul drainage all new development throughout the Plan area should be assessed against the capacity of local infrastructure. In this instance we would expect consultation with Severn Trent Water to ensure that the scale of development can be accommodated. End 3 Water Framework Directive (WFD): The EC Water Framework Directive European Union 2000 Commits all EU member states to achieve good qualitative and quantitative status of all water courses by 2027 Aims for 'good status' for all ground and surface waters (rivers, lakes, transitional waters, and coastal waters) in the EU. The Wesley Brook (classified as Main River) is currently at 'moderate status'. In line with the above we would expect development in Shifnal to have no detrimental impact on the watercourse and, where possible, aid in it achieving 'good status'</p>		

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>by 2027. To further assist you in finessing your final submission I have attached a copy of our Neighbourhood Plan Pro-Forma which contains additional information relating to the above issues and what we would expect to see in your document. I trust the above is of assistance at this time. We would be happy to co-operate further on the areas detailed above prior to the proposed Neighbourhood Plan adoption. Please can you also copy in any future correspondence to my team email address.</p>		
19 November	81	Highways & Transport Team, Shropshire Council	<p>Objectives for Transport and Movement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road network should be improved to accommodate the extra local traffic generated by the new housing developments as well as through traffic • Adequate public car parking should be provided in the town centre • Encourage and support the provision of and improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes into and around the town to create a more sustainable and safer environment and healthier life style options • Improve the provision of bus and rail services and infrastructure in order to increase public transport movements <p>Have you considered strengthening your objective to improve pedestrian routes to make the key link between this and managing traffic growth explicit? This is better reflected in the main transport section and in Para 2.16 but reduced reliance on the private car is key.</p> <p>6.6 The emerging Shifnal Transport Strategy has identified the need for a solution which reduces unacceptable levels of congestion at these junctions whilst facilitating increased safe</p>	Agree to strengthen objective.	Objective amended to include points.


Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>movement by pedestrians and cyclists. Suggest removal of the 'unacceptable levels'.</p> <p>Policy TM1 We welcome the support for the emerging Shifnal Transport Strategy as outlined in Policy TM1.</p> <p>Non-policy actions: Management of car parking For note rather than inclusion – Shropshire Council undertook a number of parking surveys in 2014 which looked at capacity and dwell time. Some of this data may be of assistance.</p>	<p>Agree to remove</p> <p>Noted and agree to include this sentence in the text, as it has been agreed to delete this sentence from policy TM1 in response to SC Planners comments Ref 52.</p>	<p>Phrase removed</p> <p>Change made</p>
4 November	81	Peter Drabble (Resident)	<p>Apart from the Housing section I am happy with the Plan. I am against the large target for Housing and using safeguarded land. I was very sorry that the Uplands was not used for a Care Home site and it is time for a decision at Stanton Road or Lawton Road. To support Shifnal needs 30% of residents are over 60! I note that no site is planned for parking what about the allotments adjoining the Aston Street car park!</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The application for a Care Home at the Uplands is still valid and has not been withdrawn.</p>	No change
5 November	82	C.J.Booth (Resident)	Response scanned in and sent as a separate document.	Noted	No change
6 November	83	Wednesfield Housing	We note from the Proposals Maps on page 57 that the Shifnal Town Football Club site in Coppice Green Lane has been	Outside the scope of Plan.	No change

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
		Association (Local landowner)	designated as "Safeguarded Land". In view of the fact that the site is already developed as a football club with a pitch, stands, floodlights and car park, together with the following amenities:- Supporters Rest Room Home And Away Teams changing rooms and showers A Public Address Building 2 Storage Buildings for football nets, flags etc A Hospitality Building A Refreshment Building A Ticket Sales Kiosk A Mower Store It is our view that this is effectively a brown field site and should not be classed as Safeguarded Land.	Designation of Safeguarded Land is a matter for Core Strategy and SAMDev.	
2 November	84	Illegible signature (Resident)	This is to register my agreement of Shifnal Town Plan's list of policies.	Noted	
5 November	85	Jennifer Isherwood (Resident)	Thank you all for the work you have done to put the plan together. I am in agreement with most of the plan. I think the retention of the green belt is very important, and linked with this is to re-use or re-develop derelict or empty buildings. The new town park will be good, and better pedestrian routes round the town, my husband and I walk to activities in the town. I don't think the shop front signage is a problem, it comes and goes with the shops. I am not sure that more visitors and tourists improve a town, having lived in Cornwall I have seen the results of lots of tourists – tatty gift shops and a 'closed' season in the winter, and the loss of 'real' shops for food, clothes etc for year round residents. Local employment is a good part of the plan too.	Noted	
(Rec,d 2 November)	86	Anonymous (Resident)	Response scanned in and sent as a separate document.	Noted	No change
7 November	87	Peter I.Paton (Resident and	I wish to have the following comments considered in connection with the ongoing Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted. Covered by existing	No change

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
		Business owner)	<p>Re. section 6. Transport and Movement.</p> <p>(1). It is clear that the road network in and around Shifnal has been totally overloaded and very poorly maintained by Shropshire Council and it`s successors for many years. It is considered that this situation has resulted in many accidents and dangerous occurrences - in particular at points where vehicle use the footpath to pass by approaching traffic. This occurs when cars are parked on the highway and or where the roadway is too narrow. The most obvious areas of concern are as follows:- Inage road— Shrewsbury Road — Haughton Road — Victoria Road — Aston Street — Curriers Lane and various other roads around Shifnal and of course within the Town Centre. It is also clear that when an additional 1,100 plus houses are occupied the problems and dangers will be made very much worse! It is also very difficult to understand what can be done to improve these ongoing and major problems without major expense and disruption. It is also clear that ALL such danger areas should have been dealt with before planning permission was granted for so many more dwellings and associated developments.</p> <p>(2). With reference to the shopping area - within the Town Centre - I point out that the following ongoing defects - all of which are the cause of great danger and inconvenience to road users and pedestrians should be assessed and dealt with ASAP. The road markings at the north end of Bradford Street have virtually disappeared and are in the most urgent need of repainting. These are the white `Give Way` lines etc. that should slow drivers down before they exit Bradford Street - in order to enter Broadway and or Shrewsbury Road. There have been two very bad accidents recently at this junction one involving a car that turned over and spilt much of its fuel! There has also recently been a very bad accident in Shrewsbury Road when two cars were written off. This was thought to have</p>	<p>policies.</p> <p>Comments will be referred to the Shropshire Highways Team who are preparing a Town Centre Enhancement scheme which will include these areas. The proposals will be on display for consultation in the village hall on 11th/12th December 2015</p>	

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>been due to excessive speed and to the fact that the roadway is not wide enough for two cars to pass where cars are parked. Many drivers actually drive down Shrewsbury Road (eastwards) <u>at speed</u> with their left side wheels on the footpath. This will surely result in a pedestrian being killed or badly injured.</p> <p>(3). The road layout in the centre was designed by Shifnal Chamber of Trade many years ago.</p> <p>Its design has worked very well for over 35 years even though the original plan has never been completed - as was promised!</p> <p>It was said that this was because the County had run out of money but that it would be done in the next financial year - and that was some 35 years ago! The original plan was to have 10 angled parking bays - to mimic those at the south end set within the central Traffic Island that is opposite Patons Garage. (3cont.). The Traffic Island is now owned by and is the responsibility of Shropshire Council.</p> <p>In more recent time Shropshire Council employed a firm of consultants to design linear parking bays within this Traffic Island. This plan was approved by SC. However at the last minute it was claimed that money for such projects had runout and so it would have to wait until the new financial year. Shifnal Town Council also approved the plan and offered to part finance the project with a donation of £10,000 - 00!</p> <p>To date there had been no further action except an apparent suggestion to remove what is left of the double lines that surround the Traffic Island and allow limited (20 minutes) parking ! However it is pointed out that this would be illegal because <u>The Highways Act states that it is illegal to park on any Traffic Island</u> and in any event there is no money available to pay anyone to enforce the regulation!</p> <p>The Highway Code (see section 243) also states that drivers <u>should not park opposite any Traffic Island</u>. These are the reasons that the Traffic Island was and is supposed still to be - surrounded by 'double yellows' albeit very badly maintained ones!</p> <p>Many drivers continually ignore the now virtually invisible double</p>		

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>yellows and are given 'tickets` This illegal parking has caused much danger, disruption and upset particularly to local shoppers who will no doubt go elsewhere to shop in future! The lowered kerb which is for wheelchair users is also continually blocked by parked vehicles.</p> <p>These illegally parked vehicles cause other traffic to drive on the opposite footpath. <u>This is very dangerous for pedestrians.</u></p> <p>The answer to ALL these problems is to put pressure on Shropshire Council to take the action that it has promised. That is to construct the off road parking spaces that it has promised to provide and to maintain the road markings that it is legally required to do.</p> <p>(4). It is clear that there are not enough parking spaces near to Shifnal's centre to cater for the existing traffic. It is thought that at the last count the total was only 150?</p> <p>It is understood that more parking spaces are to be provided on Aston Street carpark by removing some of the heavy goods spaces?</p> <p>This will be of some benefit although it may cause the drivers of the Heavy Goods vehicles to park elsewhere - maybe illegally?</p> <p>It is understood that the land that is currently used as allotments (next to Aston Street carpark) was Compulsorily Purchased by the then Local Authority specifically for the purpose of extending Aston Street carpark as and when it became too small. That time is clearly now and it is difficult to understand why this process is not underway.</p> <p>It would be kind of the Committee it could explain to me what the problem is particularly since there are vacant allotments elsewhere.</p> <p>(5). I have statement which clearly states that in 2008 the Public Sewer in Shifnal was full to capacity. I have another statement that confirms that by 2010 the Public Sewerage system in Shifnal was at a CRITICAL state - and that further nothing will (or can) be done to rectify this situation until 2020! These statements can be confirmed by the fact that when a heavy rain storm arrives several</p>	<p>The points re the Aston Street Car park and HGV Parking bays and Aston Street</p>	

Date	Ref	Name and category of respondent	Comment	Response from Steering Group	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>of the Public Sewer manhole covers blow off. The result is that raw sewage is discharged into Wesley Brook!</p> <p>It would be kind of the Committee if it could make enquiries to ascertain how Severn Trent Water Ltd was able to convince the Planning Department that there was sufficient capacity within its Public Sewerage System to accommodate and extra 1,000 plus connections to it — and to let me know the answer!</p> <p>(6). A major problem for any householder in Shifnal whose property is within 200 metres of ANY property that has been flooded - or is within 200 metres of a stream or watercourse - is that it is virtually impossible to obtain an insurance quotation from any insurer other than the insurer that that have been with for several years. This means that it is unlikely that they will be able to sell their house for anything like its perceived value!</p> <p>It will also almost certainly mean that any prospective purchaser will be unable to obtain a mortgage to purchase same!</p> <p>The ERs 2003 Flood Risk Assessment and Shropshire Council ^xs 2010 Flood Risk Assessment for Shifnal are - in my opinion — NOT FIT FOR THE INTENDED PURPOSE.</p> <p>This means that many properties in Shifnal are at a much greater risk of flooding than has been theoretically calculated.</p> <p>If the Committee wishes me to explain in detail about this VERY SERIOUS ISSUE I will be pleased to do so.</p> <p>This is all I have time for now because I have been ill!</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>  <p>Peter I Paton.</p>	<p>Allotments to be referred to the Shifnal Town Council are having both these areas transferred to them under an Asset Transfer agreement with Shropshire Council.</p> <p>Comments 5. And 6. will be referred to the Shifnal Flood Partnership Group.</p>	