

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:	Hugh Trevor-Jones
------------------------	-------------------

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="5.52-5.65"/>	Policy:	<input type="text" value="S3.1"/>	Site:	<input type="text" value="Tasley Garden Village Bridgnorth"/>	Policies Map:	<input type="text" value="S3"/>
------------	--	---------	-----------------------------------	-------	---	---------------	---------------------------------

Q3. Do you consider the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan is:

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|
| A. Legally compliant | Yes: <input 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 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.

Reasons why I do not think Policy S3.1 is sound

1. Shropshire Plan Policy

Tasley Garden Village (TGV) would surround the relocated livestock market on three sides, constricting its operations and threatening its viability. This is also in contradiction to Shropshire Council's requirement to keep the market away from housing as the two are incompatible.

2. Landscape

The TGV site is described as having the appearance of 'deep countryside' rather than 'urban fringe', it is divorced from the town and has an open parkland feel to it. It is in the foreground to the Shropshire Hills beyond, a designated AONB. The proposed TGV would forever destroy this setting. The development would impact on four Sites of Special Scientific interest, two listed buildings on the site and encroach on nearby Grade 1 listed Morville Hall.

3. Transportation

The proposed development is on the opposite side of Bridgnorth from the major towns to the north and east of Telford, Wolverhampton and Stourbridge, so that commuter and business traffic travelling to the development from these areas would result in increased congestion, noise and pollution in and around Bridgnorth. The proposal to construct a pedestrian and cycling bridge over the A458 cannot be delivered as the developer does not own the land, so residents will be forced to walk across the busy bypass to reach the town centre. The site currently has no bus service and the closest bus stop is one mile away. For the first ten years access to the development is proposed along the B4364 (Ludlow Road) a narrow country lane that is wholly inadequate for the purpose.

4. Garden Village Principles

There is no evidence that the developer's proposals follow Garden Village Principles, as set out in Sir Ebenezer Howard's recommendations and adopted by the Town and Country Planning Association. For example, there is no evidence of the requirement for strong vision, leadership and community engagement, or of community ownership of land and long-term stewardship of assets. The developer is a major volume housebuilder principally motivated by profit and shareholder returns and they are not known for retaining control or interest over their developments following completion.

5. Consultation

The developer submitted their proposal after the deadline, during the Covid-19 lockdown in April 2020 and with minimal local consultation. Shropshire Council's consultation has been added subsequently and appears to have been designed to raise the minimum amount of input from members of the public and local democratic representatives. Bridgnorth Town Council, Tasley Parish Council and Morville Parish Council have all objected to the proposals. Bridgnorth Town Council voted 6-2 in favour of the alternative development at Stanmore over Tasley at an extraordinary meeting in May 2020.

(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

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference:

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.

The Tasley Garden Village proposal should be abandoned in favour of the alternative site at Stanmore, for which a thorough proposal has been carefully worked up over several years in full discussion with the County Council.

(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 in hearing session(s) if the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.*

Signature:

Date:

10/02/2021

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference: