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:	James Riley Orves

Q1. To which document does this representation relate?

- [x] 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:	S13	Policy:		Site:		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.

Reg 19 is not legally compliant because it ignores the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan (MWNP) which has been democratically adopted by the Town through referendum. On my behalf MP Philip Dunne sought clarification from the Secretary of State for Housing the Rt Hon Robert Jenrick MP on whether there had been a change in policy in relation to Neighbourhood plans. He confirmed that "Once a neighbourhood plan has been approved at referendum, it forms part of the statutory development plan and becomes the starting point in making planning decisions". Shropshire Unitary Council has ignored the following MWNP content: i) the MWNP safeguards local infrastructure e.g. traffic, drainage, sewage, health through incremental sustainable development; Reg 19 not only proposes all development in one go, it far exceeds the maximum agreed within the MWNP, ii) the housing proposed is not affordable, instead Reg 19 proposes commercial value properties in numbers far in excess of any demonstrable local need, iii) Reg 19 ignores the legal duty re flood management by proposing large development without first demonstrably addressing the flooding issue v) public consultation activities were devolved to agents commissioned by the landowner i.e. it was biased. The above all directly contradict the MWNP, which was approved by the overwhelming majority of Much Wenlock residents in a referendum.

(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.

Legal compliance would require the Reg 19 to adopt the MWNP building volumes, types, schedule and flooding / traffic proposals in line with the views of the majority of Much Wenlock residents.

(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 have previously had my comments ignored as they were incorrectly assessed to be a complaint. I wish to see that my concerns and comments are acknowledged, given equal weight to those of the land owner and developer and assessed in a democratic way.

(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: Jim Orves

Date: 22/02/2021

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference: