

## Representation Form

Please complete a separate **Part B Representation Form** (this part) for each representation that you would like to make. One **Part A Representation Form** must be enclosed with your **Part B Representation Form(s)**.

We have also published a separate **Guidance Note** to explain the terms used and to assist in making effective representations.

### Part B: Representation

Name and Organisation:	Helen Hill
------------------------	------------

#### Q1. To which document does this representation relate?

- Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- Sustainability Appraisal of the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- (Please tick one box)

#### Q2. To which part of the document does this representation relate?

Paragraph:	<input type="text" value="S13"/>	Policy:	<input type="text" value="5"/>	Site:	<input type="text" value="MUW012VAR"/>	Policies Map:	<input type="text"/>
------------	----------------------------------	---------	--------------------------------	-------	--	---------------	----------------------

#### Q3. Do you consider the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan is:

- |  |                               |   |
|--|-------------------------------|---|
| A. Legally compliant                     | Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Sound                                 | Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate | Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(Please tick as appropriate).

#### Q4. Please give details of why you consider the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Much Wenlock's Neighbourhood Plan was agreed in 2014 when the residents overwhelming stated how development in the town should proceed. The Development Plan plays lip service to the Neighbourhood Plan stating in para S13.1 pt.2 that it will continue to form part of the Development Plan but there is no evidence that this is the case; focussing instead on a large development MUW012VAR which is outside the development boundary of the town, and is a large scale development which was not agreed in the Neighbourhood Plan.

In March 2020 I submitted a 50 signature petition to Shropshire Council, Much Wenlock Town Council, Severn Trent, Environment Agency from concerned residents asking for flood defences to be built on the Hunters Gate side of the town to protect homes and properties on Hunters Gate, Forester Ave and Barrow Street that regularly flood. £2.1m flood defences were built on the other side of town (Sytche Lane, Stretton Road) and I believe Shropshire Council has failed to protect homes on this side of the town thereby in breach of their legal duty having acknowledged the risk the town faces being located in a natural depression with a flood risk equivalent to Boscastle. To propose to now build 120 homes on the field that regularly floods adjacent to Hunters Gate and to rely on a developer led solution is not sound

as previous developer led solutions e.g. Hunters Gate and Consensus / Callaughton Lane have not worked and only added to the risk of flooding. The preferred site MUW012VAR I believe has been pre-determined by Shropshire Council and Much Wenlock Town Council without proper engagement with the residents of the town. There was an initial presentation by the developer! Hardly taking into account the Neighbourhood Plan nor asking or involving residents for their thoughts but rather presenting a done deal. At a meeting of the Town Council Planning Committee which I attended a few years ago when a plan for the development of MUW012VAR was being discussed we were met with the Chair saying what are you all doing here we are not going to discuss it! With Councillors saying "don't listen to him he is a troublemaker" this is not sound and resulted with me writing to MP asking if the way the Town Council operated could be investigated. As the town has a flood risk of rapid flooding why is a whole town solution not being sought to put in place a plan building an infrastructure that can enable any growth to happen safely. Consideration needs to be given to flooding, traffic, with a system of managing water by maybe building holding areas to release water slowly thereby protecting homes. I believe Shropshire Council should have sought to engage with residents and ask them to how they see the town developing in the next 50 years and then produce a robust plan showing how this could happen possibly through the building of a bypass creating land for housing, employment, health, education and an effective flood defence scheme rather than preferring to build on the field with the worst record of flooding which is outside the town's development boundary.

*(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

**Q5. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at Q4 above.**

*Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination. You will need to say why each modification will make the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.*

Shropshire Council needs to engage with residents to address flood risk for the town and show a coherent plan for managing water along the length of the River Severn and it's catchment area rather than propose building on a field that floods regularly and state that the flooding risk can be solved by a developer led solution.

How can the growth proposed in Cressage, Buildwas and Much Wenlock meet carbon reduction targets due to the volume of traffic with associated pressure on a medieval road network.

A whole town solution is needed to address all the issues – traffic (pressure on Gaskell Corner – build a bypass), Water - flooding build a system of flood defences for the town not a one off developer led solution which have not worked in the past; fresh water as Much Wenlock regularly has to have tankers pumping water into the system as there is insufficient pressure due the the growth of housing in Telford and foul water as the sewage farm is already at capacity. I believe Shropshire Council has failed to cooperate with Telford Council and Severn Trent to ensure sufficient water supplies can be maintained.

*(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

**Please note:** *In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.*

**After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

**Q6. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?**

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference:

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

(Please tick one box)

**Q7. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:**

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Please note:** The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

Signature: H. Hill

Date: 10/02/2021

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference: