

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: | Mrs M A Westrop |
|------------------------|-----------------|

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: Policy: Site: Policies Map:

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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.

Clive is not a Hub and the correct score for Clive's amenities and services is 47 points after the shop and bowling green are removed: not 54 as set out in the Plan. A community survey showed 68% of Clive residents were firmly against Clive's being classed as a Hub and would prefer to lose amenity rather than change the character of Clive by having so many new houses.

My own personal response is twofold. Firstly, I myself have no car and I think that there is not sufficient transport to support such a large development. Clive does not have sufficient facilities to be a Hub and there is no shop, pub or outdoor sports facility and difficult transport. Above all, there is an absence of employment opportunity for development of this kind. There is a limit to numbers the economy can sustain through internet working and some jobs will always require a physical presence but they are not here in Clive.

Secondly, I think that the response from the council to the information that the shop and bowling green had closed was not reasonable or cooperative. You require 'further evidence' about the use of the premises where the shop used to be. Otherwise you say there is a shop there. The shop has gone. It is Kafkaesque to require someone to prove something that is not there, is not there. There is no evidence it is returning. It is unreasonable and un-cooperative to attribute points to something that is not there: pari passu there is no bowling green and it is unreasonable to make us prove there is none.

(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 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 Plan should also address problems of consistency with the NPPF which requires at section 16 that the Plan has a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment and in particular the rules under section 185, which highlights the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring. The Plan should be modified to a more modest development target because development site options CLV010 or CLV012, and CLV018 would result in making the village too attenuated. The village has grown naturally around a centre and placing all new people out on a long limb is problematic for community cohesion and continuity of the historic character of the village. The Plan should be modified so that the outline development area is more compact.

The Plan should be modified so that, like our sister village, Grinshill, we are a Community Cluster. Development numbers should be commensurately smaller: modestly and realistically planned on a smaller scale so that it is the natural and sustainable level for the real economy of Clive and for the continued wellbeing of its residents.

For reasons set out fully in the response to Q4 above, the Plan, uncorrected is unsound on the grounds of justification because the designation of Hub is not based on proportionate evidence.

(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 when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.*

| | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Signature: <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Date: 31/1/2021 |
| | Office Use Only | Part A Reference: Part B Reference: |