



LATE SCOPING CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Consultation bodies have 28 days to respond with any comments, stating either the information that they consider should be included in the ES or that they do not have any comments.

Any responses received after the deadline are not considered within the scoping opinion but are forwarded to the Applicant for consideration in accordance with the policy set out in Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment, Screening and Scoping.

The following EIA scoping consultation responses were received after the consultation deadline specified under legislation and therefore did not form part of the Secretary of State's Scoping Opinion.



Development Services
Shropshire Council
Shirehall
Abbey Foregate
Shrewsbury
Shropshire SY2 6ND

Alison L Down,
EIA & Land Rights Advisor
The Planning Inspectorate
3D Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2, The Square
Bristol TF8 7BL

Date: 11 April 2017
My ref: PREAPP/17/00145
Your ref: 170309_EN02002
1_000011

Dear Alison,

PLANNING ACT 2008. INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2009 (AS AMENDED) – REGULATIONS 8 AND 9.
APPLICATION BY SP ENERGY NETWORKS FOR AN ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE REINFORCEMENT TO NORTH SHROPSHIRE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION NETWORK. SCOPING CONSULTATION

Thank you for your recent consultation letter. I would confirm that Shropshire Council as the relevant local planning authority does not object to the proposals and welcomes this initiative to upgrade local electricity infrastructure.

I would confirm that the applicant has entered into detailed pre-application discussions with the Council and consultations have taken place with relevant internal consultees on the applicant's draft EIA documents. No objections have been received. Comments received by the Local Planning Authority can be summarised as follows:

Landscape Advisor

The methodologies are comprehensive, clear, plainly written and appropriate to the latest Guidance. The choice of landscape and visual receptors and the group receptor viewpoints are acceptable. The photomontage from Nonely Hall looks as though it is from a location closer to the line route than expected. It is surprising that the cables are shown as visible above the horizon. This may be more of a concern for the Council's Historic Environment team.

Historic Environment

We have been engaged in pre-application discussion with the scheme promoters for some months now. In particular, we have discussed the proposed scope and methodological approaches to be used within the assessment work for the historic environment chapter of the Environmental Statement, and provided feedback on the related section of their draft Scoping Report. On one point of detail, we would observe that the Report still appears confuse Oswestry Castle (the medieval castle in the town centre) with Old Oswestry hillfort (the Iron Age hillfort to the north of the town) in some places. We would recommend that this is corrected to ensure consistency throughout. Otherwise, the report is in line with the

advice we have provided to date and we therefore have no further comments to make at this stage.

Economic Growth

The report does not address the economic impact the investment will have in facilitating the growth plans for North Shropshire. Development proposals for housing and employment are predicated on the availability of power which has been an issue in Whitchurch and Oswestry due to supply and capacity constraints. The Economic Growth team sent a letter of support to Scottish Power in 2016 which identifies the benefits of the upgrade.

Ecology

The Council's ecologist has made detailed comments on the wording of the ecology section of the EIA which have been incorporated into the updated ecological report. Regarding specific sections:

Table 9.1 - Bats: The timing of detailed bat surveys is important with a preference for the results to be available from the PEIR rather than from the EIA in spring 2018.

Table 9.1 - GCN: The main concern is that if a conventional EPS mitigation licence is required for particular working areas (i.e. the works would not fit the specific requirements of a low impact class license) then population data would be required.

Para 9.4.9 - Additional wording to explain potential need for extra survey is agreed whilst noting that as desk study records are so few and far between they should only be used as an indication of presence, not absence.

Drainage

A sustainable drainage scheme for the disposal of surface water from the development should be designed and constructed in accordance with the Council's Surface Water Management: Interim Guidance for Developers document. It is available on the Council's website at: www.shropshire.gov.uk/drainage-and-flooding/local-flood-risk-management-strategy/.

The provisions of the Planning Practice Guidance, in particular Section 21 Reducing the causes and impacts of flooding, should be followed.

Preference should be given to drainage measures which allow rainwater to soakaway naturally. Connection of new surface water drainage systems to existing drains / sewers should only be undertaken as a last resort, if it can be demonstrated that infiltration techniques are not achievable.

Parks and Recreation

No comments

Minerals (Comments of Planning Development Management team)

The power line route intersects Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSA) identified in the Council's SAMDev Plan. SAMDev Policy MD16(3) advises that: 'Applications for permission for non-mineral development in a MSA must include an assessment of the effect of the proposed development on the mineral resource beneath or adjacent to the site of the development or the protected mineral handling facility (termed a Mineral Assessment). This assessment will provide information to accompany the planning application to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the MPA that mineral interests have been adequately considered and that known mineral resources will be prevented, where possible, from being sterilised or unduly restricted by other forms of development occurring on or close to the resource'.

The applicant has commissioned a Mineral Assessment covering the key overlap areas between the power line route and the MSA. This establishes to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority that there would be no mineral sterilisation issues and hence there is no conflict with policy MD16.

Aviation Safeguarding (Comments of Planning Development Management team)

The proposed power line route passes close to the licensed aerodrome at Sleaf Airfield which mainly accommodates light propeller driven aircraft. Shropshire Council as Planning Authority has adopted informal safeguarding system in accordance with relevant Civil Aviation Authority Guidance (CAP 168, CAP232) and this has previously been agreed with the Sleaf Aero-club.

The principal runway at Sleaf is oriented north-east – south-west and aircraft normally take off and land into the prevailing south-westerly winds. The sector to the north-east of the principal runway is therefore used as the runway approach. It is undesirable to have any tall obstacles on or close to this approach route. It is understood that the type of line proposed would be 12m high which is preferable to other taller options in aviation terms.

Following discussion with planning officers the applicant has agreed to move the power line route further to the north (i.e. towards Pearl Farm) at the point nearest to the aerodrome landing zone. Provided this occurs it is considered at this stage that aviation safety interests are capable of being adequately addressed in principle. It is however recommended that the Planning Inspectorate satisfies itself with respect to this matter.

I hope this information is helpful.

Yours sincerely



Grahame French
Principal Planner

Tel: 01743 258714; Email graham.french@shropshire.gov.uk