

#21



COMPLETE

Collector: New Link (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, April 12, 2014 1:39:02 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, April 12, 2014 2:38:44 PM
Time Spent: 00:59:42
IP Address: 86.172.162.229

PAGE 1

Q1: Your details:

Name: Joan Zorn
 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: schedule S14 1a Allocation Land off Whittington Rd OSW004

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 No

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, Not justified, Not effective,
 Not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework or

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.

Not positively prepared:

- a) As OSW004 was submitted as part of a co-ordinated proposal with two other sites it is no longer valid as 002 and 003 have been removed.
- b) The heritage plan provided by the developers is inadequate and does not take the importance of the Hill Fort's setting and archaeological relevance into account and does not adhere to NPPF
- c) An additional 117 houses in this location will increase the volume of traffic entering and leaving the town and cause problems for the 3 local primary schools. This does not seem to have been taken into consideration

Not justified:

- a) The council has to show evidence of the participation of the local community and others. It has not taken into consideration the views of over 10 000 people (local, national and international).
- b) Shropshire Council has not responded to the professional Landscape and Visual Impact Report showing the major impact of OSW004 development on the significance of the hillfort
- c) Oswestry Town Council formally requested a review of all relevant archaeological reports before final decisions are arrived at. Shropshire Council has not responded
- d) Decisions have been based on a flawed and non-compliant Heritage Impact Assessment provided by the land owner

Not effective;

- a) There are national planning barriers outlined in NPPF to the delivery of this development
- b) English Heritage, Oswestry Town Council, and Selattyn and Gobowen Parish Council are against this proposal so Shropshire Council have not shown that 'delivery partners' are signed up to the plan
- c) Shropshire Council have not sufficiently explored all the alternatives
- d) These plans would permanently damage the second most important hillfort in the country so the council is NOT working to 'a strategy for the historic environment'
- e) The opposition of English Heritage, Oswestry Town Council and the high level of public antagonism to the plan would make planning applications costly and unjustified
- f) Any planning application submitted within OSW004 would not be compliant with NPPF paras 131 and 132
- g) The inclusion of OSW004 contradicts the council's own development management policies 2 and 13. It also contradicts the core Strategy Policy (adopted Feb 2014) CS17: Environmental Networks

Not consistent with national policy:

- a) NPPF para 126 states that 'local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment'
- b) The development planned in OSW004 does not give the protection afforded to Old Oswestry Hillfort under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979

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.

OSW004 should be dropped from SAMdev

Oswestry's Sustainable Urban Extension(SUE) of 900 houses should contribute more than the current 7% included in the 5-yr figures

Q10: Do you wish to make another representation?

No

PAGE 4: Representation details 2

Q11: Please give the policy/paragraph/policies map details for your first representation relates to:

Respondent skipped this question

Q12: Is your representation in support or objection?

Respondent skipped this question

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'.

Respondent skipped this question

Q14: If your representation considers the SAMDev plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is: (tick as many as apply)

Respondent skipped this question

SAMdev consultation 2014

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.

Respondent skipped this question

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.

Respondent skipped this question

Q17: Do you wish to make another representation?

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 5: Representation details 3

Q18: Please give the policy/paragraph/policies map details for your first representation relates to:

Respondent skipped this question

Q19: Is your representation in support or objection?

Respondent skipped this question

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'.

Respondent skipped this question

Q21: If your representation considers the SAMDev plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is: (tick as many as apply)

Respondent skipped this question

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.

Respondent skipped this question

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.

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 6: Finally...

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

No, I wish to pursue my representation through this written representation

PAGE 7

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

Respondent skipped this question

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