



For Shropshire
Council use

Respondent
no:

Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDEV) Plan

**Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)
17 March 2014 – 28 April 2014**

Representations Form

Please note you can also make representations to the SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft using our online form via:

www.shropshire.gov.uk/samdev

This is a formal consultation on the legal compliance and soundness of the Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for examination by an Independent Planning Inspector. For advice on how to respond to the consultation and fill in this representations form please see the guidance notes available on the Council's website at www.shropshire.gov.uk/samdev.

Your details: Who is making this representation?

Name:	Mr Calvin Downes
Organisation (if applicable):	public
Address:	

If you are acting as an Agent, please use the following box to tell us who you are acting for:

Name:	
Organisation (if applicable):	
Address:	
Email:	
Telephone:	

Your Representations

Please note, you must use a separate form for each representation you wish to make.

(Please refer to the accompanying Guidance Notes on Making Representations when completing this section)

In the box below please give the policy, paragraph or section of the Policies Map your representation relates to:

Samdev plan Development management policy MD2 Para 2.i and Para 6 (explanation para 4.14)
In specific relation to settlement policy S12, site PBY018/029.

Is your representation in support or objection? (please tick as appropriate)

Support	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Object	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the Policies Map, do you consider the SAMDev Plan is:

Legally compliant	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If your representation considers the SAMDev Plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is not (*Please tick all that apply*):

Positively prepared	
Justified	✓
Effective	✓
Consistent with National Policy	

In the box below please specify your reason for supporting or objecting.

If you are objecting, you should make clear why the document is unsound having regard to the issues of 'legal compliance' or whether the document is not positively prepared, justified, effective or not consistent with national policy (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary).

My objection is to the use of site PBY018/029 (Hall Bank) for building the proposed 60 houses plus retail facilities when a perfectly valid alternative site is available within the village area that would mitigate much of the detrimental impact (traffic volumes) on the village of Pontesbury (centre) created by building on PBY018/029.

I would say first of all I live in the centre of the village so am not directly affected by either site options so am therefore 'an impartial party' in as much as having an 'estate' on my doorstep. However I would be impacted along with all local residents, by the detrimental consequences on the village of building at Hall Bank.

Whilst Pontesbury is a large 'nuclear' or 'clustered' Village, it is a village with the attributes of a village, i.e. a centre with a Village Green, Church, small retail outlets all on the main road, plus houses that are built abutting the road and houses that open directly onto the road (and pavement), 'vulnerable peoples' housing around the green etc.. Pontesbury not only services the Village residents, but from a 'retail/social' perspective has a far wider catchment area, attracting more vehicles.

Pontesbury sits on the A488 that is the main route from Bishops Castle to Shrewsbury and the major road systems around and beyond. Traffic going to/from Bishops Castle, Minsterley and all surrounding villages thus passes through Pontesbury and as the bulk of employment and major retail/social amenities are around Shrewsbury and beyond; this is the bulk of all journeys.

The A488 in Pontesbury is not wide enough to cater for a two way system, nor can it be widened, so it is a one-way circular road straight through the centre (Main road) one way and around the village (Hall Bank) the other way, in sections very narrow and twisting with houses abutting it.

For many years there have been requests for and suggestions of a bypass as the road system cannot adequately cope with the EXISTING volumes and nature of vehicles, let alone any increase. In reality a Bypass is extremely unlikely to be built in the foreseeable future and may not be desirable for the future of the village anyway, so it is incumbent on the planners of ANY development that is likely to INCREASE the traffic through Pontesbury, to consider and implement options that would minimise the effect of an increase in traffic volumes. The proposal to build on Hall Bank (PBY018/029) does the absolute opposite in that it forces ALL the additional traffic from these 60 houses (plus retail) on to the one-way system – there is simply NO physical alternative to that from the proposed site (other than a bypass service road – see below). Of course it is not just the additional traffic from the Hall Bank site to take account of when considering the traffic impact, but the increased traffic from the additional houses being built on the SW side of Pontesbury, Minsterley and the surrounding area (proposed 65) and Bishops Castle and area (proposed 200 +).

There is nothing that can be done to mitigate the traffic impact from/to the SW of Pontesbury, apart from a Village bypass which we can forget for the present, but the planners CAN and SHOULD do EVERYTHING they can to mitigate the impact from the additional housing in Pontesbury.

There is a site (PBY025 and 30) that is available that was supposedly part of the SAMDEV evaluations, although to date I have seen no evidence of a comparative analysis nor any detailed evaluation of these sites, despite asking the Shropshire Strategic Planning team for this. PBY025 and PBY030 are on the NE side of Pontesbury, so if these 60 houses plus retail were built there, virtually all 'commuting' and 'School run' traffic from these houses would NOT be forced around the one-way system and through the centre of Pontesbury – unlike from PBY018/029. For 60 houses this represents some estimated 170 additional journeys per day (based on figs extrapolated from the 'Rural Services Network') – remember this excludes additional service traffic and additional traffic from/to the SW towns

and villages.

It is absolutely incomprehensible why the Planners have chosen to 'ignore' the alternative site. I have asked for reasons (even one) and been given nothing but 'access would be simpler'. I see that as a very trivial reason (and it is certainly a debateable point given the geography of the site and the one-way system on that stretch of Hall Bank) for forcing all this additional traffic through the Village, which will absolutely create severe congestion problems and create further risk to life and limb for pedestrians.

If 'Planning' includes considering the impact and accounting for it over the longer term, which is my understanding, then I see no evidence of that at all in deciding to build on PBY018/029. Should the proposal (to build on PBY018/029) be agreed, my crystal ball suggests that due to the added congestion through the village, double yellow lines will be implemented within the village, and then as nobody can park to use the retail facilities, proposals will be made to turn the Village green into a car park or creating an 'out of village retail park', thus destroying the outlook and atmosphere of the Village – an impact the Planners have a duty to avoid.

The Strategic Planning team need to revisit this proposal and do some proper PLANNING for the area, not just take an easy route to satisfying the Government targets. The current proposal can only be detrimental to the Village as a whole and what is staggering is that an alternative exists that whilst not ideal (nobody wants an estate built on their doorstep, especially in the 'country'), does help mitigate the inevitable impact on the centre of Pontesbury.

Please reject the S12 proposals subject to a more detailed and valid analysis of the options and some proper planning and proposals to be implemented as part of this exercise, to manage the traffic volumes in Pontesbury.

Please use the box below to explain the changes you think should be made to the SAMDev Plan in order to make it legally compliant or sound? You should explain your suggested revisions to the policy,

paragraph or section of the Policies Map, and why this change would make the plan legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Plans implemented **as part** of this proposal, to mitigate the impact of additional traffic volumes without further destroying the Pontesbury Village centre. To this end I'm unaware, despite asking, of any reasons for not building on sites PBY025 and 30, which would mitigate the impacts.

Building on PBY025 and 30 instead of PBY018/029 is the option best suited to minimising the traffic impacts (and everything that would result from that) on the centre of Pontesbury.

Should there be valid reasons (yet to be published) why PBY025 and 30 are unsuitable (and I can see none when offset against the impact of the current proposal), one suggestion is the provision of a 'service road' to the estate on PBY018/029, across PBY025 and 30 linking in to the A488 on the NE side of the village. This would create a 'by-pass' for the new 'estate' avoiding the village centre.

We need some 'inventive thinking/planning' if we are to avoid destroying Pontesbury as a Village and making it a 'road crash' and 'pedestrian nightmare' waiting to happen.

Please be sure that you have provided all the information necessary to support your representations and any changes you are proposing. After this stage you will not be able to make any further representations about the SAMDev Plan to Shropshire Council. Any further submissions will only be possible at the invitation of the Inspector conducting the examination, who may seek additional information about the issues he/she has identified.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the examination?

Yes, I wish to give evidence about my representation at the examination.

☐

No, I wish to pursue my representations through this written representation.

☒

If you wish to attend the examination, please explain why you think this is necessary in the box below:

--

Do you wish to be notified of any of the following? Please tick all that apply. We will contact you using the details you have given above.

When the SAMDev Plan has been submitted for examination	✓
When the Inspector's Report is published	✓
When the SAMDev Plan is adopted	✓

Please return this form by 5pm on Monday 28 April 2014

You can e-mail it to:

Planning.policy@shropshire.gov.uk

Or return it to: Planning Policy Team, Shropshire Council, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Please note, we will acknowledge receipt of representations made by e-mail.

Data Protection Act 1998 and Freedom of Information Act 2000

Representations cannot be treated in confidence. Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires copies of all representations to be made publically available. The Council will place all the representations and the names of those who made them on its website, but will not publish personal information such as telephone numbers, emails or private addresses. By submitting a representation on the Pre-Submission SAMDev Plan you confirm that you agree to this.