

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:	JEANETTE HOOPER MEMBER OF LVAG
------------------------	--------------------------------

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.

As a resident of Longden and member of Longden Village Action Group (LVAG) I do not consider the Plan sound or sustainable.
Please see my earlier response to the Regulation 18 consultation. In particular, I do not agree with the methodology adopted in the Hierarchy Assessment as applied to Longden and explained in detail by the letter from LVAG.
Furthermore I do not understand why some proposed development sites are included when they have been subject to appeals and previously rejected. In particular, sites 016 and 002.

(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 see the letter submitted by LVAG which I fully endorse.

(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 wish for nominated representatives from LVAG to participate in the hearing sessions because despite wide local community consultation I do not feel that the residents of Longden have been given a fair hearing by Shropshire Council. I have grave reservations about the application of the hierarchy assessment to Longden and feel it is unfair, not logical, not sound and not sustainable.

(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: J D Hooper

Date: 19/02/2021

Office Use Only

Part A Reference:

Part B Reference:

SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN

Dear Sir,

My husband and I would like to make the following objections re Longden becoming a Community Hub. Having sent similar before really annoyed about having to do this once again. Perhaps the Council is hoping that we might go away exhausted from the process. The points system is **TOTALLY UNSOUND.**

We are a very small old village, (first mentioned in the Domesday book) we believe only 135 residential dwellings and only a fraction of the size of all the other villages in the area. We have limited road infrastructure reflects the size of the current community, there is difficulty for two tractors or buses to pass outside our house and no pavement, having to work in the road

We feel very strongly about this proposal and really distressed about being designated as a Hub as building could be anywhere in the village. Indeed, in 2018 we complete a survey and said we wished to remain a 'Community Cluster' and against becoming a HUB. We are extremely distressed about the proposals and feel we are being ignored by the Council as usual, asking for our comments but going against the majority vote. We know that a Local Councillors connected with the village know the sentiment of the Longden Residents and the unsuitability of the proposal to make Longden a **HUB**

We thought that that community HUBS would be identified by services and facilities, including employment opportunities, we believe Longden does not provide them.

You cannot compare Longden with Pontesbury OR Minsterly Village

PONTESBURY VILLAGE

Large Primary and a Secondary

Numbers of pubs, restaurants

P.O. shops (long opening hrs)
Butcher, bakery, chemist etc.

Doctors surgery, dentist

Library

GOOD bus service

Good roads, with one way road
System pavement all around the village

Assisted living housing with a warden
& a Private Home Care Service

LONGDEN VILLAGE

Small Primary (100) and small nursery

Pub with small bar open 3 days per week (if lucky)

Village Shop & P.O. room for 2 during Covid

NONE

Mobile Library once a fortnight for 10 minutes

Limited bus service

Narrow roads some only wide for one car.
Few pavement areas having to walk in the road

NONE

How the scoring points have been totalled and how they are similar to Pontesbury completely baffles us and **unsound** and perhaps somebody could tell us how these have been calculated and a comparison statement made from the Council.

We have only a very small village shop (Only two persons allowed in at any one time during

'Covid 19' restrictions) having to stand outstand in all weathers to get in. The 'post office' is delivered over the same small counter as the shop/convenience store. The prices the local shop charges are too costly to buy main purchases and they have limited merchandise anyway, we do try and support them, especially the Post Office, but have to go to shop Radbrook or Meole business park for our main shopping which you need a car.

The 'Tankerville Arms' **Public House** only opens three days a week and the one remaining bar room is now very small, the Pub has been destroyed over the years by the changes made to the building which planning was given and the frequent change of ownership. The Primary School and Nursery are only small compared to schools in the area and there is no Secondary School in the Village. We have no doctor's surgery. The village does NOT have superfast broadband, or anywhere near that. The Sport facility consists of two tennis courts and a football field and adjacent a small Children's Playground which was reopened in 2019 following a great deal of effort and fund raising by Paul Carter and other members from the village.

The bus service from Longden village to Shrewsbury is regular but it is not sufficiently frequent to have a major impact on sustainability. It is impossible to connect with either trains or other buses out of Shrewsbury town centre to reach other destinations at a reasonable time in the morning or returning in the evening. There is no bus service to local catchment GP services at Pontesbury, Bayston Hill or Dorrington. The main connecting road to Shrewsbury is unclassified and that to connect East to the A49 and A5 requires travel through narrow, often single-track lanes, and narrow parts of the road causes problems with large vehicles, buses, tractors unable to pass each other. These limitations force residents to use cars, often two or more per household

Our infrequent bus service does not provide a sustainable transport link from Longden. To describe it as a transport link does not reflect the true nature of the limited infrastructure and also does not help reduce the carbon emissions when most people have to use cars. There are very few employment opportunities in Longden Parish and most residents of working age are forced to commute to Shrewsbury or beyond. Longden as a HUB would generate significant additional levels of carbon. As there are very few employment opportunities in Longden Parish most residents have to travel by vehicle to urban areas for employment and this increases the congestion in Shrewsbury and other routes out of the Parish, many of which are along single-track roads. There are no cycle lanes out of the village and as the roads are so narrow there is no potential to develop them. Making Longden a HUB would have a negative impact on the climate, increasing carbon emissions. Retaining "CLUSTER" status would enable Longden village to experience some growth through infill (in addition to the significant growth experienced in recent years) whilst minimising carbon emissions. If we are to meet Climate Change targets, limitations in infrastructure needs to be addressed before significant numbers of housing are built.

Longden is an ancient village with mature trees and hedgerows. Arrow Court development, has not retained the ancient look of the village as you approach coming into the village it's a blot on the horizon/landscape. Any further development even in "Cluster Status" should be carefully looked at by planners before giving permissions which destroys the village ethos, removal of mature hedgerows to enable access is surely contrary to this policy. At best hedgerows will only be partly replaced (to allow for access and visibility), so as well as an element of total destruction of hedgerows, it will take many years for any replacement hedgerow to mature.

The development of Arrow Court caused us much disturbance during construction nearly 12 months, noise from early morning and sometimes at weekends, dust etc. and loud language from builders and loud music played etc. The approach into the village Arrow Court is a blot on the horizon/landscape and not in keeping with other properties in the village. The road providing access to the houses into arrow court is very limited, the road is so narrow so as to be able to cram so many houses in such a small plot. People since moving in have had to pave their front gardens to park their cars, we have counted approx. 25 cars in the road, it does not appear that garages are being used for their cars, either the garage is too small for their car or using them for storage. People have got to have car to

commute for work because of lack of flexibility of public transport. The garages built directly at the back of our house we can nearly touch through the fence and if there is a problem with the fence in the future we don't know how we will maintain it; when the planning application was put in we asked for a wall to be built and we did query this when the development was being built, but this was ignored.

We supported the Council with their survey 'Right Home, Right Place' which indicated Longden requires an additional 18 homes. The Council has conveniently forgotten about this because it did not provide the Council with the anticipated numbers to fit the Local Plan Review. There is another six years to reach 2026, this continual shifting of the goal post gives us only mistrust of the Local Council (which we did not have much before but we certainly do not have now). We feel we have been 'hoodwinked' and regret the same as the Parish Council that they engaged with the Council to assist with housing targets.

I have worked for Local Government and question what influence some contractors have on planning applications.

The Council should consider what their decision has on people's lives and if they would pass some building applications if it was on their own doorstep

Yours sincerely Jan & Tony Hooper