

Broster, Harriet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 July 2026 12:47
To: LocalPlan
Categories: Awaiting info

CAUTION: This email originated from outside Telford & Wrekin Council's network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Sent from my iPad Dear Telford & Wrekin Council,

I am submitting this representation on MM130, covering proposed sites HOA5 and HOA15 near Allscott Meads.

The main point I wish to make is that Allscott has already taken a very large amount of housing growth. The former sugar factory site has become a substantial new estate, with around 470 homes recently developed or still being completed. It therefore seems unreasonable to add further sites before the consequences of that development are properly known.

Traffic is the most obvious pressure. Roads and junctions around Allscott Meads are already busy at peak times, and residents can see the change day to day. I understand that earlier work recognised this as a sensitive traffic area and that the scale of one site was reduced substantially. That should not be brushed aside. The cumulative effect of all housing in and around Allscott needs to be assessed openly.

There are also questions about whether everyday services can cope. GP access, school places and road capacity all matter to the soundness of the Plan. It is not enough to say that these matters can be dealt with later through planning applications, because the allocation itself creates the principle of development.

Drainage should also be considered before any site is allocated. Residents have seen standing water and flooding around the railway underbridge. If these problems exist now, further building may make them worse unless there is firm evidence to prove otherwise.

I am particularly concerned about the loss of greenfield land. The old sugar factory redevelopment used previously developed land. HOA5 and HOA15 would push development onto productive farmland, changing the character of the area and potentially opening the door to more greenfield expansion.

For these reasons, I object to MM130 as drafted. I ask that the Inspector gives proper weight to local highway, infrastructure, flooding and greenfield concerns before allowing these allocations to proceed.

Kind regards,

Jim and Eileen Collis

[REDACTED]