

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" value="S17"/>	Policies Map:	<input type="text" value="SHA019 shawbury"/>
------------	----------------------	---------	----------------------	-------	----------------------------------	---------------	--

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

- | | | | | |
|--|------|--------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|
| A. Legally compliant | Yes: | <input type="checkbox"/> | No: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Sound | Yes: | <input type="checkbox"/> | No: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate | Yes: | <input type="checkbox"/> | No: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(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.

A number of residents including myself have serious concerns over the selection of this site SHA019, the personnel involved, the breaking of previous promises and assurances given by the Planning Department and developers and sweeteners being given to local residents as well as the choice of this location for a range of unsound environmental and locational issues.

1. When the previous development of Oaklands Park was granted and recently finished (last house only just sold by Lioncourt) there was a clear understanding to local residents who voted in a parish meeting to limit the build to 50 houses and assess the impact to the village over a 10 year period. The current Plan has a short term build period now in addition to that understanding as the first phase.
2. Rodney Cooke the owner of the land and under the direction of his brother in Law Gerard Videno sold the land through the land developer Nigel Thorns who was a previous head of Shropshire Planning department. SEE SEPARATE SHEET

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Continued: The Promise of a football pitch for Shawbury United was a clear planning proposal along with Oakwell Park. This promise was mysteriously removed and is now being re-dangled as a carrot for the development of SHA019 by Mr Videno in conjunction with Rodney Cooke and Mr Thorns. It is unscrupulous.

3. Nigel Thorns has already been in contact with at least one resident adjacent to SHA019 (name and details withheld at present) in exchange for pushing the development away from said houses adjoining the development in apparent exchange for not objecting to the development. Indeed, Nigel Thorns own website (link to Fieldcrest associates below) advertises the procurement of land particularly difficult to get planning permission on such as SHA019 which has a grade 2 listed Kiln and old brickworks field areas on.

eldcrest-associates/

- The planning application fee,

Aside from the initial cost savings there are also significant benefits to all land owners in coming to us as we do not insist on agreeing land values up front.

Current Projects include

Land at Tilstock Road, Whitchurch
500 dwellings, School Site, Football Pitches and a Cricket Club Expansion

Land Off A53 Shawbury
50 Dwellings along with Football Pitches for Shawbury Football Club

Land at Ash Parva
8 Executive Dwellings, Highway Improvements and Village Footpath

Land at Tibberton
44 Dwellings and Provision of Car Park for School

Essentially we obtain the best possible planning permission we can, and then sell the land on the open market to the highest bidder. This has a far greater potential of allowing a competitive market to push up the value of the land and so increase returns for the landowner.

In a recent case a client had spent £10,000.00 on architects fees in attempt to obtain planning permission for 4 and then 3 houses on land that they owned, each of which failed.

On this basis the land was valued at £600,000. The land fell within a Conservation Area and adjacent to a Grade II* Listed Building and the Conservation Officers advice at that time was that the site should remain open and free of development.

Following our involvement we received planning permission for 12 dwellings within 1 year and the site later sold for over £1,300,000.00. The clients were obviously happy with the result and we took a percentage of the sale value (the amount of the percentage depends upon the complexity of the case itself).

From a landowners viewpoint the key issues are that:

1. We can solve problems where others have failed;
2. On the basis of a no win no fee project, we are very determined in our desire to get a planning permission, and also obtain a planning permission which achieves the best 'sale value' for the site (as our fee depends upon it);
3. The land is sold to the highest bidder with planning permission;

If you wish to meet us to discuss any potential Fieldcrest Partnership projects we would be pleased to arrange a meeting at your convenience.

Please contact Nigel Thorns on (01743) 343660

S. Affleck-Drimer

4. The building of a roundabout from the A53 into Oaklands Park and the deliberate attempt to misinform the new residents of a proposed development through the estate and likely 5-year heavy goods through traffic by Lion court Homes was underhand. Conversations I have had with some residents revealed their concern 1 year ago that they had been misled and why searches did not reveal this proposal is a mystery.

5. The building of Oaklands Park and the creation of a roundabout was always a back door method for Rodney Cooke and Mr Videno aided by Nigel Thornes in partnership with David Owen to continue with the development on greenbelt fields and adjacent marsh areas and habitats surrounding the Kiln as a future profiteering venture.

6. Building from the back of Oakwell via an extension road through a marshy area to fields beyond when other sites around Shawbury closer to the A53 as identified on the feasibility plans does not hold up to scrutiny. The current plans use areas that are clearly unviable e.g. due to flooding probability but others weren't. The draft plan should be modified to identify other potential smaller developments.

7. SHA019 does flood particularly in the wetter wild areas from beyond Oakland Park. It is an ill-conceived area of land to build a road on and the areas around the Kiln, and the fields behind The Paddocks and Hazeldines.



This Photo is directly behind the Paddocks and has been in this state on and off for over 3 months

Even though the draft plan discusses that the development will not lead to any flooding in the surrounding residential areas, the brook which flows behind the Hazeldines and Paddocks regularly fills up in winter and spring and even with dredging and the onset of more wet weather our house is at the lowest point in Shawbury and is likely to suffer from flooding. Building high ridge unsightly mounds and/or deep hole drainage is unlikely to resolve the problem of potentially increasing run off.

8. **Sewage** - STW refuse to provide details on the visits to Shawbury (as they claimed they are outside the freedom of information act being a PLC) which are known to be extremely high. The sewage system simply cannot cope with current housing which is increasing with micro housing developments. This results in regular sewage pipe cleaning, blockages, manhole spewing etc. As a result of sewage flooding to our garden in up to 2005 eventual intervention by STW and the introduction of a non-return valve may be exacerbated by further housing developments. A thorough overhaul of Shawbury's sewage system should be completed before any large-scale development is completed

9. **Flora and Fauna** is in abundance and needs to be supported to allow to thrive such as: Buzzards, Red Kites, Goldfinches, Spotted Woodpecker, Kingfisher (along the brook adjacent to the paddocks/Hazeldine) plus lots of other finches, starlings, blackbird, finches and the spectacular barn owl who lives near the brick kiln. In addition: Bats, Foxes, squirrel, hedgehogs, mice & voles all use the fields adjacent to the Paddocks and beyond. Flora- the hedgerows between the Paddocks and Hazeldene field is a rich habitat for the flora above as is the surrounding area to the Kiln. Shrubs including Hawthorne, Holly, trees to include Alder, Birch, Oak will all be affected. Running a road through this will lead to further loss of wildlife.

10. **Footfall through the Paddocks.** The Paddocks is the only viable and realistic way that residents from the new estates will use as a thorough fare to the village fields, playground, church, school, and shops. This is an unlit unmaintained road with a right of way but no foot paths. We do not want lighting, and with delivery lorries and occasional visitors speeding down the road it is a fatal accident waiting to happen by increasing the footfall from 80 houses. There is no other feasible alternative as a way into the village that would be realistically used. We were informed that SIL monies were to be used to create a footpath adjacent to the school to the new development i.e. Oaklands Park, this money however was used to create the roundabout on the A53 and the path safe, secure path was never created. Yet another instance where the village was misled with the previous development and the rightful use of SIL money.

Summary

1. In Part 3 of Question 5, it is unclear how a transparent consultation between the local Shawbury community as represented by Shawbury Parish Council and individual submissions and Shropshire Planning Department quickly identified SHA019 as the preferred development site of those identified of which some were not only viable but more feasible. This throws into conjecture the process followed.
2. The relationship between Mr Cooke and family and Mr Thorns who are now physical Shrewsbury neighbours and dog walk together and the potential connections with Shropshire Planning Department (as the ex head of Planning) could be easily perceived as a conflict of interest when one considers the broken promises over developments linked to Oakland Park and the use of Cil money for the roundabout as well as to the community in future developments without absorbing the impact of current housing developments. These relationships leave Planning and the parish open to collusion and criticism which of course may not be true.

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.

1. The proposed development of SHA019 should be re examined as a preferred location for housing development as outlined in 4 above.
2. Alternative developments on a much smaller scale should be considered from those inspected as earlier proposed development sites around Shawbury as part of a modification to the plan.
3. The responsibility to consult with Shawbury Parish Council in identifying a site for further development has not been considered by Shropshire Council equivocally in a transparent way, who announced 1 year ago that non of the identified planning sites had preference.

(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 to observe due process if needed, personally or by a representative solicitor

(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: Stephen Affleck-Drimer

Date: 25/02/2021

Office Use Only

Part A Reference:

Part B Reference: