

#36

**COMPLETE****Collector:** New Link (Web Link)**Started:** Wednesday, April 23, 2014 4:05:44 AM**Last Modified:** Wednesday, April 23, 2014 5:11:59 AM**Time Spent:** 01:06:15**IP Address:** 188.29.121.215

## PAGE 1

**Q1: Your details:**

Name: Philip Needham

Address:

**Q2: Are you acting on behalf of anyone?**

No

## PAGE 2

**Q3: Who are you acting on behalf of:***Respondent skipped this question*

## PAGE 3: Representation details

**Q4: Please give the policy/paragraph/policies map details for your first representation relates to:**

LYD009

**Q5: Is your representation in support or objection?**

Object

**Q6: In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map do you consider that the SAMdev is: See guidance notes sections 1 and 2 for the meanings of 'legally compliant' and 'sound'.**

Legally compliant Yes

Sound No

**Q7: If your representation considers the SAMDev plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is: (tick as many as apply)**

Not positively prepared

**Q8: Please specify your reason for supporting or objecting. If you are objecting, you should make clear why the document is unsound having regard to the issues of 'legal compliance' or whether the document is not positively prepared, justified, effective or not consistent with national policy.**

I believe the site LYD009 has been used as a 'levering point' for the other two plots being considered.

I was never consulted by ANYONE prior to this plan being drafted (and only found out when the first letter came out) this was quite a shock after the Parish Council turned my planning application down, despite extensive support from the village for this, the only 'brown field' site in the village.

The Parish Council website is STILL not functioning (hardly a transparent process).

Prior to this draft there was a meeting between the Parish Council and Liam Cowden (Shropshire Planning Officer) of which I was given only six hours notice (via email) from the Parish Council Clerk, this is not an acceptable time scale (did Liam Cowden have the same notice?).

Next, we went to an open meeting at the Powis Arms public house, where a Shropshire Council representative clearly stated that all landowners had been consulted (THIS IS NOT THE CASE and when challenged the subject was quickly dropped). When asked which landowners were forwarded / designating their land the subject was again quickly dropped.

To be honest I have had enough of being messed about and until Plowden Estates, Lydbury North Parish Council and Shropshire Council come up with a sensible offer of what I can build there, (leaving the Bungalow intact). I WISH TO HAVE MY 'PLOT' REMOVED FROM THE PLAN IMMEDIATELY.

Please let me know what has happened to the other suggested plots.

Please see why my previous application was rejected below :

Plans to build two homes on a piece of land described as an "eyesore" in a south Shropshire village have been turned down by councillors. They were submitted by Phillip Needham.

They sought to turn the former garage in Lydbury North, near Bishop's Castle, into two homes.

The scheme had attracted 45 letters of support.

But Shropshire Council's south planning committee rejected the application on Tuesday, claiming the plan would not meet the council's affordable homes strategy and would not help to meet the need in the area.

The plans had been opposed by Lydbury North Parish Council and Peter Phillips, Shropshire councillor for Bishop's Castle, said he was pleased the plans had been refused.

Shirehall planners had recommended the scheme should be turned down in a report ahead of the meeting.

The planned development site lies about 45 metres outside Lydbury North's conservation area but within the boundary of Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Councillor Phillips said: "The application was for two open market value houses on the old garage site, and if it would have been allowed it would have been a case of driving a coach and horses through the council's affordable housing strategy.

"It was pretty hotly contested as 45 standardised letters in favour of building the homes had been signed by residents, and it is fair to say that the site is quite a large area and an eyesore.

"But members of the parish council had opposed the plans and I'm pleased to say the committee decided unanimously to turn it down."

Ian Kilby, head of development management at Shropshire Council, said: "The application proposed the development of two detached dwellings, which are not intended as affordable dwellings for eligible local households within a small village without a development boundary.

"In this situation new housing development, other than to provide affordable dwellings, would not normally be permitted."

**Q9: Explain the changes you think should be made to the SAMdev Plan in order to make it legally compliant or sound. You should explain your suggested revisions to the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map and why this change would make the plan legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

Due to the huge losses I would incur by demolishing the bungalow (ie. the payment of CIL Tax on any development, Contamination Surveys / Removal and the Covenance to be lifted by Plowden Estates for any planning at LYD009 to be allowed, it is simply not viable, but if a sensible offer is put to me I would consider the redevelopment but currently do not wish to 'invest' any further monies or time on 'wild goose chases'.

I am also opposing all planning on sites LYD007 and LYD008.

**Q10: Do you wish to make another representation?**

No

## PAGE 4: Representation details 2

<b>Q11: Please give the policy/paragraph/policies map details for your first representation relates to:</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q12: Is your representation in support or objection?</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q13: In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map do you consider that the SAMdev is: See guidance notes sections 1 and 2 for the meanings of 'legally compliant' and 'sound'.</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q14: If your representation considers the SAMDev plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is: (tick as many as apply)</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q15: Please specify your reason for supporting or objecting. If you are objecting, you should make clear why the document is unsound having regard to the issues of 'legal compliance' or whether the document is not positively prepared, justified, effective or not consistent with national policy.</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q16: Explain the changes you think should be made to the SAMdev Plan in order to make it legally compliant or sound. You should explain your suggested revisions to the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map and why this change would make the plan legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q17: Do you wish to make another representation?</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>

## PAGE 5: Representation details 3

<b>Q18: Please give the policy/paragraph/policies map details for your first representation relates to:</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q19: Is your representation in support or objection?</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q20: In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map do you consider that the SAMdev is: See guidance notes sections 1 and 2 for the meanings of 'legally compliant' and 'sound'.</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q21: If your representation considers the SAMDev plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is: (tick as many as apply)</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q22: Please specify your reason for supporting or objecting. If you are objecting, you should make clear why the document is unsound having regard to the issues of 'legal compliance' or whether the document is not positively prepared, justified, effective or not consistent with national policy.</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
<b>Q23: Explain the changes you think should be made to the SAMdev Plan in order to make it legally compliant or sound. You should explain your suggested revisions to the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map and why this change would make the plan legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>

## PAGE 6: Finally...

**Q24: Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the examination?**

Yes, I wish to give evidence about my representation at the examination

PAGE 7

**Q25: If you wish to attend the examination please explain why you think this is necessary.**

To be personally informed (better than emails).

**Q26: Do you wish to be notified of any of the following: (we will contact you using the details you have provided)**

When the SAMDev plan has been submitted for examination	Yes
When the Inspector's report is published	Yes
When the SAMDev plan is adopted	Yes