

## 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:	ANNA MOSZYNSKA
------------------------	----------------

#### 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="Pg16"/>	Policy:	<input type="text" value="App Q"/>	Site:	<input type="text" value="SHR060"/>	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No: | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| B. Sound                                 | Yes: | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate | Yes: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No: | <input 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.

<p>I do not feel this plan is sound as it proposes to create and excess of development on an area that contains established natural beauty, that has been established for centuries.</p> <p>The level of development is excessive and the density of housing will also be an incredible burden on the already saturated land. The water level is already rising in the local area ponds, the run off from the fields is extreme, and this development will increase this issue.</p> <p>Within SHR060 on its East boundary there is a large pool which is recognised within the Site Assessments of the Sustainability Appraisal (App Q p517-519). However, this fails to attract any negative scoring (p16) for what should be considered a Wildlife Site. This is the area that I think needs urgent protection.</p>
---

(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.

I would like to see the following:

- Reduction in the density of housing
- Insistence on the retention of existing green spaces and natural habitats
- Creation of a green corridor that runs through the estate that enhances and protects the existing habitats, and provides a pleasant outdoor space for well being and safer recreational space
- Separate cycle paths for safe travel within and beyond the development boundary – especially for and around travel to the new schools
- Separate pedestrian paths for safe movement within and beyond the development boundary – especially for and around travel to the new schools
- The significant pond adjacent to Violet Grove and Bluebell place, which is recognised as a core/priority habitat (p518) should be given appropriate negative scores (1-3) in recognition of it being a wildlife site with diverse permanent and migrating waterfowl and amphibious creatures. This site is a Poor site for development due to the potential damage to these existing habitats, which are established and recorded on the OS maps from over 100 years ago.
- *The existing trees and hedgerows will not be protected with this density of development*
- *Proposed Key Green corridor is not in the best place and ignores the previously published Shrewsbury Big Town Plan Green Network and seems to fail to identify the significant pond to the East of SHR060 which is a significant wildlife attraction.*
- *The Master Plan suggests building almost to the waters edge which would severely affect the migrating birds that use those fields and impact the existing permanent resident waterfowl.*
- *This area would provide be an excellent green space and corridor and enable a nature walk around the other existing natural ponds in the area..*
- *The proposal does not maintain the link between existing ponds and buffer as much as possible from these.*
- *The proposal does not include a sustainable drainage plan as water levels are already an issue with them rising annually and recent heavy rain has seen streams of water flowing from the fields in SHR060 to the existing large pond.*
- *Flood concerns and erosion for some existing properties, will only get worse when there is less natural surface run off and pools with more built-up areas*
- *The schools are planned to be completed before this proposed development, but other essential community services need to be guaranteed as part of the planning permission.*
- *Access for the schools is already a concern as it will be off Squinter Pip and Red Deer Road as they are too narrow, bendy and parking causes further issues. Additional Access from the new site to the school is essential.*
- *Park and Ride towards Mytton Oak Road would be good but access from it and then through to Hanwood Road a concern.*
- *This development in combination with the proposed inner link road will become very busy when there are issues on the A5 in peak season.*
- *Roads already busy when A5 has congestion. The roundabout between Red Deer Road and Bank Farm is not fit for purpose now and needs serious consideration with increased traffic which will be generated. The new development will add to this congestion.*
- *Consideration of adding traffic signals where the Hanwood Road joins the A5 as already queues from in peak times; with significant housing added this will only worsen.*
- *Need to wait for NWRR to be completed before further development occurs, rather than this.*

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference:

- Local centre to North of SHR158 great but must be guaranteed, still waiting for the play areas in Bowbrook and Darwin's Walk. There is no current allocation of play areas for youngsters defined on the development plan.

(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.

Signature:

ANNA MOSZYNSKA

Date:

24/02/2021

Office Use Only

Part A Reference:

Part B Reference: