

## 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:	LAYLA 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:	<input type="text"/>	Policy:	<input type="text" value="10.15 to 10.25 S13"/>	Site:	<input type="text"/>	Policies Map:	<input type="text"/>
------------	----------------------	---------	---	-------	----------------------	---------------	----------------------

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

- |  |      |                                     |     |                                     |
|--|------|-------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|
| A. Legally compliant                     | Yes: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No: | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| B. Sound                                 | Yes: | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate | Yes: | <input type="checkbox"/>            | No: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(Please tick as appropriate).

#### Q4. Please give details of why you consider the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

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 responses. 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 arguments. 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 continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference:

**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 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 Charities 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:**

*(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:

Date:

26-01-2021

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:	LAYLA 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:  Site:  Policies 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.

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)

**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 these serious errors and misinformation within the Local Plan document.

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

I ask that the inspector urgently reviews these errors and restarts the consultation 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)*

**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:

Date:

02/02/2021

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:	MISS LAYLA 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:  Site:  Policies 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.

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 continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Q5. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at Q4 above.**

*Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination. You will need to say why each modification will make the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.*

The 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)*

**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:

Date:

02/02/2021

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:	LAYLA 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:  Site:  Policies 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.

Within appendix B.13 Much Wenlock Place Plan Area Consultation Response Summary you can see the responses of local residents to the previous round of consultation.

The breakdown of views were as follows –

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 community hub.

It is also clear 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 individual 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 individual 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:

Date:

01/02/2021

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference: