



COMPLETE

Collector: New Link (Web Link)
Started: Friday, April 25, 2014 6:10:30 AM
Last Modified: Friday, April 25, 2014 6:33:36 AM
Time Spent: 00:23:06
IP Address: 91.195.113.2

PAGE 1

Q1: Your details:

Name: Paul Field-Williams
 Address:

Q2: Are you acting on behalf of anyone? No

PAGE 2

Q3: Who are you acting on behalf of: *Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 3: Representation details

Q4: Please give the policy/paragraph/policies map details for your first representation relates to: SAMDev Schedule S17.1a: Housing Sites – Land at Tilley (WEM012)

Q5: Is your representation in support or objection? Object

Q6: In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map do you consider that the SAMdev is: See guidance notes sections 1 and 2 for the meanings of 'legally compliant' and 'sound'.

Legally compliant No
 Sound No

Q7: If your representation considers the SAMDev plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is: (tick as many as apply) Not positively prepared, Not justified, Not effective, Not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework

Q8: 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.

I would like to object to the proposal to build or develop, in any way, on the land to the south of Sun Grove, Roden Grove and Brook Drive, registered as the SAMDev plan Site WEM012 in Wem.

This location is not suitable for development. There have been numerous attempts by the land owner to apply for planning permission to build in this field over a number of years and permission has always been denied. The site has been reviewed as part of the Local Plan but was considered unsuitable for development because of the flooding/infrastructure issues and also the desire to maintain the distinction between Wem and the village of Tilley. The circumstances have not changed and therefore the original reasoning and decisions should be sustained. Why is this parcel of land now considered suitable?

My understanding of the principles behind SAMDev is to meet Shropshire Council's Core Strategy expectations by building affordable housing to assist in the growth and regeneration of local hubs, communities and market towns. The proposals to build at Site WEM012 will do nothing to achieve this but will have an unwelcome and unnecessarily detrimental impact on the surrounding properties in that area.

The site in question, for many years, has been prone to flooding. The River Roden runs less than 200m from the site and according to the Environment Agency (EA) web site the area is currently at risk of flooding from the river. The EA also state that the land adjacent to the proposed site is prone to flooding from surface water as the water table is high.

Surface water on the field, especially during the winter months, sits on the ground until it dissipates or it runs off into the adjacent

SAMdev consultation 2014

properties. On a number of occasions over the years, and especially more recently with high levels of rain fall, residents have had their gardens flooded with 6 to 12 inches of water which has remained for many days after. (Photo evidence is available). On a number of occasions Shropshire Council has had to provide sand bags to help protect properties adjacent to the field along Sun Grove. Any additional properties constructed in the fields opposite could only make matters worse and force the surface water towards the existing properties.

The existing drainage infrastructure in the adjacent estate roads are almost 50 years old. They do not cope with the current levels of surface and foul water drainage and on numerous occasions Severn Trent have had to come to the area to assist the outflow and also repair the deteriorating system when water and other drainage contents began 'backing up' into the road.

A development on Site WEM012 will bring extra foul and surface water that would have to connect to the existing, inadequate system. This can only increase the existing problems and have a significant, detrimental affect on the local properties.

The original SAMdev consultation document stated that: 'There are critical infrastructure capacity issues concerning wastewater treatment and access capacity constraints.' and a recent report regarding the working capability of Wem Town Sewage Works included the following statement:

'while the system is coping with the catchments and areas to the east of the railway line there are known internal flooding problems to the south of the river Roden'.

Site WEM012 was discussed in detail at a 'special' Wem Town Council meeting on 12th July 2012 and requests to reject the site were supported by a number of Shropshire and Wem Town Councillors. A 376 signature petition objecting to the development was presented and at the meeting the Town Council agreed that the site should not be built upon and dropped from the SAMDev proposal. I have included some excerpts from the minutes of the meeting:

Resolved:- that Shropshire Council be advised that this Council would not support a housing development on land off Roden Grove because of the flooding issues.

Resolved:- that Shropshire Council be advised that this Council has strong concerns about the capacity of the infrastructure and road system to cope with the proposed number of dwellings and that this Council does not support the housing development on land off Roden Grove.

The original SAMDev application was to build 32 houses on the site. I note that the current proposal is now to build 10. I do not believe that this is a true and honest aspiration of the landowner and I believe that this is a 'veiled' attempt to introduce a 'softer' option that would attract less interest from locals and subsequent objections and, if pursued, I believe would create a new precedence for future desires to increase the development size and build even more buildings. Such development would have a significant and severe affect on the surrounding area and would be difficult to control.

The site is landlocked on three sides by the river, the railway and the recently planted wood at Tiley. The only available access to the site is via the estate road serving Roden Grove. Any proposed development will increase traffic volume, speed and noise pollution to the area. This will introduce a greater number of car journeys along a road that was designed using 1960's design standards to accommodate far less volumes of traffic.

The governments planning guidance PPG13 sets out a requirement for new developments to promote sustainable transport links such as the provision of cycle lanes. The road widths along Roden Grove could not accommodate such facilities and therefore any new development would generally be accessed by car. This goes against local and national policies for developing areas with 'green' transport links to access them. Roden Grove could not sustain the extra traffic nor accommodate improvements to provide alternative 'greener' facilities.

Further traffic will also bring road safety problems to the area and will impact on the living conditions of the young and elderly families that already live there. This problem would increase considerably if the site is expanded in the future. Greater traffic volumes will also create an extra burden on the busy Roden Grove junction with Mill Street. This will give rise to further queuing, congestion and road safety issues at this junction especially at the busy pedestrian desire line along Mill Street.

Any new drainage and utilities system for the 10 properties would have to be connected to the town's existing systems via Roden Grove, Sun Grove and Brook Drive. They could not by-pass the existing, ageing and already overburdened system. I refer again to the SAMDev document statement 'There are critical infrastructure capacity issues concerning wastewater treatment and access capacity constraints.'

This clearly demonstrates that Shropshire and Wem Town Councils already have concerns about the capacity for drainage in this part of the town. Any additional affect on capacity will only bring greater and expensive maintenance problems to area. It will also create long term and significant financial burdens to the local authority that will have to provide on-going financial commitments that can only be drawn upon from the dwindling local authority budgets and resources in the future. This is not sustainable.

It is clear that developing on Site WEM012 is totally impractical and would create many un-manageable problems and costly maintenance burdens for Shropshire Council for many years to come. There are numerous, more suitable, practical and realistic sites available elsewhere in the town that could be developed with minimal impact to Wem businesses, residents and local services. This development cannot be allowed to go ahead and I urge Shropshire Council to remove the proposed site WEM012 from the SAMDev proposal and prevent any future attempts to introduce any other form of development on or near this field.

SAMdev consultation 2014

Q9: 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.

The principal SAMDev site for the Wem development, Site WEM003, proposes 100 properties to the north west of the town. If this is considered the most suitable location for such a significant number of dwellings and therefore a more suitable location for the town's future growth plans and, if it is the council's desire is to build a total 110 new dwellings, why not introduce all 110 properties at site WEM003 and not pursue the 10 properties at WEM012?

Strategically, compared to 100 new properties, a nominal 10 properties to south of the town would not have an impact on the town's future growth and core strategy. Why create such a sizable disruption to the detriment of the existing infrastructure and local residents for the sake of 10 houses?

Why go to the expense and disruption of introducing new and additional services at two separate sites? Why create such a burden on the existing drainage, gas and electricity supplies on the area to the south of the town and introduce un-sustainable maintenance problems in the future for the sake of 10 houses?

The cost and disruption of providing the additional services would not be proportional to the number of houses built. The cost for providing the services and the disruption would not be minimised because there are only 10 dwellings, they would be the same for each site. This is not practical and is not an effective use of public funds.

If 110 new dwellings are required then the SAMDev proposals should be changed to introduce the full 110 properties allocation at Site WEM003 and remove the proposal for any development at Site WEM012.

Q10: Do you wish to make another representation?

No

PAGE 4: Representation details 2

Q11: Please give the policy/paragraph/policies map details for your first representation relates to:

Respondent skipped this question

Q12: Is your representation in support or objection?

Respondent skipped this question

Q13: In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map do you consider that the SAMdev is: See guidance notes sections 1 and 2 for the meanings of 'legally compliant' and 'sound'.

Respondent skipped this question

Q14: If your representation considers the SAMDev plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is: (tick as many as apply)

Respondent skipped this question

Q15: 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.

Respondent skipped this question

Q16: 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.

Respondent skipped this question

Q17: Do you wish to make another representation?

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 5: Representation details 3

Q18: Please give the policy/paragraph/policies map details for your first representation relates to:

Respondent skipped this question

Q19: Is your representation in support or objection?

Respondent skipped this question

SAMdev consultation 2014

Q20: In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map do you consider that the SAMdev is: See guidance notes sections 1 and 2 for the meanings of 'legally compliant' and 'sound'.

Respondent skipped this question

Q21: If your representation considers the SAMDev plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is: (tick as many as apply)

Respondent skipped this question

Q22: 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.

Respondent skipped this question

Q23: 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.

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 6: Finally...

Q24: 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

PAGE 7

Q25: If you wish to attend the examination please explain why you think this is necessary.

I can supply back ground information and photographic evidence of flooding and drainage issues.

Q26: Do you wish to be notified of any of the following: (we will contact you using the details you have provided)

When the SAMDev plan has been submitted for examination	Yes
When the Inspector's report is published	Yes
When the SAMDev plan is adopted	Yes