Shropshire Council: Shropshire Local Plan



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: C Pelling-Fulford

Q1. To which document does this representation relate?

\mathbf{N}	Regulation 1	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: Pol	icy:	Site: DUD	H006 Policies Map: S	8			
Q3. Do you consider the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan is:							
A. Legally compliant		Yes:	No:				
B. Sound		Yes:	No: 🗹				
C. Compliant with the Duty to	o Co-operate	Yes:	No:				

(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.

Site DUDH006 – described as Ravenscroft Haulage site but which is, in large part, Greenfield, agricultural land outside of the previous village development boundary – should **not** be 'saved' from the SAMDev process because its inclusion would be **UNSOUND**, as it is

- <u>Not Justified</u> it is based on inaccurate assumptions / information about the ground / soil conditions and drainage which go to the heart of the site's suitability for the proposed development
- <u>Not Effective</u> as a result of these inaccuracies and the site constraints the development numbers are undeliverable

And it is

 <u>Inconsistent with Policy</u> – particularly National Flood Planning Policy and SuDS drainage policy. And see Local Plan DP21 Flood Risk (Para 8,b,d,e,) and DP22 SuDS and SP8(para 1, d) insufficient infrastructure capacity

The proposal to include this site has not been made on a sound basis, for the following reasons:

- The site assessment relied on incorrect assumptions about the ground / soil conditions and drainage. The site is <u>not</u> located on 'Highly permeable geology', as stated in the SAMDev submission, but on impermeable clay. It floods, and acts as a storage area for flood water, as shown on the Environment Agency's map of Surface Water Flooding (attached), and as is revealed by observation of standing water on the site after rainfall.
- There has been a failure to correctly assess the Flood Risk despite assessment of local flood risk being identified as a Priority for Dudleston Heath Hub in the Ellesmere Place Plan – will bring a 'Major Development' within the definition at Annex 2 of the NPPF, of a 'More Vulnerable' use (housing), into an area currently put to a significantly less vulnerable use (Greenfield and part haulage yard). In addition, the Greenfield flood storage area will be lost. Discharges off the site to watercourses / ditches will increase flood risk to adjoining land. All contrary to planning policy at national and local level.
- Sustainable Drainage Solutions were not properly considered before the site assessment. Policy requirements are to do so at as early a stage as possible. The Local Government Association advice is that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be considered `at the earliest stage of site selection and design'.

• Drainage constraints have not been taken into account:

- On-site surface water storage may provide the most sustainable option, but would mean that large areas of land must be kept clear of development.
- Ground conditions/ flooding are such that soakaways are not a viable drainage solution
- The alternative of pumping to watercourses via a private pumping station, even if technically possible, is the least sustainable and least acceptable in flood risk terms
- Discharge of surface water to public sewer is contrary to the aims of SuDS and Severn Trent have said the existing pumping station already becomes overloaded especially at times of high rainfall, exactly when the discharge to sewer would be at its peak
- The development capacity of the site has been specified without due regard to drainage and other constraints (e.g. habitats, highways, presence of public sewers) on the site. An expressed suitability for 20 homes raises development expectations such that, if the site were to go forward as proposed, opportunities for the best and most sensible drainage and other planning solutions would be lost.

(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

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference:

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.

Necessary modifications

- The site DUDH006 should be either excluded or reassessed as to its suitability for development, taking into account:
 - Flooding / Drainage constraints of the site
 - Sustainable Drainage Solutions
 - Consequent development capacity of the site

(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)?

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.

Date: 25/02/2021

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference:



Environment Agency 'Risk of Flooding from Surface Water'

Site DUDH006 - Edged Red being former Ravenscroft haulage depot and adjoining agricultural land