

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 August 2017 09:20  
**To:** LocalPlan  
**Subject:** Comments on Inspector's draft main modifications L1

**Categories:** [REDACTED]

I list below my comments on the draft main modifications to the TWC Local Plan suggested by the Inspector. I have commented in the same order set out by the Inspector. I've ignored the two typo mistakes I found.

## Local Plan

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>My Comments</u>
MM1	12	TWCs version made very clear it found no credible argument in Birmingham's suggestion of Telford & Wrekin accepting any obligation to satisfy some of Birmingham's housing needs. The Inspector's proposed wording weakens TWCs position to resist having to solve Birmingham's housing problems.
MM8	34	TWCs presumption of prioritising building on brownfield sites before using 'best and most versatile' farmland requires developers to submit strong arguments for greenfield site building. The Inspector's wording weakens that requirement.
MM9	35	Ditto.
MM12	37	Inspector again removes any presumption to protect greenfield sites and worse, provides a bland statement that "...economic and other benefits...will be taken into account" when considering building on greenfield sites. He restricts the definition of "best and most versatile" land to grades 1, 2 and 3a but doesn't define what is meant by "economic" or "other" benefits. Are these "economic" and "other" benefits to the local community or to the developer?
MM13	37	"...and well-designed new buildings". Inspector includes a meaningless requirement for "well designed" buildings. Who decides what is "well designed"- Prince Charles or Persimmon designers? He might just as well demand houses are "well built". Reputable developers should do this anyway; it just so happens, they don't.
MM14	38	Well-designed buildings again.
MM15	39	Removes TWC clear presumption of prioritising development on brownfield sites in Telford and Newport. Inspector wants no delay in processing planning applications if they are deemed to be in accordance with the development plan. Who decides if they are in accordance? Doesn't this open the door for clever developer-barristers?

## M34 - J. R. France

Inspector wants presumption in favour of planning permission if no local plan policy exists or is out of date. Unless every single possible issue is covered in the local plan doesn't this allow the developers' lawyers to have a field day? It's the reverse of catch-all legal clauses so far as TWC is concerned.

Inspector places responsibility on TWC to prove there are adverse effects of a development which outweigh the benefits rather than requiring the developer to prove benefits outweigh the adverse effects. Presumption in favour of the developer.

Inspector limits power to reject a development proposal by requiring TWC to quote a specific policy in NPPF which says development should be restricted. It's inconceivable that every situation has been covered in the NPPF. Developers' lawyers will have a field day on this escape clause.

- MM21 47 TWC was clearly indicating the type of diversification development that would be acceptable but the Inspector's alternative implies it can be anything (eg a foundry) provided, of course, the building is "well designed".
- MM22 47 "Well designed" raises its ugly head again.
- MM25 50 ".....located in Telford and Wellington....." Isn't Wellington in Telford?
- MM33 62 Why has Inspector rejected hotels in Ironbridge?
- MM35 63 Ditto.
- MM62 98 The proposed "Lilleshall Strategic Landscape Area" finally put some teeth in the oft-implied desire to "protect the Lilleshall Gap". Why has the Inspector rejected the Lilleshall Strategic Landscape as a defined area? I can find no explanation.
- MM66 107 Why has the requirement for funding from the developer been removed?
- MM67 124 What is the definition of "substantial" as in harm to a World Heritage site? The first sentence says "any" harm.
- MM75 140 This appears to say that if TWC decide the non-mineral development should proceed then permission for prior removal of minerals is virtually guaranteed. No reference to considering any adverse effects on the community from the mineral removal.

J R France

████████████████████  
██████████  
██████████  
████████████████████