

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:	ROBERT	DAVIES	
Q1. To which document do	es this repre	sentation relat	e?
Regulation 19: Pre-Submi	ssion Draft of th	ne Shropshire Loca	l Plan
Sustainability Appraisal of Local Plan	the Regulation	19: Pre-Submissio	on Draft of the Shropshire
Habitats Regulations Asse Shropshire Local Plan (Please tick one box)	ssment of the R	egulation 19: Pre-	Submission Draft of the
Q2. To which part of the de	ocument doe	s this represen	tation relate?
Paragraph: Poli	cy:	3 Site:	Policies Map:
Q3. Do you consider the Re Shropshire Local Plan is:	egulation 19:	Pre-Submissio	n Draft of the
A. Legally compliant		Yes:	No: 🗹
B. Sound		Yes:	No: 🗹
C. Compliant with the Duty to (Please tick as appropriate).	Co-operate	Yes:	No: 🗹

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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the have not taken into account how Covid 19 restrictions have impacted people's ability to have their say and have not stopped this process due to Covid19.

The consultation has not taken into account the restrictions on public involvement because of Covid19 restrictions and it is therefore against government guidelines. One of the stated consultations means for people without internet access is through public libraries. Much Wenlock library is now closed, as are all libraries throughout Shropshire, resulting in those without internet access not being able to participate in the consultation process. The demographics of Shropshire on the 2011 census states that 24% of the population in the county is over 65 and are more likely to rely on libraries for internet access. As you can see, the consultation process has not been sound as these demographics have had no access to the resources they need to respond.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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.

I ask the Independent inspector to review Shropshire Councils consultation process during Covid19 and the obvious impacts that has had on preventing people from replying.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the have not taken into account how Covid 19 restrictions have impacted people's ability to have their say and have not stopped this process due to Covid19.

(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)

Signature:		Date:	03/02/2021
	Office Line Only	Part A Reference	e:
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference	:e:



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

Na	ame and Organisation:	ROB	SERT	DF	AVIES
Q1.	To which document	does this repro	esentatio	n relat	e?
Ø	Regulation 19: Pre-Sub	mission Draft of t	he Shrops	hire Loca	l Plan
	Sustainability Appraisal Local Plan	of the Regulation	n 19: Pre-S	ubmissic	on Draft of the Shropshire
	Habitats Regulations As Shropshire Local Plan (Please tick one box)	sessment of the l	Regulation	19: Pre-	Submission Draft of the
Q2.	To which part of the	document doe	es this re	present	tation relate?
Parag	graph: P	olicy: 10.15 to 16-25 \$	3 Site:		Policies Map:
100 million (100	Do you consider the opshire Local Plan is:		: Pre-Sul	omissio	n Draft of the
Α.	Legally compliant		Yes:	\checkmark	No:
в.	Sound		Yes:		No: 🗹
	Compliant with the Duty lease tick as appropriate)		Yes:		No: 🗹

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.

I believe Cressage should remain as Open Countryside and not be designated a Community Hub so ensuring that no significant housing development will be allowed to take place for the life span of this Local Plan.

There is very strong evidence that the majority of residents in Cressage do not want any more large scale development of the village. In 2019, nearly 300 residents from Cressage responded to Shropshire Council asking not to be classed as a Community hub. In 2020, over 250 residents from Cressage and Cross Houses responded asking to remain Open Countryside.

A full scale needs assessment should be undertaken so that the community can understand exactly what it is that the village wants. Until this is done I am not sure how Shropshire Council Planning Department can understand what is right for our village.

I am concerned that the Parish Council are already taking as read that this Community Hub is a given – they should not be taking this view. This has led to confusion and uncertainty for many residents. The Parish Council has misrepresented the Village views throughout. It feels throughout this whole process that the people of Cressage have not been listened to I would ask that the Inspector at the Public Inquiry specifically looks into this issue.

I ask the Inspector to evaluate how and if, Shropshire council evaluated and processed the previous consultation resonses. Local reports told of staff shortages within Shropshire Council due to the Covid-19 outbreak and many believe this consultation process was unable to happen thoroughly or fairly. How can nearly 300 responses to previous rounds of consultation be ignored? Why was no feedback or acknowledgement given?

Shropshire Council will almost certainly face a legal challenge over its new local plan if it does not take into account how Covid 19 restrictions have impacted people's ability to have their say. Having not stopped this process due to Covid19 and the number of cases still to be heard in the courts, this case may not come up for a few months with the outcome being that the local authority must re-run the entire regulation 19 process again.

There are four 'Gunning principles' for public consultations, including the stipulation that "there is adequate time for consideration and response". The consultation has not taken into account the restrictions on public involvement because of Covid19 restrictions and it is therefore against government guidelines. One of the stated consultations means for people without internet access is through public libraries. Much Wenlock library is now closed, as are all libraries throughout Shropshire, resulting in those without internet access not being able to participate in the consultation process. The demographics of Shropshire on the 2011 census states that 24 per cent of the population (76,030 persons) in the county is over 65 and they are more likely to rely on libraries for internet access and are more likely to respond to consultations. As you can see, the consultation process has not been sound as these demographics have had no access to the resources they need to respond.

The way in which Cressage has been selected for Community Hub status is incorrect. I would make the following arguements. The proposed Hub status is based on a points system and there are several areas of contention in the scoring of services, facilities and employment for Cressage.

Cressage Parish Council (PC) along with Councillor Clare Wild held a public meeting on January 8th 2019. This was attended by over 80 people who all felt strongly against the classification of Cressage becoming a Hub. As well as this, nearly 300 Cressage residents responded to Shropshire Council opposing becoming a Community hub.

The scoring system that determined Cressage as a hub is incorrect, unfair and unjust. Cressage receives the same points for a mobile library as a fixed one, we also get 3 points for a "Place of Worship" which is closed.

Cressage is awarded 3 points for having a Chemist/Pharmacy yet we only have a Dispensing Surgery.

All villages designated as Hubs have been awarded the same points for having a "Public Transport Link" as well as having a "Peak Time Regular Service". However there is a complete lack of differentiation between Cressage and major towns like Shrewsbury.

I request that the Inspector at the forthcoming Public Inquiry comes and inspects these facilities to determine if this points scoring assessment by Shropshire Council is appropriate. Should it be found that a deduction of points is required to be made I believe that Cressage would remain as Open Countryside status which I assume will last for at least 20 years and will mean that no further large scale housing developments will occur within or around the village over this period of time.

The CPRE (the countryside charity) also agree the local plan is unsound because The Draft Plan's targets are too high and its plans for growth are not sustainable, particularly in view of the declared climate emergency. The charity also agrees the process is undemocratic and it still won't get enough affordable housing built.

(Please co	ntinue on a separate sheet if necessary)
Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
Once use Obly	Part B Reference:

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.

I ask that the Independent inspector looks into the points scoring system and the scores Cressage received to be designated a Community Hub. There are obvious irregularities and errors which need urgently addressing.

I ask that the Independent inspector looks at the previous responses to the consultation from Cressage residents. There were many hundreds of objections and it feels these have not been evaluated or assessed fairly by Shropshire Council. I ask the inspector to evaluate the consultation process.

I ask that the Independent inspector reviews the Countryside Charitys objections and responses and considers them in depth.

I ask the Independent inspector to review Shropshire Councils consultation process during Covid19 and the obvious impacts that has had on preventing people from replying.

(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:

To	REPRESENT THE BODDCE OF
	CRESSAGE PROPERLY.
	(Please continue on a cenarate sheet if necessary)

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Signature:		Date: 04/02/21
	Office Has Only	Part A Reference:
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference:

z



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 Organis	sation:	ROBO	AT	DAVIES	S .
Q1. To which doc	ument does t	his represe	entation	relate?	a d'ar a gan an an an
Regulation 19:	Pre-Submission	Draft of the	Shropshi	re Local Plan	
Sustainability / Local Plan	Appraisal of the	Regulation 1	9: Pre-Su	bmission Dra	ft of the Shropshire
Habitats Regul Shropshire Loo (Please tick or	al Plan	ent of the Reg	julation 1	9: Pre-Subm	ission Draft of the
Q2. To which part	t of the docur	ment does	this rep	resentation	relate?
Paragraph:	Policy:	Section13	Site:		Policies Map:
Q3. Do you consid Shropshire Local		ation 19: P	re-Subr	nission Dra	aft of the
A. Legally complia			Yes: [No: 🗹
B. Sound			Yes: [No: 🗹
C. Compliant with (Please tick as app		operate	Yes: [No: 🗹
Draft of the Shrop fails to comply wi If you wish to support	pshire Local F ith the duty to the legal complia I Plan or its comp	Plan is not o co-opera ance or sound	legally of te. Please iness of the	compliant of se be as provide Regulation	19: Pre-Submissio or is unsound or ecise as possible. 19: Pre-Submission Draf blease also use this box t

Within the preferred sites consultation document it clearly states that Cressage is a 'proposed hub'.

However, the Local plan says that Cressage has been a hub since 2015.

This is totally inaccurate, erroneous and misleading.

It means that the Local plan is not legally binding because of misinformation and error.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account".

I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering these serious errors and misinformation within the Local Plan document.

This major error will have mis-informed respondants and therefore means the process isn't legally binding, sound or complaint with the Councils duty to co-operate.

I ask that the inspector urgently reviews these errors and restarts the consulatation process.

(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)

Signature:		Date: 15/02/2021
	Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Office Use Offiy	Part B Reference:



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

relate? ire Local Plan Ibmission Draft of the Shropshire 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the
ubmission Draft of the Shropshire
19: Pre-Submission Draft of the
presentation relate?
Policies Map:
mission Draft of the
No: 🗹
No: 🗹
No: 🗹
Regulation 19: Pre-Submission compliant or is unsound or ise be as precise as possible. The Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft to co-operate, please also use this box to
sultation Response Summary you can l of consultation.

A.8. Question 32 (a) Question 32 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub.

Of the unique respondents that completed this question: • 5% agreed with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub; • 82% did not agree with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub; and • 12% responded don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub

A.9. Question 32 (b) Question 32 (b) asked respondents if they agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cressage.

Of the unique respondents that completed this question: • 5% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cressage; • 84% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cressage; and • 11% responded don't know/ no opinion on preferred housing guideline for Cressage.

A.10. Question 32 (c) Question 31 (c) asked respondents if they agreed with the proposed development boundary for Cressage.

Of the unique respondents that completed this question: • 6% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Cressage; • 82% did not agreed with the proposed development boundary for Cressage; and • 12% responded don't know/ no opinion to the proposed development boundary for Cressage.

A.11. Question 32 (d) Question 32 (d) asked respondents if they agreed with the preferred housing allocation CES005 in Cressage.

Of the unique respondents that completed this question: • 5% agreed with preferred housing allocation CES005; • 83% did not agreed with preferred housing allocation CES005; and • 12% responded don't know/ no opinion on preferred housing allocation CES005.

It is very clear that the well over 82% of residents opposed the identification of Cressage as a comminuty hub.

It is also cleat the Shropshire Council have made a serious error in their calculations of the totals because they have classed identical responses as a single response. They only classed unique responses as singular responses. Over 300 people replied using pre filled forms!

This is totally undemocratic and needs urgent investigation. Is it legal to group together identical responses as one when they have come from indeivdual people? They have silenced the voices of hundreds of residents who responded using the same answer. Their voices should still be heard.

(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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account".

I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the extremely strong opposition to community hub status from within the community that has been ignored.

I also believe they have broken the law and/or rules of consultation by classing identical invidual responses as one response.

These issues need urgent investigation and reconsideration.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference:

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:

07/02 Date: 202

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:	
Office Ose Offiy	Part B Reference:	

4

. .



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:	RUBERT	DAV	NES			
Q	1. To which document d	oes this represe	entatio	n relate	2		
E	Regulation 19: Pre-Subm	nission Draft of the	Shrops	hire Local I	Plan		
C	Sustainability Appraisal of Local Plan	of the Regulation 19): Pre-S	Submission	Draft of t	he Shropsh	iire
E	Habitats Regulations Ass Shropshire Local Plan	essment of the Reg	ulation	19: Pre-S	ubmission	Draft of th	e
	(Please tick one box)						
Q	2. To which part of the c	locument does t	this re	presenta	ition rel	ate?	Sec.
Pa	aragraph: Po	licy: 16.15 to 16.25 \$13	Site:		P	Map:	
	3. Do you consider the R hropshire Local Plan is:	tegulation 19: P	re-Sul	bmission	Draft o	f the	
	A. Legally compliant		Yes:		No:	\checkmark	
	B. Sound		Yes:		No:		
	C. Compliant with the Duty t (Please tick as appropriate).	o Co-operate	Yes:		No:		
D fa If of se	4. Please give details of raft of the Shropshire Lo nils to comply with the d you wish to support the legal of the Shropshire Local Plan or its to out your comments. This response from CPRE Shro submissions, that the loca plan	ocal Plan is not I uty to co-operat compliance or sound s compliance with th opshire expands on	egally te. Ple ness of the duty t	complia ase be a the Regulat to co-opera	nt or is s precise tion 19: Pr te, please	unsound e as poss re-Submissio also use thi	or ible. on Draft
i t i t i) is suffused with a model for ruly sustainable, because it is cological emergency; i) has targets for both housing hat are questionable; ii) won't get the right sort of h places; and	growth well in exce at odds with both g and employment	the clim land tha	nate emerg at are too l	jency and high, base	the ed on figure	S
i	 v) has a flawed consultation p 	rocess, which is un	democr	ratic.			

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.

I ask the Independent inspector to review Shropshire Councils consultation process and answer the following questions which is common law duty to take the results and questions of a consultation "conscientiously into account".

- 1) Why the local plan is suffused with a model for growth well in excess of demographic need? (This is at odds with the climate emergency).
- 2) Why the local plan has targets for both housing and employment land that are too high, based on figures that are questionable.
- 3) Urgently assess wether the local plan will get the right sort of houses, particularly affordable houses, built in the right places?
- 4) The local plan has a flawed consultation process, which is undemocratic. Please confirm?

(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)

Signature:		Date: 28/01/2021	
	Office Use Only	Part A Reference:	
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference:	



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:	ROBERT	DA	VIES			
21. To which document d	oes this represer	ntatio	on relate	e?		
Regulation 19: Pre-Subm	nission Draft of the S	hrops	hire Loca	l Plan		
Sustainability Appraisal of Local Plan	Sustainability Appraisal of the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan					
Habitats Regulations Ass Shropshire Local Plan (Please tick one box)						
2. To which part of the c	locument does th	nis re	present	tation rela	ate?	
aragraph: Po	licy: 1000 Section	Site	:	Po	blicies Map:	
3. Do you consider the R shropshire Local Plan is:	legulation 19: Pr	e-Su	bmissio	n Draft of	the	
A. Legally compliant		Yes:		No:	\checkmark	
B. Sound		Yes:		No:		
C. Compliant with the Duty t (Please tick as appropriate).	o Co-operate	Yes:		No:		

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.

Official Government guidelines on local consultation state that Consultation should strive to achieve a representative cross-section of views to ensure that you understand differing views within the community. Government law states that 'While it is unrealistic to think you can consult everyone about everything, you should strive to achieve a representative cross-section of views to ensure that you understand differing views within the community'. The consultation has not taken into account the restrictions on public involvement because of Covid19 restrictions and it is therefore against government guidelines. One of the stated consultations means for people without internet access is through public libraries. Much Wenlock library is now closed, as are all libraries throughout Shropshire, resulting in those without internet access not being able to participate in the consultation process. The demographics of Shropshire on the 2011 census states that 24% of the population in the county is over 65 and are more likely to rely on libraries for internet access. As you can see, the consultation process has not been sound as these demographics have had no access to the resources they need to respond.

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.

I ask the Independent inspector to review Shropshire Councils consultation process during Covid19 and the obvious impacts that has had on preventing people from replying.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the have not taken into account how Covid 19 restrictions have impacted people's ability to have their say and have not stopped this process due to Covid19.

(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)

Signature:		Date:	08/02/2021
	Office Line Oply	Part A Reference	ce:
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference	ce:



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:

ROBERT DAVIES.

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: Policy:	3 Site:		Policies Map:
Q3. Do you consider the Regulation 19: Shropshire Local Plan is:	Pre-Sub	omissior	n Draft of the
A. Legally compliant	Yes:		No:
B. Sound	Yes:		No: 🗹
C. Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate (Please tick as appropriate).	Yes:		No: 🗹

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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". Therefore the inspector must investigate the responses of nearly 300 residents from Cressage opposing becoming a Community hub in the previous round of consultation and why feedback was not given and changes were not made considering the strong response from the community about the way in which Cressage has been selected for Community Hub status being incorrect. There are several areas of contention in the scoring of services, facilities and employment for Cressage and it is clear the scoring system that determined Cressage as a hub is incorrect, unfair and unjust.

I request that the Inspector at the forthcoming Public Inquiry comes and inspects the village facilities to determine if the points scoring assessment by Shropshire Council is appropriate. Should it be found that a deduction of points is required to be made I believe that Cressage would remain as Open Countryside status which will last for at least 20 years.

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.

I ask that Shropshire Council and the Inspector disclose the numbers of people in support of Cressage becoming a Community hub status compared to those who opposed it. I ask this as a formal request for information under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

I request that the Inspector comes and inspects the village facilities to determine if the points scoring assessment by Shropshire Council is appropriate. Should it be found that a deduction of points is required to be made I believe that Cressage would remain as Open Countryside status which will last for at least 20 years and will mean that no further large scale housing developments will occur within or around the village over this period of time.

(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 the 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)

Signature:		Date:	03/02/2021
		Part A Referen	ce:
	Office Use Only	Part B Referen	ce:



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: ROBERT DAVIES 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? Policies Policy: Section13 Site: Paragraph: Map: Q3. Do you consider the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan is: A. Legally compliant V Yes: No: B. Sound Yes: No: C. Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate Yes: No: (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.

Within appendix B.13 Much Wenlock Place Plan Area Consultation Response Summary you can see that 82% did not agree with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub.

In section A.8. Question 32 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub.

Of the unique respondents that completed this question: • 5% agreed with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub; • 82% did not agree with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub; and • 12% responded don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub

Shropshire council have not taken this strong overwhelming response into consideration and this is totally undemocratic and needs urgent investigation.

They have also silenced the voices of hundreds of residents who responded using the same answer. Their voices should still be heard. Using the term 'of the unique respondents' isn't legally correct. Just because their views were identical, their responses were still unique because they came from individual people who were entitled to separate views and opinions and should have been classed as so.

By classing them as one, this process has taken away their legal and moral right to fair consultation on this process.

If all responses were taken into accunt like they should have been legally, then the true figure of those who did not agree with the classification of Cressage as a community hub would have been above 99%!

(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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account".

I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the extremely strong opposition to community hub status from within the community that has been ignored.

This needs urgent investigation and reconsideration.

Why were the hundreds of responses ignored and classed as one because they weren't unique?

(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)



ito, i do not man to participate in nearing session(t

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

(Please tick one box)

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:	
	Part B Reference:	

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)

Signature:	Date: 63/02/2	021

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:	
	Part B Reference:	



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: ROBERT DAVIES

Q1. To which document does this representation relate?

7				
	Population	10. Dro-Submic	cion Draft of the	Shropshire Local Plan
	Regulation	19. FIC-Subinis	Sion Diant of the	Shi upshi e Lucai Flan

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:	Section13	Site		Policies Map:	
Q3. Do you conside Shropshire Local Pl		ation 19: P	Pre-Su	bmissior	Draft of the	
A. Legally compliant			Yes:		No: 🗹	
B. Sound			Yes:		No:	
C. Compliant with th		operate	Yes:		No: 🗹	

(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.

Within appendix B.13 Much Wenlock Place Plan Area Consultation Response Summary you can see that 82% did not agree with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub.

The response also said that 84% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cressage.

82% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Cressage.

83% did not agree with preferred housing allocation CES005.

Shropshire council have not taken this strong overwhelming response into consideration and this is totally undemocratic and needs urgent investigation.

They have also silenced the voices of hundreds of residents who responded using the same answer. Their voices should still be heard.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account".

I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the extremely strong opposition to community hub status from within the community that has been ignored.

This needs urgent investigation and reconsideration.

(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)

Signature:		Date:	01/02/2021
	Office Lice Only	Part A Reference	e:
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference	e:



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:

ROBERT DAVIES

Q1. To which document does this representation relate?

V	7	Regulation	19:	Pre-Submis	sion Draft	of the	Shropshire	Local	Plan
	- L I	regulation		The Submis	Sion Diare	or cric	Sinopsinic	Local	1 Juli

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:	Section13	Site		Policies Map:	
Q3. Do you conside Shropshire Local Pl		lation 19: F	Pre-Sul	bmissior	n Draft of the	
A. Legally compliant			Yes:		No: 🗹	
B. Sound			Yes:		No: 🗹	
C. Compliant with the	e Duty to Co-	operate	Yes:		No: 🗹	

(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.

Within appendix B.13 Much Wenlock Place Plan Area Consultation Response Summary you can see that 82% did not agree with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub.

The response also said that 84% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cressage.

82% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Cressage.

83% did not agree with preferred housing allocation CES005.

Shropshire Council have made a serious error in their calculations of the totals because they have classed identical responses as a single response. They only classed unique responses as singular responses. Over 300 people replied using pre filled forms! These peoples views have been ignored because they used a pre filled form!

This is totally undemocratic and needs urgent investigation.

Is it legal to group together identical responses as one when they have come from indeivdual people?

They have silenced the voices of hundreds of residents who responded using the same answer. Their voices should still be heard.

(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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account".

I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the extremely strong opposition to community hub status from within the community that has been ignored.

I believe they have broken the law and/or rules of consultation by classing identical invidual responses as a single response.

These issues need urgent investigation and reconsideration.

(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)

Office Lles Only	Part A Reference:	
Office Use Only	Part B Reference:	

Q7. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:					
1	*				

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Signature:	Date:	02/02/	2021
		02/02/	2021

Office Lles Only	Part A Reference:	
Office Use Only	Part B Reference:	

1 10



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:	Name and Organisation: ROBERT DAVIES					
Q1. To which document	does this represe	entation relate	97			
Regulation 19: Pre-Sub	mission Draft of the	Shropshire Local	l Plan			
Sustainability Appraisal Local Plan	of the Regulation 19	9: Pre-Submissio	n Draft of the Shropshire			
Habitats Regulations As Shropshire Local Plan (Please tick one box)	sessment of the Reg	gulation 19: Pre-S	Submission Draft of the			
Q2. To which part of the	document does	this represent	ation relate?			
Paragraph: F	Policy: Section	Site:	Policies Map:			
Q3. Do you consider the Shropshire Local Plan is:		re-Submissio	n Draft of the			
A. Legally compliant	*	Yes:	No: 🗹			
B. Sound		Yes:	No: 🗹			
C. Compliant with the Duty (Please tick as appropriate,		Yes:	No: 🗹			
Q4. Please give details o Draft of the Shropshire I fails to comply with the	ocal Plan is not	legally compli				

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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". Therefore the inspector must investigate the fact that building more houses than the required amount in Shropshire is incompatible with the government's legally binding commitments to tackle the climate emergency.

The additional proposed number of houses breaches the government's legally binding commitment to hit net zero carbon by 2050.

It is important that decisions of local authorities that have significant ramifications for the environment for years to come be taken in a free and fair manner, not dictated by central government as appears to have happened here.

To confirm, there is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". Therefore the inspector must investigate the fact that building more houses than the required amount in Shropshire is incompatible with the government's legally binding commitments to tackle the climate emergency.

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 inspector must investigate the fact that building more houses than the required amount in Shropshire is incompatible with the government's legally binding commitments to tackle the climate emergency.

(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)

Signature:		Date: 03/02/2021
	Office Line Only	Part A Reference:
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference:



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:	ROBERT	DAVIES	5
Q1. To which document o	does this representa	tion relate?	
Regulation 19: Pre-Sub	mission Draft of the Shro	pshire Local P	lan
Sustainability Appraisal Local Plan	of the Regulation 19: Pr	e-Submission	Draft of the Shropshire
Habitats Regulations As Shropshire Local Plan	sessment of the Regulat	on 19: Pre-Su	Ibmission Draft of the
(Please tick one box)			
Q2. To which part of the	document does this	representa	tion relate?
Paragraph: P	olicy: 16.15 to 16.15 to 16.25 \$13 \$	ite:	Policies Map:
Q3. Do you consider the Shropshire Local Plan is:		Submission	Draft of the
A. Legally compliant	Ye	s: 🗹	No:
B. Sound	Ye	s: 🔲	No: 🗹
C. Compliant with the Duty (Please tick as appropriate)	al al la constante de la const	s:	No: 🗹
04. Please give details o	f why you consider t	he Regulati	ion 19: Pre-Submission

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.

Responses of nearly 300 residents from Cressage opposing becoming a Community hub in the previous rounds of consultation were submitted because the village believe the scoring system to be incorrect. They have been totally ignored.

The Parish Council have also ignored the majority view of the Cressage population and continued to support the Community Hub status, this is despite the overwhelming responses in previous rounds of consultations and also residents calling an extraordinary meeting to ask the Parish Council to change their position to reject the Local Plan.

In their response, The Parish Council said that although there was clearly a strong feeling to reject the Local Plan in Cressage, they believed there was an ever larger 'silent majority' who support it.

I have never heard such undemocratic nonsense in my entire life and this needs urgent attention because they are clearly abusing their position of power and have misrepresented the village on this important issue.

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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". Therefore the inspector must investigate the responses of nearly 300 residents from Cressage opposing becoming a Community hub in the previous round of consultation and why feedback was not given and changes were not made considering the strong response from the community about the way in which Cressage has been selected for Community Hub status being incorrect. There are several areas of contention in the scoring of services, facilities and employment for Cressage and it is clear the scoring system that determined Cressage as a hub is incorrect, unfair and unjust.

I request that the Inspector at the forthcoming Public Inquiry comes and inspects the village facilities to determine if the points scoring assessment by Shropshire Council is appropriate. Should it be found that a deduction of points is required to be made I believe that Cressage would remain as Open Countryside status which will last for at least 20 years.

I also request that the inspector investigates the response of the Parish Council and how this goes against the majority view in the village .

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

n 1

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)

Signature:		Date: 12/02/20	21
	Office Lice Only	Part A Reference:	
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference:	



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: **Robert Davies** 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) 02. To which part of the document does this representation relate? Policies Section Policy: Site: Paragraph: Map: Q3. Do you consider the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan is: A. Legally compliant Yes: No: B. Sound Yes: No: C. Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate Yes: No: (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.

The Government's assessment of Shropshire Council's housing "need" is 25,400 houses. However, the Shropshire Local plan sets out plans for 30,800! 5,400 more than required! Interestingly, around 6000 of these planned houses are in rural settings (like Cressage) where there is little/no public transport. This senseless decision by Shropshire Council goes against the Governments guidelines for tackling the climate emergency!

My opinion is in rural areas we need well thought out, smaller scale development which caters for the local younger population and gives affordable housing and gives them the chance to stay in their local communities. Despite raising this many times, Shropshire council have not co-operated.

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.

I ask the Independent inspector to review Shropshire Councils Local Plan and decide if the intention to build more 5,400 more houses than the legally required amount goes against the Governments own guidelines on tackling the climate emergency. I also ask that the analysis that decided Shropshire needed this extra amount of housing is fully studied and examined because there appears to be many errors within its calculation.

(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)

M

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)

Signature:			Date:	14/02/2021
	Office Use Only	Part A Reference:		
		Office Use Only	Part B Reference	e:



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 Organ	ame and Organisation: ROBERT						
Q1. To which do	cument does t	his represe	entation	n relate	?		
Regulation 19	: Pre-Submission	Draft of the	Shropsh	ire Local	Plan		
Sustainability	Appraisal of the	Regulation 19	9: Pre-Su	ubmission	Draft of	the Shropsh	ire
Habitats Regu Shropshire Lo (Please tick o		ent of the Reg	gulation :	19: Pre-S	ubmissior	Draft of the	9
Q2. To which par	rt of the docur	nent does f	this rep	oresenta	ation rel	ate?	
Paragraph:	Policy:	Section13	Site:		Р	olicies Map:	
Q3. Do you consi Shropshire Local	and the second se	ation 19: P	re-Sub	mission	Draft o	f the	
A. Legally complia	ant		Yes:		No:	\square	
B. Sound			Yes:		No:		
C. Compliant with (Please tick as ap		Yes:		No:			
	dotails of why	vou consid	lor the	Populat	ion 10.	Dro-Subm	iccion

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.

Official Government guidelines on local consultation state that when Consultations communicate its results, it is important to clearly articulate whom it consulted, the methods used and how the information gathered will inform its future work. If possible consultation should show that all opinions and suggestions have been taken into account and explain if there are reasons why it hasn't been possible to address all of the issues raised by the people consulted.

Due to the covid 19 restrictions there have been huge staffing pressures at Shropshire council and there is evidence to show that the previous responses have not been dealt with in accordance with government guidelines and in some cases, have been totally ignored.

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.

I ask the Independent inspector to review Shropshire Councils consultation process during Covid19 and the obvious impacts that has had on Shropshire Council staff available and wether these staffing issues have affected the process.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the have not taken into account how Covid 19 restrictions have impacted people's ability to have their say and why they have not stopped this process due to Covid19.

I ask the Inspector to provide evidence of how the previous responses were processed and confirm they were administered in line with Government guidelines by Shropshire Council staff.

(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)

Signature:		Date: 15/02/2021
	Office Lies Only	Part A Reference:
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference:



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:		ROBERT	D	AVIES	
1. To which documen	t does t	this represen	tatio	n relate	2
Regulation 19: Pre-Su	ubmissior	n Draft of the S	hropsh	nire Local I	Plan
Sustainability Apprais Local Plan	al of the	Regulation 19:	Pre-S	ubmission	Draft of the Shropshire
Habitats Regulations Shropshire Local Plan (Please tick one box)	ľ	ent of the Regu	lation	19: Pre-S	ubmission Draft of the
2. To which part of th	e docu	ment does th	is re	presenta	tion relate?
aragraph:	Policy:	Section 13	Site:		Policies Map:
3. Do you consider th hropshire Local Plan i	and the second se	lation 19: Pro	e-Sub	mission	Draft of the
A. Legally compliant			Yes:	\square	No:
B. Sound			Yes:		No: 🗹
C. Compliant with the Du	ty to Co-	operate	Yes:		No: 🖌

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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". Therefore the inspector must investigate the responses of nearly 300 residents from Cressage opposing becoming a Community hub in the previous round of consultation and why feedback was not given and changes were not made considering the strong response from the community about the way in which Cressage has been selected for Community Hub status being incorrect. There are several areas of contention in the scoring of services, facilities and employment for Cressage and it is clear the scoring system that determined Cressage as a hub is incorrect, unfair and unjust.

I request that the Inspector at the forthcoming Public Inquiry comes and inspects the village facilities to determine if the points scoring assessment by Shropshire Council is appropriate. Should it be found that a deduction of points is required to be made I believe that Cressage would remain as Open Countryside status which will last for at least 20 years.

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.

I ask that Shropshire Council and the Inspector disclose the numbers of people in support of Cressage becoming a Community hub status compared to those who opposed it. I ask this as a formal request for information under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

I request that the Inspector comes and inspects the village facilities to determine if the points scoring assessment by Shropshire Council is appropriate. Should it be found that a deduction of points is required to be made I believe that Cressage would remain as Open Countryside status which will last for at least 20 years and will mean that no further large scale housing developments will occur within or around the village over this period of time.

(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)

Signature:		Date: 07/02/2021		
	Office Lice Only	Part A Reference:		
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference:		



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 Organ	isation: 🦷	LOBERT	DAVI	ES	-	
Q1. To which do	ument doe	s this repr	esentatio	n relate	e?	
Regulation 19	: Pre-Submiss	sion Draft of t	he Shrops	nire Loca	l Plan	
Sustainability	Appraisal of t	he Regulatior	n 19: Pre-S	ubmissio	n Draft of	the Shropshire
Habitats Regu Shropshire Lo (Please tick o		ment of the	Regulation	19: Pre-:	Submissior	Draft of the
Q2. To which par	t of the doo	cument doe	es this re	present	tation rel	ate?
Paragraph:	Policy	: Section 13	Site:		Р	olicies Map:
Q3. Do you cons Shropshire Local		gulation 19	: Pre-Sul	omissio	n Draft o	f the
A. Legally complia	ant		Yes:		No:	\checkmark
B. Sound			Yes:		No:	\square
C. Compliant with (Please tick as ap		Co-operate	Yes:		No:	

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.

Government law for local consultation states that the process should make sure that consultation is accessible to all those who wish to participate, which might mean identifying and overcoming any barriers to their involvement. For example, offer a range of dates and times of day for events (some older residents may not wish to be out at night and working people might not be able to get to a daytime event). Remember that different groups will have different and specific needs depending on language barriers, literacy ability, access, cultural differences and different levels of understanding.

I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering they have not taken into account how Covid 19 restrictions have impacted people's ability to have their say and have not stopped this process due to Covid19.

The consultation has not taken into account the restrictions on public involvement because of Covid19 restrictions and it is therefore against government guidelines. One of the stated consultations means for people without internet access is through public libraries. Much Wenlock library is now closed, as are all libraries throughout Shropshire, resulting in those without internet access not being able to participate in the consultation process. The

demographics of Shropshire on the 2011 census states that 24% of the population in the county is over 65 and are more likely to rely on libraries for internet access. As you can see, the consultation process has not been sound as these demographics have had no access to the resources they need to respond.

(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.

I ask the Independent inspector to review Shropshire Councils consultation process during Covid19 and the obvious impacts that has had on preventing people from replying.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the have not taken into account how Covid 19 restrictions have impacted people's ability to have their say and have not stopped this process due to Covid19.

(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:

Office Use Only

Part A Reference: Part B Reference: (Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Part B Reference:

Date: 15/02/2021

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:

Signature.		Date	-041
· .			
. · · · · · ·		÷	
	· · · · ·		
		·	
	·		
N*		· · · ·	
	·		
	· .		
· .			
· · · · 2		• •	
	•	· · ·	
		· ·	
•			
			•
	·		,
		Part A Reference:	
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference:	



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:	ROBERT	DAVIES	
Q1. To which document	does this repres	sentation relate	7
Regulation 19: Pre-Sub	mission Draft of the	e Shropshire Local	Plan
Sustainability Appraisa Local Plan	I of the Regulation :	19: Pre-Submissio	n Draft of the Shropshire
Habitats Regulations A Shropshire Local Plan (Please tick one box)	ssessment of the Re	egulation 19: Pre-S	Submission Draft of the
Q2. To which part of the	document does	this represent	ation relate?
Paragraph:	Policy: 1615 5/3	Site:	Policies Map:
Q3. Do you consider the Shropshire Local Plan is	the second	Pre-Submissio	n Draft of the
A. Legally compliant		Yes:	No: 🗹
B. Sound		Yes:	No: 🗹
C. Compliant with the Duty (Please tick as appropriate		Yes:	No:
,			

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.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the have not taken into account how Covid 19 restrictions have impacted people's ability to have their say and have not stopped this process due to Covid19.

The consultation has not taken into account the restrictions on public involvement because of Covid19 restrictions and it is therefore against government guidelines. One of the stated consultations means for people without internet access is through public libraries. Much Wenlock library is now closed, as are all libraries throughout Shropshire, resulting in those without internet access not being able to participate in the consultation process. The demographics of Shropshire on the 2011 census states that 24% of the population in the county is over 65 and are more likely to rely on libraries for internet access. As you can see, the consultation process has not been sound as these demographics have had no access to the resources they need to respond.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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.

I ask the Independent inspector to review Shropshire Councils consultation process during Covid19 and the obvious impacts that has had on preventing people from replying.

There is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". I do not believe Shropshire Council have met this requirement considering the have not taken into account how Covid 19 restrictions have impacted people's ability to have their say and have not stopped this process due to Covid19.

(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)

Signature:		Date: 0	1/02/2021
	Office Lles Only	Part A Reference:	
	Office Use Only	Part B Reference:	



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	Rob	DAVIES		
Q1. To which docume	nt does this re	presentatio	n relat	e7
Regulation 19: Pre-	Submission Draft o	of the Shropsh	nire Loca	l Plan
Sustainability Appra	isal of the Regulat	ion 19: Pre-S	ubmissic	on Draft of the Shropshire
Habitats Regulation Shropshire Local Pla (Please tick one box	in	e Regulation	19: Pre-	Submission Draft of the
Q2. To which part of t	he document d	loes this rej	present	tation relate?
Paragraph:	Policy: 10.15	Si3 Site:		Policies Map:
Q3. Do you consider t Shropshire Local Plan		19: Pre-Sub	missio	n Draft of the
A. Legally compliant		Yes:		No:
B. Sound		Yes:		No:
C. Compliant with the D (Please tick as appropria		Yes:		No: 🗹
Draft of the Shropshin fails to comply with the If you wish to support the le	e Local Plan is the duty to co-o	not legally perate. Plea	compliance be he Regul	ation 19: Pre-Submission ant or is unsound or as precise as possible. ation 19: Pre-Submission Dra rate, please also use this box
There is a common law de account". Therefore the in the required amount in S	nspector must inve	stigate the fa	ct that b	uilding more houses than

commitments to tackle the climate emergency.

The additional proposed number of houses breaches the government's legally binding commitment to hit net zero carbon by 2050.

It is important that decisions of local authorities that have significant ramifications for the environment for years to come be taken in a free and fair manner, not dictated by central government as appears to have happened here.

To confirm, there is a common law duty to take the results of a consultation "conscientiously into account". Therefore the inspector must investigate the fact that building more houses than the required amount in Shropshire is incompatible with the government's legally binding commitments to tackle the climate emergency.

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 inspector must investigate the fact that building more houses than the required amount in Shropshire is incompatible with the government's legally binding commitments to tackle the climate emergency.

(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)

Signature:		Date: 01/02/2021	
	Office Use Only	Part A Reference:	
		Part B Reference:	