

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:	
------------------------	--

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"/>	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: 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.

(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.

(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:

Office Use Only

Part A Reference:

Part B Reference:

- **Article 4(1)** - The proposed application sits on land which is covered by a direction under article 4(1). This direction prohibits the erection of fences, hedges and walls. This direction was imposed by Bridgnorth District Council in 2002 (Richard Fortune himself was the contact point for this enforcement) after 6 months this land was deemed so important and sensitive that the direction was extended by the Secretary of State, and remains in place today (copies attached). How can this land which has been deemed unsuitable for walls and fences and in the Severn Valley now be suitable for 120 houses plus a residential facility? This direction has been in place for 17 years and nothing has changed, therefore we would respectfully request that this direction remains in place. If this planning goes ahead you could have the ridiculous situation where there are two residential developments with pigs or cattle being run through the middle.
- **HNN014** – There has been 3 submission on the same parcel of land, initially bungalows, then 20 affordable homes both times it has been refused in part due to access. Suddenly planning has been granted, however nothing has changed with the land. It is evident that it has only been passed (without access being yet approved) because had it been refused again then the preferred site of HNN016 could not then be developed with 122 properties and a residential facility, all of whom would presumably be using this dangerous access.
- **Access** - the access for these properties is still the same which is on one of the worst bends in the village, dangerous and inappropriate. There is no room to widen the footpath which is used daily by children walking to and from school. Residents living by this bend have stated that there have been accidents and in the winter months in the morning you cannot see and literally have to stop. An accident waiting to happen
- **1.2 (5016) & (DP18)- Mental Health of residents affected, landscape and visual amenities** - states that there will be no significant adverse effects that the plan might have? I totally disagree. It is plain to see that this aspect of the plan does not include current residents and that Shropshire Planning has total disregard for the mental health and wellbeing of these residents, many of whom are retired and elderly and who have chosen to live in this area for the reasons mentioned above. These same residents managed, in the main to get to the meetings but would be unable to plough through the many pages of this document which are presented as unnecessarily complex and full of jargon. I have no doubt that should only a few responses be submitted Shropshire Council will take this as evidence that residents are not interested, not that they are unable to work their way through the deliberate and copious pages of jargon.
- **Alternatives** - During the public meetings that were held a Mr Mark Unitt made it very clear that if his proposal was accepted he would be prepared to gift 6 acres of land, giving safe pedestrian access to within 150 yards of the village centre. This would give sufficient space for a 50 bed assisted living facility, a new medical centre (which we need) and approximately 70 affordable homes. His land also gives direct access to and space for expansion of the already stretched sewage facility.
- **Mr Unitts proposal** gives a solution to housing in Highley for the next 100 years, land that can be added to as and when required in the future and given full backing by the residents already in Highley. I would like to know if this offer was minuted at the public meeting and if anyone from the council has contacted Mr Unitt as this solution would seem to be one that ticks all stakeholder boxes and would in effect show that this is a real consultation. As we were offered a choice of one option I would argue again that it wasn't.

Page 3 of 3

Elaine Higgins - Shropshire Planning – Draft Plan Highley

- The villagers know that they have a responsibility to accept their fair share of housing but the expectation is that they will be consulted fairly and transparently which is not the case here. It is ridiculous that planners have been offered land that will prejudice nobody, will solve the housing shortage in Highley now and for many years to come and that the land owner will grant, free of charge, sufficient land to allow the 50 bed assisted living property together with a purpose built medical centre (which we need) with adequate parking and approximately 50 to 70 affordable houses now and further land available in the future.
- Please can someone shed some practical, sensible light onto this issue before it is too late.
- I would request that someone enters into dialogue with Mr Mark Unitt, what is there to lose?
- A number of residents have sought the guidance of our own solicitor with regard to a judicial review. They have written to the council but as far as I am aware have still not received a response, which shows again their **lack of respect and muscle flexing** with regard to this issue.

Regards

Elaine Higgins

19.02.21