

Respondent	Summary of response
<p><b>A Barker, Much Wenlock Group Scout Leader</b></p>	<p>Mr Barker expresses strong support for the designation of the land adjacent to the Much Wenlock Scout Headquarters as a Local Green Space (LGS), noting its longstanding use by Beavers, Cubs, and Scouts for informal play and its significance as one of the few recreational areas available to young people in the town. He raises concerns about the Town Council’s apparent intention to repurpose the site as a car park without public consultation or evidence of need, emphasising that such a move would compromise safety, damage historic lime trees, and disregard the Scouts’ lease and the community’s recreational needs.</p>
<p><b>Boningale Developments (Marrons)</b></p>	<p>Boningale Developments has land interests within Much Wenlock including Land off Bridgenorth Road which the Town Council is aware of.</p> <p>Boningale Developments have made the following comments on specific policies:</p> <p><b>MW2 (Local Housing Needs):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy needs to contain sufficient flexibility to allow for factors such as a fluctuation in the market, site specific viability, changing demographics and the need to maintain growth of settlements in order to prevent their decline.</li> <li>• In order to provide those smaller homes there will naturally need to be some larger homes in order to provide a marketable housing mix which ensures a variety of options are available for a range of buyers.</li> <li>• Relying solely on a settlement-specific housing needs assessment could potentially lead to a stagnation in population due to newcomers or first time buyers being unable to acquire a property in the town.</li> <li>• It is noted and supported that the policy requirement for affordable homes would be to have 70% affordable rent and 30% affordable purchase, as this is in line with the policy aspiration of the withdrawn plan. However, the percentage proposed exceeds that prescribed by national Building Regulations. Sufficient flexibility should be established within the policy to allow for site-by-site circumstances to be considered.</li> <li>• The inclusion of a requirement for 25% of for-sale affordable homes to be First Homes is not quite consistent with national policy, with the preference for First Homes having been removed from the most recent version of the Framework. We would want to see evidence of a local need for this product in order to meet national guidance.</li> </ul> <p><b>MW3 (Rural Exception Sites):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MWNP should not wholly rely on rural exception sites and cross subsidy schemes to meet the local need for affordable housing. Only 26 have been delivered since 2013.</li> </ul> <p><b>MW9 (Flexible Workspaces):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• policy does not align with policy MW2 which expresses a very clear preference for smaller 1-3 bedroom homes, which would not provide individuals with a dedicated space to work.</li> </ul> <p><b>MW18 (Character and Design):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point V: The buildings and environment of the Conservation Area, listed buildings and other heritage assets should be protected from</li> </ul>

	<p>harm in accordance with the NPPF, which also provides that the level of harm should be graded, and would require benefits to be present in order to outweigh the harm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Point VI: The wording of point ‘vi’ is vague, particularly the clause “visual intrusion on the views and surroundings that create a backdrop to an area”. It is an established principle in planning law that an individual does not have a right to a view, and even so, impact on a view is not to be considered a matter of amenity.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Canal and River Trust</b></p>	<p>The Trust have no waterways, assets or land interests within the area covered by the document and as such have no comment to make.</p>
<p><b>Cartwrights Waste Disposal Services (Axis)</b></p>	<p>This submission focuses on the treatment of Farley Quarry, a disused limestone quarry located approximately 1.8 km north of Much Wenlock and situated entirely within the Shropshire Hills National Landscape Area.</p> <p>Farley Quarry has a long-standing history of mineral extraction, with no formal restoration obligations under its original 1948 consent meaning that the quarry void remains and formal restoration of the Site has not taken place. The routes of two public rights of way (‘PRoW’) run roughly parallel to one another east-westwards across the Site. These are PRoWs ref. 0133/42/1 and 0133/43/1. Both PRoWs were severed by quarry operations and are not currently accessible</p> <p>Restoration of the Site will enable the following opportunities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The delivery of new high-quality habitats and biodiversity enhancements - including great crested newt (GCN) ponds, species-rich grassland, scrubland and woodland;</li> <li>2. A new pocket biodiversity park – including a picnic area, outdoor classroom space and educational fossil displays of found fossils on-site with information boards;</li> <li>3. New and reinstated PRoWs – offering access to and through the Site and re-completing the severed PRoW route; and</li> <li>4. Sustainable surface water drainage arrangements, including new soakaway features.</li> </ol> <p>The following concerns are raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While Policy MW23 supports restoration of disused quarries for biodiversity and public access, Farley Quarry is excluded from the list of supported sites. Axis argues this omission is inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which advocates for timely and high-quality restoration of mineral sites (Paragraphs 223(h) and 224(e)).</li> <li>The Draft Plan proposes ecological enhancements around the quarry and rerouting of PRoWs to bypass the site. Axis contends this approach fails to address the restoration of the quarry itself, leaving a gap in the green infrastructure network and undermining the visual and ecological integrity of the National Landscape Area.</li> </ul> <p>The following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include Farley Quarry in Part F of Policy MW23 to support its restoration for biodiversity, leisure, and public access.</li> <li>Amend Policy MW12 to prioritise reinstatement of the severed PRoWs through the quarry rather than rerouting them.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognise the restoration of Farley Quarry as a strategic opportunity to enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, and recreational access within the National Landscape Area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Lesley Durbin, Tree Warden to Much Wenlock, Chair of Much Wenlock Tree Forum, and former Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group member</b></p>	<p><b>Policy MW22 – Local Green Space Designation</b> Ms Durbin advocates for the formal designation of a parcel of land adjacent to the Much Wenlock Scout Headquarters as a Local Green Space (LGS). The land, owned by Shropshire Council, is currently used by Scouts and Cubs for informal play. She describes the site as unsuitable for development due to its boggy terrain and presence of an underground stream, yet ideal for recreational use. The site is referenced in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and contains historic lime trees planted by the railway company in the 19th century.</p> <p>Ms Durbin expresses concern that the submitted version of the MWNDP omits this space, despite its inclusion in earlier drafts, and evidence showing that Much Wenlock has insufficient in recreation and play space. She is concerned that the omission may be linked to potential plans to convert the area into a car park for the adjacent Gaskell Ground.</p> <p>The representation includes a detailed description of the proposed LGS site near William Brookes School and supporting photographs.</p> <p><b>Policy MW5 – Commercial Development</b> Ms Durbin objects to Policy MW5, which restricts redevelopment of commercial land unless it has been unused for 12 months and lacks potential as a future employment site. She argues this policy conflicts with Policy MW1 and Objective 1, which promote the redevelopment of brownfield sites. She highlights two commercial sites (MW01 and MW02, from the withdrawn draft Shropshire Local Plan) within the development boundary that are underutilised and could be repurposed for residential use, particularly small dwellings suitable for older or younger residents. She contends that Policy MW5 imposes unnecessary barriers to mixed-use development and fails to reflect community preferences expressed during consultation.</p>
<p><b>Environment Agency</b></p>	<p>In the absence of specific site allocations within the plan, the Environment Agency is not providing a bespoke comment at this time. They advise the Steering Group to ensure conformity with the Shropshire Local Development Plan. Further guidance is included within the accompanying Neighbourhood Plan Proforma.</p>
<p><b>Forestry Commission</b></p>	<p>Response highlights key considerations on the sustainable management and expansion of woodland areas and includes a link to standing advice.</p>
<p><b>Herefordshire Council</b></p>	<p>Herefordshire Council do not foresee any cross-border issues that would affect Herefordshire and believe that the proposals set out in the draft Plan align with their planning policies and do not raise any concerns.</p>
<p><b>Historic England</b></p>	<p>Historic England confirm that their previous comments on the Regulation 14 Plan remain entirely relevant, that is: ‘Historic England is supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and objectives set out in it and consider that an admirably comprehensive approach is taken to the environment including the historic</p>

	<p>environment.</p> <p>The design parameters set out in the Much Wenlock Design Guidance and Codes will no doubt prove invaluable as a context and guide for future development. This approach and those policies designed to conserve and enhance both the distinctive character of the settlements of Much Wenlock Parish and the surrounding countryside, including the Shropshire Hills National Landscape, whilst protecting designated and undesignated heritage assets and promoting green infrastructure is highly commendable.’</p>
<p><b>H Horsley</b></p>	<p>Mr Horsley supports the modifications to the existing Plan which ensure its continuing relevance. However, he expresses concern that the Plan does not sufficiently emphasise the gravity of the associated flood risks in this Rapid Response Catchment in the Highest Category of Risk, especially in light of mounting evidence of climate change. The geographic characteristics of Much Wenlock are fundamentally unsuitable for significant new development. Mr Horsley challenges the rationale behind Shropshire Council’s designation of the area for substantial growth, arguing that such decisions should be based on a thorough reassessment of site suitability.</p> <p>He recommends a revision of Policy MW1 to consolidate flood risk considerations more prominently. New development to fully account for existing and future flood risks in accordance with Policy MW10.</p> <p>Mr Horsley also highlights the need to address the shortage of public open space in Much Wenlock. The proliferation of impermeable surfaces—roads, footpaths, and buildings—exacerbates flooding, and the provision of open space is seen as a necessary countermeasure.</p>
<p><b>L Marlow</b></p>	<p>Mr Marlow expresses concern that the Plan fails to address the needs of individual self-builders and lacks a coherent strategy for sustainable housing. He argues that the plan is overly focused on volume housebuilders and theoretical definitions of affordability, while omitting practical support for single self-build dwellings, including land allocation and planning flexibility.</p> <p>Mr Marlow recommends that the plan be amended to encourage self-build initiatives, accommodate non-standard materials (such as straw bales) and off-grid living. He recommends that the 100m<sup>2</sup> restriction on external measurement be changed to internal measurement to allow for better insulation. He also advises that accessibility requirements be relaxed for properties aimed towards first time buyers.</p>
<p><b>Lovell Strategic Land (on behalf of a landowner)</b></p>	<p>The submission supports the overall direction of the Plan and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Paragraph 4. 79</i></li> <li>• <i>Objective 4: Transport and movement</i></li> <li>• <i>Objective 6: Good quality design, local character and heritage</i></li> <li>• <i>Objective 7: Green and open spaces, local landscape and wildlife</i></li> <li>• the strengthened wording in <i>Policy MW10</i>, which supports development that delivers flood mitigation alongside wider benefits such as housing and biodiversity gains. This is seen as essential for addressing the town’s flood risk and meeting local housing needs, particularly for older residents and those with disabilities.</li> <li>• <i>Policy MW18: Character and Design of Development</i></li> </ul>

- *Policy MW19: Energy Efficiency and Mitigating Climate Change*
- *Policy MW20: Conserving Heritage Assets*
- *Policy MW22: Recreational Open and Play Space.* Lovell highlight that this principle is imperative in ensuring healthy and safe developments and in the delivery of Land to the rear of the Cemetery and north of Oakfield Park, it would secure a level of open space and assist in responding to the current deficit in Much Wenlock of 2.491 hectares (6.15 ac) (as confirmed by Figure 18 in the Plan).
- *Policy MW23: Green and Blue Infrastructure and Delivering Biodiversity Net Gain*
- *Policy MW25: Dark Skies*

The submission proposes several amendments to ensure alignment with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and to facilitate sustainable development. These are:

- *Objective 1: Spatial Strategy and Housing.* It is vital that the Town Council produces a Plan that responds to not only Much Wenlock's status as a Key Centre but also, how the Town 'functions within a wider strategic area' [Housing Needs Assessment (2024) para 2.10] (with Telford, Bridgnorth and Shrewsbury). Thus, it is imperative that there is clear policy support that allows the Town to grow through housing development that is 'well located and designed and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities' [NPPF (2005) para 77].
- *Objective 3: Reducing Flood Risk.* Lovell advise that the following wording is deleted: 'keeping sites free from development if they have the potential to be used to slow down the flow of surface water through engineering or natural means' as its inclusion would stop a site being developed which can secure the necessary mitigation alongside the delivery of housing which is supported through Policy MW10.
- *Policy MW1: Supporting Sustainable Development – Part B.* As currently worded, the Policy is restrictive and is at odds with the drive to deliver housing in sustainable locations which is at the forefront of the Government's directive. Further, part B (as drafted) ignores Shropshire Council's assessment of sites and that of Site MUW006 (Land to the rear to the cemetery and north of Oakfield Park, Much Wenlock). In summary, the way in which the policy is drafted will not only limit the delivery of housing but will also reduce the benefits that are associated, including development that can provide mitigation to address the existing issues of flooding that is experienced in the Town through the provision of a flood attenuation scheme that can be delivered (alongside residential development). Lovell include a suggestion of alternative wording.
- *Policy MW12: Improving walking, cycling and equestrian opportunities.* Sites which are located within sustainable locations and offer opportunities to deliver upon the objectives (of the policy) through enhancement of existing, cycle and pedestrian routes alongside securing possible traffic calming measures, should be supported.
- *Policy MW14: Mitigating vehicular impacts at junctions and pinch points.* Lovell support the addition of our recommendation to the Regulation 14 consultation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Policy MW15: Improving opportunities for community and cultural facilities, sport and recreation.</i> Lovell reiterate their comments from the Regulation 14 consultation: ‘Whilst we strongly agree with the Policy and in particular part B, specific reference should be made to how new residential development can deliver upon the objectives of this policy.’</li> <li>• <i>Policy MW24: Landscape and Environment.</i> This policy needs to ensure consistency with both National and Local Policy alongside that emerging, as for example, there was no such requirement in the most recent iteration of the Local Plan for 20% tree canopy in locations such as Much Wenlock.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Much Wenlock Civic Society</b></p>	<p>The Much Wenlock Civic Society have had representation on the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and have been involved in the public Consultation days. The Society therefore supports the draft Submission of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p><b>National Highways</b></p>	<p>In relation to the Plan, National Highways’ principal interest is in safeguarding the operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The nearest routes are the A5 and the A49 located approximately 9.5km north and 12.5km west of the plan area respectively. They believe that the scope and scale of proposed development identified in the current Shropshire Local Development Plan (accounted for within the draft Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan), is modest and shall not have any significant impact on the operation of the SRN.</p>
<p><b>National Rail</b></p>	<p>Network Rail’s response outlines its statutory role in the planning process, particularly for developments within 10 metres of railway land or those affecting level crossings. They emphasise the need for early engagement with its Asset Protection (ASPRO) team to safeguard railway operations. The organisation advises that any development near the railway must comply with specific safety and operational requirements, including fencing, drainage, lighting, and access considerations, and that proposals likely to increase station footfall or impact level crossings should include mitigation measures and developer contributions through planning obligations such as CIL or Section 106 agreements.</p>
<p><b>Natural England</b></p>	<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, they have included an annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. Further information on protected species and development is included in Natural England’s Standing Advice on protected species.</p>
<p><b>Natural Resources Wales</b></p>	<p>Natural Resources Wales have reviewed the plan and have no comments to make.</p>
<p><b>S O’Dowd</b></p>	<p>As a member of Much Wenlock Civic Society and part of the Steering Group, Ms O’Dowd supports the adoption of this draft update of the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

	<p>Ms O’Dowd recommends as improvement to the Much Wenlock Design Guide produced by AECOM, noting that the list of Listed Buildings copied from Historic England’s website is disorganised and should be replaced with the version reordered by street name by the Steering Group. Additionally, she highlights an omission in Figure 7 on page 31, where the map of commercial sites includes the Raven Hotel but fails to show the Wheatland Garage and supermarket.</p>
<p><b>J Petford</b></p>	<p>Ms Petford expresses concern that the development boundary for Bourton has moved and will therefore not protect council houses. She isn favour of more affordable housing but not at the expense of existing settlements and social housing. Ms Petford supports development and accompanying infrastructure on grey land, not on fertile agricultural land.</p>
<p><b>Powys County Council</b></p>	<p>The planning department of Powys County Council has no comments to make.</p>
<p><b>Shropshire Council – Planning Policy</b></p>	<p>Planning Policy recognises the significant amount of work which the Steering Group has undertaken to review and redraft the emerging Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan (MWNDP) between Regulations 14 and 15.</p> <p>In particular we support the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the removal of references to the now withdrawn draft Shropshire Local Plan and the continued inclusion of references to the underpinning evidence base which retains material weight in planning decisions;</li> <li>• minor text amendments which add greater clarity to the MWNDP’s policies and supporting information;</li> <li>• the provision of further specialist advice to support policy MW2;</li> <li>• the amendment of policy MW3 to align with the LPR evidence in terms of numbers of dwellings that may be acceptable on a rural exception site (increasing from 20 to 25).</li> </ul> <p>Regarding <i>Policy MW1: Supporting sustainable development</i> and <i>Policy MW2: Meeting local housing needs</i>: Shropshire Council is currently at an early stage of preparing a new Local Plan for the period to 2045. It is expected this will be adopted in 2028. The Local Plan will establish a new settlement hierarchy, and where appropriate, growth strategies for settlements. As such, there may be a need for the Local Plan to allocate additional land in settlements covered by this Neighbourhood Plan to ensure an appropriate development strategy to 2045.</p>
<p><b>Shropshire Council – Tree Team</b></p>	<p>Urban trees provide a wide range of well-documented benefits—from improving air quality and mitigating heat to supporting biodiversity and enhancing residents’ wellbeing. National guidance from the Trees and Design Action Group (TDAG) and the Forestry Commission reinforces the importance of integrating trees into planning policy and design.</p>

	<p>The following points are aligned with the national objective of achieving 20% tree canopy cover in urban areas and would help Much Wenlock move towards that goal while securing the long-term value of its green infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the goal of 20% tree canopy cover</li> <li>• There is a high number of ash trees in the area; plan for substantial canopy losses due to ash dieback with proactive replacement.</li> <li>• Recommend diverse, mixed-species planting (native and climate-resilient) to build long-term resilience.</li> <li>• Require replacement planting at higher ratios (e.g. 2–3 trees for every one lost due to development or disease).</li> <li>• Encourage tree planting in public spaces and streets, not just private gardens.</li> <li>• Use structural soil, tree pits, and permeable surfaces in new developments to support healthy street trees.</li> <li>• Strategically plant trees to frame key views and landmarks (e.g. Much Wenlock Priory, town entrances).</li> <li>• Develop formal Tree Management Plans across sites: include a tree inventory, inspection schedules, and clear roles/responsibilities.</li> <li>• Promote Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) for high-value and important trees.</li> <li>• Reflect public desire for trees at key town entrances and car parks (e.g. Stretton Road, Much Wenlock Primary School, Gaskell Field).</li> <li>• Include planting of commemorative trees, heritage fruit trees, and informal community orchards where appropriate.</li> <li>• Support green corridors and hedgerow planting for biodiversity and ecological connectivity.</li> <li>• Recognise trees as key to local identity and character—especially for streetscape, historic setting, and seasonal change.</li> <li>• Encourage locally led planting events and 'adopt-a-tree' schemes, supported by local volunteers and schools.</li> <li>• Involve and encourage the public in shaping the tree strategy and treescape going forward</li> </ul>
<p><b>Shropshire Council – Green Infrastructure Officer</b></p>	<p>We acknowledge that the northern part of Much Wenlock better served than the south for access to green and natural spaces. Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework plan <a href="#">Green Infrastructure Map</a> gives more detail on Accessible Natural Green Space Standards (ANGSt) and data on Access to Greenspace Standards, Access to Nature Close to Home, Accessible Greenspace Inequalities, Urban Heat Management and other data. It might indicate potential future connections and new green spaces.</p> <p>Objective 7, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point (Pages 13 and 82):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>creating extra areas of high-quality green space are created within new developments that will adapt to climate change and support tackling existing disparities to accessing greenspace.</i></li> </ul> <p>Table 5 – Natural Drainage Solutions (Page 49):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests inclusion of swales alongside rain gardens in Table 5 (under Objective 3).</li> </ul> <p>Policy MW15 – Improving opportunities for community and cultural facilities,</p>

sport and recreation (Page 63):

- Section B – reference all ‘children of all ages and abilities’.
- Possibly refer to Fields in Trust Guidance also - [Home | Fields in Trust](#) specifically the range of play and recreation opportunities.

Policy MW18 - Character and design of development (Page 73):

- Possibly refer to Fields in Trust Guidance also - [Home | Fields in Trust](#)

Policy MW19 - Energy Efficiency and mitigating climate change (Page 75):

- No mention of nature-based solutions to deal climate change mitigation. Nature-based solutions can help facilitate, cleaner air, urban cooling, carbon sequestration, drainage.
- No mention of green roofs or walls integrated into built form.

Policy MW21- Local Green Spaces (Pages 83 and 85):

- Allotment Gardens adjacent to local green space 7 – why was this not included? Inclusion justified as open space is limited in Much Wenlock.

Policy MW22 - Recreation open and play space (Pages 86 and 87):

- Reference children of all ages and abilities.
- For provision of future play - Attached is a Fields in Trust PDF that has guidance on play space design. This also includes the recommended walking distances for different types of play spaces. This would help Much Wenlock identify where they should be locating future play space to deal with disparities. This could also help inform future Section 106 contributions delivery.
- Could also refer to providing play equipment that is challenging and engaging to ensure longevity of interest.
- Provide new equipment and surfacing that makes play spaces inclusive and accessible.
- Adding play areas onto other green spaces to create social hubs is a great idea. The NP could propose to connect all the play areas/ green spaces/ hubs to create a network of social hubs with high recreational value that are easily accessed by walking or wheeling.

Policy MW23: Green and blue infrastructure and delivering biodiversity net gain (Page 88):

- Make Reference to Biodiversity Net Gain.
- Any future landscape improvements should be informed by the Shropshire Environmental Network and the incoming Shropshire & TW Local Nature Recovery Strategy. [Shropshire Environmental Network and planning applications | Shropshire Council & Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin Local Nature Recovery Strategy | Shropshire Council](#)
- Could also reference Natural England’s principles for GI. [Green Infrastructure Principles](#) or [Green Infrastructure Standards for England \(Summary\) - Green Flag Award](#)
- Does the NP look to promote locations where existing green spaces could be connected via improvements to existing streets or spaces? [Neighbourhood Plan Process Journey](#)

Policy MW24 - Landscape and environment (Page 96):

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add '<u>hedgerow trees, species rich grassland and meadow</u>' to section A.</li> <li>• Trees and woodland: increase hedgerow trees. Plant trees to provide succession strategy to existing mature trees. Consider species selection with a view to future climate change adaption.</li> <li>• Wildlife Friendly Features: insect hotels, bee boxes, butterfly boxes amongst planting with nectar sources.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sport England</b></p>	<p>Sport England's response does not contain advice specific to Much Wenlock.</p> <p>It emphasises the importance of aligning local planning policy with national guidance on promoting physical activity and protecting sports infrastructure. The response also advises that any new or improved sports facilities should be designed in accordance with Sport England's guidance to ensure they are fit for purpose. It stresses that new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport, and planning policies should secure appropriate provision or enhancements to existing facilities. Furthermore, Sport England encourages the use of its Active Design principles to support healthy lifestyles through the layout and design of new developments.</p>
<p><b>Cllr D Thomas</b></p>	<p>Supports the plan in its current form and believes it will make an important contribution to planning in the area.</p>
<p><b>Wenlock Olympian Society</b></p>	<p>Comments relating to MW15 and MW22.</p> <p>The Wenlock Olympian Society request that the green area in front of the Scout Hut be considered as a space that can be used for additional temporary parking on an exceptional basis when larger events take place on the field or leisure centre. Prior approval for temporary parking should be managed by Gaskell Field Management and only granted when the ground conditions are suitable to avoid environmental damage.</p>