Shropshire Council: Shropshire Local Plan

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:	Jon Newson

Q1. To which document does this representation relate?

- [x] Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- [x] 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:	SP9 & 10	Site:	WBR010	Policies Map:	

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

	Yes:	No:
A. Legally compliant	☐	☐
B. Sound	☐	☑
C. Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate	☐	☑

(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.

Not sure you can ask an ordinary consultee if the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan is legally compliant, frankly I do not know.

It is however it's not sound and would seem to be at odds with the Duty to Co-operate.

The proposal for site WBR010 in the 'Reg 19 pre-submission draft local plan' does not take into account the previous planning appeal refusal (14/00398/out) which was upheld by the Planning Inspector. This approach is flawed in that the same issues that determined the Planning Inspectors decision in the last planning plan are prevalent in the current proposed plan so do they need to be taken into account in the assessment of site.

I have had a response to a written question to the council that the previous planning appeal refusal was in the context of the previous plan and so has no bearing on the current plan. A "that was then, and this is now" attitude.

Continued on separate sheet.....

(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.

Reassess the site WBR010 considering the detail of the Planning appeal refusal 14/00398/out.

Also reassess the site WBR010 together with WBR007 and WBR008 because they share the same infrastructure, communications, transport, drainage as well as community.

Outcomes of reassessment can't be reviewed until this has happened.

(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:

I do not feel the issues raised are not singular but are interconnected and so far there has been no engagement that has produced a considered response.

(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: 24/02/2021

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference:

Answer to Question 4 continued…..

I would argue that they whilst the decision may only be applicable to the previous plan, the issues raised considered in the Planning Inspectors review and assessment of the site are relevant and should be considered. Merely saying, because it was against the pervious plan and is of no relevance to the proposed plan, prevents the issues seen by the Planning Inspector being considered, and so the assessment is incomplete.

The issues previously raised by the Planning Inspector are relevant to the current selection criteria. For ease I shall summarised below:

> "For the purposes of planning policy, I share the Council's view that the site is located within the countryside."
> "I am therefore not satisfied that the Framework's objective to create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities would be achieved."
> "Further harm would be caused to the attractive landscape setting of the village that I observed on my site visit."
> "Housing in this location would not be acceptable."

All the above are relevant to the current selection criteria in the management of Community Hubs (SP9 & 10) and have been ignored by the council's selection process.

It should also be noted that the previous planning application was for 25 and in this Local Plan is for 20 houses. The plot in WBR010 is far bigger and could accommodate 40 or more dwellings. This does not make sense unless there is a plan to vary the number of dwelling it the WBR010 plot is included within the plan, so frustrating any objections to a larger development.

Within the process site assessments of WBR007, WBR008 and WBR010, have not been considered together. Taken together, these sites would represent approximately a 50% increase in the number of dwellings within Worthen. It would seem reasonable that such a significant change to the community should be assessed and part of the appraisal. In addition there has to be an assessment of that if taken together would this represent Sustainable Development (SP4). This issue has not been considered, it therefore follows the issue strategic policy is not being followed which is part of the National Planning Policy Framework. I and my MP have asked this question of the council in writing and it has also been a subject raised in Cabinet questions by myself but has received no answer only the response to raise it here as part of this consultation response.