

From: Mike Turner [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 September 2017 16:43
To: LocalPlan
Subject: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED MODIFICATION STO THE T&C PLAN 2011-2031

Please find below my comments on the Proposed Main Modifications **(L1)** to the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 Publication Version-January 2016 **(D5a)**.

Regards

Michael Turner
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Comments on Major Modifications

MM5: I do not support the modified increase to the housing numbers in the rural area. The assumption that the rural areas requires housing growth at exactly the same rate as the urban areas of Telford and Newport has always been fundamentally flawed. This flaw continues to be applied to the modified increase with the rural area continuing to have to take 6% of overall housing numbers meaning an equivalent proportional increase in its allocation as do Telford and Newport

MM12: I do not support the modified increase to the number sin the rural area. The assumption that the rural areas requires housing growth at exactly the same rate as the urban areas of Telford and Newport has always been fundamentally flawed. This flaw continues to be applied to the modified increase with the rural area continuing to have to take 6% of overall housing numbers meaning an equivalent proportional increase in its allocation as do Telford and Newport. **The increase 100 homes should fall within Newport and Telford and not the rural area.**

MM62: The removal of Lilleshall Village/Gap is disgraceful. As is the failure to include the Chetwynd Deer park and the gap between Newport and Edgmond. The latter preventing the coalescing of Newport & Edgmond. Lilleshall should be reinserted and the 'Chetwynd Gap' added.

Other Comments

The rural areas continue to remain extremely vulnerable to inappropriate and unwanted development. Particularly the 5 settlements listed as 'most sustainable' in the Rural Area Technical Paper. This later paper is already being quoted by developers in planning applications and appeals as justification for large housing estates. It is suggested that the Plan clarifies the status of the Rural Settlements Technical Paper and its recommendation the these 5 settlements can only sustain very limited infil development and not housing estates.

The plan should make a very clear policy statement that the rural character of Edgmond is to be maintained and that development which reduces the spatial separation between Edgmond, Harper Adams University and Edgmond Marsh will be resisted. Also any development which closes the spatial separation between Edgmond and Newport will be resisted.

M52 - Michael Turner

There should be a very clearly statement, and contingency plan, that any under-delivery at Allscott and Crudgington sites will be re-directed to the urban environment and not to settlements within the rural environment which cannot sustain such large housing numbers without significant harm to their rural character.

Whilst seeking to support its sustainment there should be a very clear policy guidance as to what constitutes 'Appropriate Development' at/of Harper Adams University (HAU), and which guides both the university and developers on how they are required to:

- Protect the rural character of Edgmond Settlements through not building multi-story research, office or accommodation units south of the B5062;
- Avoid light pollution by developing a very carefully thought through lighting strategy which respects the local rural area and limits to the absolute minimum light pollution

Furthermore the Plan should be strengthened further to ensure the viability of the university by the provision of a policy statement protects agricultural land surrounding the university from development and which protects it for use as agricultural land by the university and other farmers;