From: Sian Evans

To: North Shropshire Reinforcement

Subject: FW: SP Manweb North Shropshire Reinforcement Adequacy of Consultation response

 Date:
 26 November 2018 13:48:50

 Attachments:
 EL- Eddie West (22 11 18).PDF

SPManweb Adequacy of Consultation response.doc

From: Ian Kilby [mailto:ian.kilby@shropshire.gov.uk]

Sent: 26 November 2018 12:37

To: Sian Evans

Cc: Edward West; Robert Macey

Subject: SP Manweb North Shropshire Reinforcement Adequacy of Consultation response

Dear Sian,

Please find attached a copy of Shropshire Council's response to the adequacy of consultation request for the above project. We have also received correspondence on this on behalf of the Canal and River Trust which they have agreed I can attach to this response to you.

Regards

Ian Kilby

Planning Services Manager Shropshire Council Shirehall Abbey Foregate Shrewsbury SY2 6ND

(01743) 258718

\*

If you are not the intended recipient of this email please do not send it on to others, open any attachments or file the email locally. Please inform the sender of the error and then delete the original email.

\*

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service. For more information please visit <a href="http://www.symanteccloud.com">http://www.symanteccloud.com</a>



Strictly Private and Confidential

Eddie West

Principal Planning Policy Officer

Shropshire Council

By email only: edward.west@shropshire.gov.uk Your Ref: Our Ref:

(P)MKH.MKF.TLM.CRT001.1324

Document No:

wh22512840v3

Date:

22 November 2018

Direct Line:

+44 (0) 191 204 4190

Direct Fax:

+44 (0) 191 204 4001

Email Address: melissa.flynn@wardhadaway.com

Dear Sirs

Re: Re-enforcement to North Shropshire Electricity Distribution Network Development

**Consent Order** 

Our Client: The Canal and River Trust ("the Trust")

**Applicant: SP Manweb** 

We are instructed by the Trust to advise in relation to the Development Consent Order which has been applied for by the Applicant for the re-enforcement to North Shropshire Electricity Distribution Network. We write to make representations in respect of the adequacy of the pre-application consultation undertaken by the Applicant and would be obliged if you would ensure these comments are taken in to account at the time that you submit your response to the Planning Inspectorate in respect of the adequacy of the consultation process pursuant to the Planning Act 2008.

As you will be aware, the Trust is a statutory undertaker for the purposes of section 127 of the Planning Act 2008 (2008 Act) and a statutory party as defined in Schedule 1 of the Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties and Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2015. On the basis of the limited information that has been made available to our client by the Applicant our client is concerned that the proposed development will have a significant impact upon the Montgomery Canal and its setting.

Whilst the Trust acknowledge that the Applicant, through its consultants, have been liaising with the Trust for some time, there have been clear deficiencies in the consultation process as follows:

1. Our client has consistently stated as part of its formal responses to the consultation (correspondence dated 6 April 2017 and 2 February 2018) and has also raised in a number of meetings that there is a need to fully assess the potential to underground the electrical cables in the vicinity of the canal. We do not accept that this issue has been properly addressed and we do not consider that the Applicant's latest response

**Ward Hadaway Solicitors** 

Sandgate House, 102 Quayside, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 3DX Tel: +44 (0)191 204 4000 Fax: +44 (0)191 204 4001 DX: 730360 Newcastle upon Tyne 30 Email: legal@wardhadaway.com Web: www.wardhadaway.com







**INVESTORS** 

that this will be addressed in the documentation to be submitted with the Application to be satisfactory.

- 2. The Trust's Estates Team have not yet been contacted and there has been no attempt to discuss with our client in even very broad terms the necessary rights that the applicant will require in order to deliver the project.
- 3. Whilst we have been provided with draft protective provisions, we have not received a copy of the draft Development Consent Order which would provide the context to enable us to review the protected provisions. We acknowledge that this is now available on the Planning Inspectorate's website but we have not had the opportunity to review this during the pre-application consultation.
- 4. Notwithstanding that a number of requests have been made, the Trust has not been provided with an appropriate undertaking from the Applicant to cover the Trust's reasonable legal costs. The Trust is a charity with limited resources and require its reasonable legal costs to be covered in order to facilitate its engagement with the Examination process.

In summary, we do not consider that the pre-application consultation meets the requirements of Chapter 2 of Part 5 of the Planning Act 2008 and the DCLG's Guidance "Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the Pre-Application Process" (March 2015) and we would respectfully ask the Council to carefully take in to account these concerns at the time that it responds to the Planning Inspectorate in respect of the adequacy of the consultation to date.

