



Consultation Form

Part B Consultation Form: Your Response(s) – this part (please fill in a separate Part B Consultation Form for each comment you wish to make, relating it to the relevant paragraph, policy (including its explanation) or site).

Please ensure that you also complete one **Part A Consultation Form** and submit this alongside you Part B Consultation Form(s).

We have also published a separate **Guidance Note** to assist in making effective representations.

Part B: Response

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Name: | Cecil Hayward |
| Organisation (if relevant): | |

Q1. To which document does this response relate?

- Regulation 18: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- Sustainability Appraisal of the Regulation 18: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Regulation 18: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan

(Please tick one box)

Q2. To which part of the document does this response relate?

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|-------------|--|
| Paragraph: | | Policy: | S2 Bishops Castle Plan area |
| Site: | WBR007 & WBR008 | Policy Map: | S2 Bishops Castle Place Plan area - S2.2(i) Bishop’s Castle Plan Area – Worthen and Brockton |

Please note: Responses to this Regulation 18: Consultation can address any of the Supporting Documents and Evidence by relating them to the resulting paragraph, policy (including its explanation) or site in the Regulation 18: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan.

Q3. Do you agree or disagree with the paragraph, policy, site or policies map you have identified in Q2?

- Agree
- Disagree

Don't know / no opinion

(Please tick one box)

Q4. Please use this space to make any comments on the paragraph, policy, site or policies map you have identified in Q2:

There is a need for 2 & 3 bedroomed properties in the area for families and younger people. There is a school, shop, pub, village hall and importantly a doctors here and it is important to keep these going and supported. But these families need safe pedestrian access to these places. If you need to cross the road at the Back Lane turning it is blind and there is already a severe speeding issue with traffic in the vicinity.

There isn't a safe pavement for people to get to the above mentioned places and in a number of locations it does narrow to less than half a metre. People will have to cross the road around the vicinity of the Old Post Office due to a lack of pavement. There is limited vision and with speeding traffic there have been many near misses and earlier this year sadly a fatality. I would imagine that if there were not at least two safe crossings available then families would be forced into using cars for these short distances adding to local pollution and to traffic at busy times. There is already an issue with parked cars in the vicinity of the school on the B4386.

The speeding traffic which enters Worthen from the Shrewsbury direction in the Little Worthen area would need some calming measures installed. Currently many vehicles ignore the 30 mph signs and don't slow down until the bend. Something needs to be done to help prevent collisions. Even extending the 30 mph zone might not have the desired effect.

There has been significant flooding on the road between this site and just before Little Worthen. I feel that this proposed site will only add to the problem.

I believe there were initially 30 properties allocated in this settlement of around 148 houses. With all the proposals on both sites and other infill areas it brings the total to around 55 which is exceptionally big for a small rural community to absorb.

Please succinctly provide all evidence and supporting information necessary to support your response. Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

Completed Consultation Forms can be submitted by emailing:
Planningpolicy@Shropshire.gov.uk

*If submitting your own response, please enter your last name in the subject field of the email;
If submitting a response on behalf of a client, please enter their last name in the subject field of the email.*

Completed Consultation Forms can also be submitted by post to:

Shropshire Council, Planning Policy & Strategy Team, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Office Use Only | Part A Reference: |
| | Part B Reference: |



Consultation Form

Part B Consultation Form: Your Response(s) – this part (please fill in a separate Part B Consultation Form for each comment you wish to make, relating it to the relevant paragraph, policy (including its explanation) or site).

Please ensure that you also complete one **Part A Consultation Form** and submit this alongside you Part B Consultation Form(s).

We have also published a separate **Guidance Note** to assist in making effective representations.

Part B: Response

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Name: | Cecil Hayward |
| Organisation (if relevant): | |

Q1. To which document does this response relate?

- Regulation 18: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- Sustainability Appraisal of the Regulation 18: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Regulation 18: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan

(Please tick one box)

Q2. To which part of the document does this response relate?

| | | | |
|------------|--------|-------------|---|
| Paragraph: | | Policy: | S2 Bishops Castle Place Plan area |
| Site: | WBR010 | Policy Map: | S2 Bishops Castle Place Plan area – S2.2 (i) Bishop’s Castle Place Plan Area – Worthen and Brockton |

Please note: Responses to this Regulation 18: Consultation can address any of the Supporting Documents and Evidence by relating them to the resulting paragraph, policy (including its explanation) or site in the Regulation 18: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan.

Q3. Do you agree or disagree with the paragraph, policy, site or policies map you have identified in Q2?

- Agree
- Disagree

Don't know / no opinion

(Please tick one box)

Q4. Please use this space to make any comments on the paragraph, policy, site or policies map you have identified in Q2:

As with most rural communities there is a need for affordable housing and 2 / 3 bedroomed properties. Under new legislation I believe there will be no planning permission for developers to go through, therefore giving them the opportunity to build what they want and naturally the 4 / 5 bedroomed executive style housing would give them a greater profit.

Of course we need new families in the area to support the school, doctors, village hall, shops, pub etc. Families in these new developments would need safe pedestrian access to the said establishments. In places the pavement is narrower than half a metre. Pedestrians would need to cross the busy road if they were to access facilities at either end of the village. There is a well documented speeding issue through the village which has deteriorated since the early part of this year during lockdown. Over the years the Road Safety Camera Van has visited regularly.

This site includes the site next to Millfield House which has already been turned down on appeal by the planning inspector. It was deemed to be out of character with that part of the village. It would impact on the settlement view from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The planning appeal statement upheld refusal of planning application.

The site originally was for 25 houses. This site is vast and could easily double or triple this number. If the developers had their own way I feel this could happen. It would be unacceptable.

Safety and environmental issues could be overlooked in favour of profit if they were not included in the development. There have been several near misses and a recent fatality in the last year.

There is a significant sewage problem in the village in this area. Water runs off the field causing flooding and backing up towards Brockton and beyond. A large introduction of new housing would further add to this.

If any development was to be introduced to the village on this site it should stay in character with this part of the village and be linear in nature. The site should be greatly reduced in order to prevent a sprawling development. I think the rest of the field is not included so this reduction should not be a problem.

Without safe pavements and crossings it is feared that pedestrians will use their vehicles to get around to the various places in the village, adding to air pollution, adding to parking problems and adding to the risk of further accidents with the increased traffic.

Please succinctly provide all evidence and supporting information necessary to support your response. Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

Completed Consultation Forms can be submitted by emailing:
Planningpolicy@Shropshire.gov.uk

*If submitting your own response, please enter your last name in the subject field of the email;
If submitting a response on behalf of a client, please enter their last name in the subject field of the email.*

Completed Consultation Forms can also be submitted by post to:

Shropshire Council, Planning Policy & Strategy Team, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Office Use Only | Part A Reference: |
| | Part B Reference: |