

**UMA
AMA
DHR**

**Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development
(SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan):
Further Main Modifications**

08 – 28 August 2015

Ms J De Rosa – Representation

Contents

Title 1	My Representation
Chapter 1	Testing Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Further Main Modifications
Section 1	Soundness Test
Section 2	Legal compliance.
Section 3	Positively prepared.
Section 4	Justified
Section 5	Effective.
Section 6	Consistent with national policy
Chapter 2	Rationale Test of the Schedule of Further Main Modifications
Section 1	Where's the Legitimate Expectation?
Section 2	Proportionate?
Section 3	Statutory Duty and Unreasonableness?
Section 4	Reasonable?
Section 5	Bias = Belief? National Policy is bias?
Chapter 3	What changes to Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2?
Section 1	Change(s) to FMM1
Section 2	Change(s) to FMM2
Chapter 4	House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24), Department for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18 th June 2015
Section 1	DCLG Ministerial Written Statement & Refutations, of Ministerial Written Statement
Section 2	Energy Bill: ss. 59 – 60
Section 3	Bias = Belief?
Chapter 5	Ethical Test of the Schedule of Further Main Modifications
Section 1	Discriminate between Ethics and Morality
Section 2	Meta-ethics
Section 3	Normative Ethics
Section 4	Applied Ethics: Environmental sphere
Chapter 6	Politics Considerations Test
Section 1	Philosophy Questions
Section 2	Politics Questions
Title 2	Conclusions
Section 1	Preliminary considerations <i>10/08/2015</i>
Section 2	Intermediary considerations <i>17/08/2015</i>
Section 3	Final conclusions <i>24/08/2015</i>

Title 1 My Representation

1 References:

1. Planning Policy Statement 12: creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (2008): 4.50 – 4.52, 4.44, 4.36 Core Strategies must be justifiable: they must be: (1) found on a robust and credible evidence base; and (2) the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, 4.44 “Core Strategy must be effective: this means they must be: deliverable, flexible.
2. Local Development Frameworks: Examining Development Plan Documents: Procedure Guidance, Annex: Model Representation Form and Model Guidance Note for Development Plan Documents, 2, 3.1 – 3.2.
3. Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18th June 2015, Secretary of State Amber Rudd MP: “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to

- change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications”, “I am now setting out proposals to end new subsidises for onshore wind, specifically in relation to the Renewable Obligation (PO)”, “The Energy Bill will devolve powers out of Whitehall so that applications onshore wind farms are considered by democratically elected councils”;
4. Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 20 (5) (a), 19 (1), 19 (2) (a – b), 19 (2)(a) “national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State”, 26 (2) (a) “If the Secretary of State directs them to do so”, 21 (1)(a) “he may at any time before the document is adopted under section 23 direct the local planning authority to modify the document in accordance with the direction”;
 5. Planning Reference: **15/00532/FUL Wind Turbine 2.1 miles away from Bridgnorth.**
 6. The Bridgnorth Town Council: “**Revolved:** that the Town Council had no objections to the SAMDev Schedule of Main Modifications – June 2015”;
 7. The Conservative Party Manifesto 2015: **STRONG LEADERSHIP, A CLEAR ECONOMIC PLAN, A BRIGHTER, MORE SECURE FUTURE: Guaranteeing you clean, affordable and secure energy supplies** (page 57) – halt the spread of subsidised onshore wind farms, “Onshore wind now makes a meaningful contribution to our energy mix and has been part of the necessary increase in renewable capacity. Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support, however, and are unable by themselves to provide the firm capacity that a stable energy system requires. As a result, we will end any new publicly subsidy for them and change the law so that local people have a final say on windfarm applications” (page 58), “Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support”.
 8. Community Energy Strategy: Full Report 27 January 2014: Para 22 “Community energy’ covers many types of community getting involved in many different ways: a group of local people setting up their solar installation or wind turbine”, Figure 3: indicative costs of community electricity project (pre-construction phase) Wind resource assessment (onshore).
 9. Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): MD8 – Infrastructure Provision: para 4 Renewable Energy infrastructure & para 4.73.
 10. The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2 & “for consistency with the recent Written Statement on wind turbine” and “The modifications is required for consistency to changes with national policy guidance”, FMM2 In the case of wind energy proposals, proposals will be assessed national policy guidance, including the Written Ministerial Statement of 18 June 2015 & .
 11. National Planning Policy Framework (2012): para 182 Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considers against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence, 182 Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities, 182 “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared on a strategy which meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirement, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development”.
 12. Onshore Wind: Economic Impacts 2014 (April 2015), by Renewable UK.
 13. International support for onshore wind (Frontier Economics) by a report prepared for DECC June 2013.
 14. Sciences (Hypothesis, Null Hypothesis, Data Analyst, Experiments to Test Theories, to prove or disprove Theory or Hypothesis).
 15. Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 In the case of wind energy proposals, proposals will be assessed national policy guidance & For consistency with the recent Written Ministerial Statement on wind turbines, FMM2.
 16. Energy Bill: ss. 59 – 60, ss. 59 Electricity Act 1989: ss. 36 (1D) “(1D) Subsection (1) does not apply to an England or Wales onshore wind generation station”, ss. 60 Onshore wind power: closure of renewables obligation on 31 March 2016, Electricity Act 1989: ss. 32LB –

- ss. 32LC (1) “No renewable obligation certificates are to be issued under the renewables obligation order in respect of electricity generated after 31 March 2016 by an onshore wind generating station which is accredited after that date”
17. House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24), Department for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18th June 2015: “Subject to the transitional provision set out below, these considerations will take effect from 18 June and should be taken in to account in planning decisions. I am also making a limited number of consequential changes to planning guidance”, “When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:”, “The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and”, “Following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing”, “In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines, or similar, will not be sufficient. Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority”, “Where a valid planning application for a wind energy development has already been submitted to a local planning authority and the development plan does not identify suitable sites, the following transitional provision applies. In such instances, local planning authorities can find the proposal acceptable if, following consultation, they are satisfied it has addressed the planning impacts identified by affected local communities and therefore has their backing”.
 18. Bridgnorth District Local Plan 1996 – 2011.
 19. Bridgnorth Place Plan 2014 – 2015.
 20. BBC News (22 June 2015) “about 250 planned onshore wind farms are likely to be cancelled because of an early end to subsidies, the government said”,
 21. Utilities Act 2000: ss. 62, Electricity Act 1989: ss. 32 “(1) An order under section 32 may make provision generally in relation to the renewables obligation imposed by order, and may in particular specific -” and ss. 64 “Green certificates”.
 22. Renewables Obligation Order 2006 (SI) 2006 No. 2004.
 23. DECC Propriety Guidance: For Ministers and Officials dealing with Department Consent applications (December 2011).
 24. Ministerial Code (2010): 1.2 f “Ministers must ensure that no conflict arises, or appears to arise, between their public duties and their private interests”, 4.1 “The Prime Minister is responsible for the overall organisation of the executive and the allocation of the functions between Ministers in charge of departments”.
 25. Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012, Localism Act 2011: ss. 33A.
 26. Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 [SI No. 767]: “local plan” explanation encompass “site allocation policy” means a policy which allocates a site for a particular use or development, regulation 17 “decision statement” (a), regulation 29 “Where the Secretary of State gives a direction under the section 21(1) of the Act in respect of a local plan, the local planning authority. . .”, regulation 30 “The provisions of Schedule 1 apply to the Secretary of State gives direction under section 21(4) of the Act”.
 27. Shropshire Council – Site Allocation and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan: Legal Compliance Checklist July (2014) says “Section 33A of the Act (introduced by the Localism Act 2011) introduces a duty of cooperate. . .”
 28. Localism Act 2011: ss. 33 (1 – 2)(a), 33(1)(a) refers to ss. 31(4).
 29. Human Rights Act 1998 and Equality Acts, Civil Partnership Act 2004, Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Act 2013.
 30. Renewables Obligation (RO) Order 2002.
 31. Renewables Obligation Closure (Amendment) Order 2015.

32. Electricity Act 1989: ss. 32K, 32LA.
33. The Electricity and Gas (Energy Companies Obligation) Order 2014.
34. Sovereign Grant Act 2011.
35. Renewables Obligation Order 2009.
36. Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report (July 2014): The Final Plan sustainability appraisal – table 14A: SA summary appraisal for the Final Plan: MD8 Policy, 11.1 “Therefore, it is essential that the SAMDev Plan does not conflict with any principles established within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Shropshire Council Adopted Core Shropshire 2011”, .
37. Inspector's Note to Council: Wind Energy Development.
38. Utilities Act 2000: ss. 28.
39. ogfem e-serve Renewables Obligation: closure of the scheme to large-scale solar PV: 2.1. “From April 2015 the RO closed to large solar PV stations. A large solar PV station is defined in the RO Closure Order 2015 as “a solar PV station where the total installed capacity of the RO capacity of the station is more than five megawatts”, ;
40. Contract length analysis for Feed-in-Tariff with Contract for Difference: Summary of onshore and offshore wind analysis (August 2013 DECC).

2 My previous representations', connected to LDF SAMDev DPD:

1. LDF Bridgnorth & Shrewsbury SAMDev Preferred Sites DPDs.
2. SAM Devel DPD Revised July 2013.
3. SAMDev Local Plan & Local Plan Plan (Examination) Matters & Issues for Examination 2014.
4. Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) 17 March 2014 – (Representation) Vision 7.

3 My methods of enquire and questioning.

The Soundness Test:

- Legal compliance.
- Positively prepared.
- Justified.
- Effective.
- Consistent with national policy.

The Rationale Tests:

- Philosophy Rationalism.
- Administrative Law Principles.
- Philosophy Relativism.

The Ethical Tests:

- Meta-ethics.
- Normative ethics.
- Applied ethics – environmental ethics.

The Politics Considerations Test:

Philosophy Enquire

- Is the policy legitimate?

- Is the policy justified?
- Is the policy right?
- Is the policy legal?
- Is the policy correct?
- Is the policy and the legislative, all void?
- Is the policy incorrect?

Politics Questions

- What things are neglected are said?
- What other things are effected by ending of subsidies?
- What other things, are effected by unspoken and hidden behind, the decision statements?
- Right decision, to give Planning Permissions to small and medium onshore wind turbine farm yet discriminate against large onshore wind turbine farms, is it really right?
- Right decision to give Planning Permissions to large onshore wind turbine farm yet the Conservative Secretary of State MP, is obstructive of its development, who is right the local authority or impropriety of the Secretary of State undue process of his/her decision statement?
- Right decision to stop further Renewables Obligation certificates, in turn stops further onshore wind turbine farms and solar PV farms developments', thus the local community objectors and the bias Conservative Secretaries of State MPs are pleased, but its not right, there irresponsibility to the global environment is damaged by their NIMBYees attitude, is it right decision?

Further sub questions, to follow.

- Where is the sense or reason, or logic in irrational of both electorate and elected MPs?
- Right decision to stop further Renewables Obligation certificates, is it right decision?
- Stops further onshore wind turbine farms and solar PV farms developments', is it really the right decision?
- The local community objectors and the bias Conservative Secretaries of State MPs are pleased, but its not right, there irresponsibility to the global environment is damaged by their NIMBYees attitude, is it right decision?

Chapter 1 Testing Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Further Main Modifications

Section 1 Soundness Test

1 Original Soundness Test.

The source or origins of, the Soundness test is Planning Policy Statement 12: creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (2008): 4.50 – 4.52, 4.44.

Another source of Soundness test is Local Development Frameworks: Examining Development Plan Documents: Procedure Guidance, Annex: Model Representation Form and Model Guidance Note for Development Plan Documents, 2, 3.1 – 3.2.

2 The *Corrupted* Soundness Test.

The National Planning Policy Framework (2012): para 7, 182. The NPPF is bias on side of, the economic role over environmental role and social role, thus National Planning Policy Framework is corrupt!

3 The Soundness Test.

The Soundness test:

- Legal compliance.
- Positively prepared.
- Justified.
- Effective.
- Consistent with national policy.

Here is the current soundness test, I use the soundness test to test whatever planning policy, national policy, planning applications. National policies, Bills and Acts of Parliament are NOT immune, from my questioning and philosophical enquire.

Section 2 Legal compliance

1 Legal Questions.

1. Main Modifications compatible, compliant with Legal requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 20 (5) (a)?
2. Main Modifications compatible, compliant with Legal requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 19 (1), 19 (2) (a – b)?
3. Are the Further Main Modifications legal?
4. Is the Secretary of State, statement Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18th June 2015 a legitimate expectation?

Additional question is. Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, risen from Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 26 (2) (a) “If the Secretary of State directs them to do so”, was the revision of the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) unduly influenced by Ministerial bias?

2 Considerations.

	Questions	Considerations
1	Main Modifications compatible, compliant with Legal requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 20 (5) (a)?	The Planning and Compulsory Act 2004: ss. 20(5)(a) refers to, ss. 19 & 26, has follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subsection 19, is meet by Schedule of Further Main Modifications. 2. Subsection 26, is met by Schedule of Further Main Modifications is a revision of LDD (“Local Development

		<p>Document”) Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan).</p> <p>The original Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), is now a revision, because of the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2, etc.</p>
2	<p>Main Modifications compatible, compliant with Legal requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 19 (1), 19 (2) (a – b)?</p>	<p>Subsection 19 (1), is a yes, positively prepared and informing local consultees representatives'.</p> <p>Subsection 19 (2)(a), is a yes, meets it. Subsection 19 (2)(a) “national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State”, but the Ministerial Written Statements of 18th June 2015 are neither 'national policy' or 'advice contained in guidance', thus the Ministerial Written Statements of 18th June 2015 are annulled.</p> <p>Neither Secretary of State Amber Rudd MP or Secretary of State Greg Clark MP, have complied with, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 19 (2)(a), thus Secretaries of State Ministerial Written Statements' are illegal. Its seems, the Shropshire Council and the Planning Inspectorate, are following illegal national policy guidance. The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2 are annulled.</p> <p>Subsection 19 (2)(b) is meet, by</p>

		Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, etc.
3	Are the Further Main Modifications legal?	<p>The legality of Main Modifications, is speculation in the context, of the Independent Examination by Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>A valid question, should not be dismissed or ignored, because the Planning Inspectorate is following the whims of, whatever Secretary of State.</p>
4	Is the Secretary of State, statement Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18 th June 2015 a legitimate expectation?	<p>The previous Secretary of State, did support 'community energy', onshore wind energy development projects, thus gave subsidises to worthy projects to energy generation. Here is a legitimate expectation.</p> <p>The new Secretary of State, don't supports onshore wind energy development projects, anti 'community energy', the Ministerial Written Statement 18th June 2015, is incompatible with legitimate expectation.</p>
5	Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, risen from Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 26 (2) (a) “If the Secretary of State directs them to do so”, was the revision of the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) unduly influenced by Ministerial bias?	<p>The Conservative Manifesto 2015: STRONG LEADERSHIP, A CLEAR ECONOMIC PLAN, A BRIGHTER, MORE SECURE FUTURE: Guaranteeing you clean, affordable and secure energy supplies (page 57) – halt the spread of subsidised onshore wind farms, “Onshore wind now makes a meaningful contribution to our energy mix and has been part of the necessary increase in renewable capacity. Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support, however, and are unable by themselves to provide the firm capacity that a stable energy system requires. As a result, we will end any new publicly subsidy for them and change the law so that local people</p>

have a final say on windfarm applications” (page 58), “Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support”, combined with Secretaries of State MPs – Ministerial Written Statements and the Energy Bill, are evidence of incompatibility, of the Ministerial Code (2010): 1.2 f “Ministers must ensure that no conflict arises, or appears to arise, between their public duties and their private interests”, oh yes, their Political interest is unduly influencing public interest and unduly influencing national planning policy, even through those Ministerial Written Statements are neither 'national policy guidance' or 'advice contained in guidance'.

Also, the Ministerial Code (2010): 4.1 “The Prime Minister is responsible for the overall organisation of the executive and the allocation of the functions between Ministers in charge of departments”, the Prime Minister is three conflicting roles/interests:

1. He/she is a Prime Minister.
2. He/she is a Leader of the Political Party.
3. He/she is a Member of Parliament (MP).

Three conflicting interests, the party politics Manifesto pollutes impartiality and fairness of upholding Administrative Justice, and the Ministerial interests, corrupts his/her Constituency interests, so the backdrop of the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are of conflicting interests of those Secretaries of State. The illegality, of those Ministerial Written Statements

		<p>of 18th June 2015. There is Ministerial bias, at the heart, of those Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2.</p> <p>The Secretaries of State are unduly influencing Shropshire Council directly, by Planning Inspectorate and indirectly impacting local consultees, wider local communities, while it is illegal and the Ministerial Written Statement is bias, that bias is justified wrongly called legal by Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012: regulation 17 “decision statement” (a), it relates to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 21 (1)(a) “he may at any time before the document is adopted under section 23 direct the local planning authority to modify the document in accordance with the direction”.</p>
--	--	---

The principal focus of Local Consultees is, the FMM1, FMM2, etc., and the focus on FMM1, FMM2 is ignorance of wider background and context behind, the FMM1 – 2. While, Local Towns Councils and Parish Councils', won't object to Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2 , they are neglecting their responsibilities to there own local Wards' residents, by allowing unsound and endorsing unsound Secretaries of State Ministerial Written Statements', with environmental consequences' upon their own towns.

3 Original Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): MD8 policy: Renewable Energy infrastructure and now Schedule for Further Modifications: FMM1 – 2, what is the legality of Public Interest to change Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): MD8 policy: Renewable Energy infrastructure wording in line, with a unsound national policy guidance?

Each Secretary of State, can and do change, amend where the 'Public Interest' is, like making a Ministerial Written Statement eventually becomes, a 'national policy', such the change or no change of national policy, can't be proof its legal. Even, the Acts of Parliament, can't prove the Acts of Parliament are lawful nor the Royal Assets given to a Bill, to become an Act of Parliament, a Public Law, the Public Law itself can't prove its own legality.

The national policy is always, in permanent reasonable doubt, likewise all Acts of Parliament and Statutory Instruments are in permanent reasonable doubt, no regulation or no national policy, no legislation, are immune from reasonable doubts and enquire. The 'Public Interest' is not immune, from reasonable doubts, the public interest to subsidise onshore wind energy developments then the

public interest is to end subsidises to onshore wind energy developments. The 'public interest' = lawful, but the national policy is subsidising onshore wind energy development is lawful, then a new Secretary of State wants to end subsidising onshore wind energy development, means the subsidising onshore wind energy developments by Public money is unlawful.

The legality of anything, is speculation, conjuncture, like the illegality of anything is speculation, conjuncture, whatever national policy and eventual legislations have no legitimacy and; the Law of the Land itself is simply, a long line of conjuncture and national policies, are simply a long list of toilet rolls. Renewable Energy infrastructure of MD8 policy of the Shropshire Council, is being undermined by unsoundness of the Secretary of State inappropriate Ministerial Written Statement.

And in the light of, Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012: regulation 17 “decision statement” (a), it relates to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 21 (1)(a) “he may at any time before the document is adopted under section 23 direct the local planning authority to modify the document in accordance with the direction”, here the “decision statement” by the Secretaries of State and those “decision statement” are conjuncture, proposition to be subjected to enquire and reasonable doubts. The Ministerial Written Statements are merely political propositions, bias loaded and very little evidence or, very little rationale behind whatever unsound Ministerial Written Statements.

4 Shropshire Council – Site Allocation and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan: Legal Compliance Checklist July (2014), it mentions the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012, Localism Act 2011: ss. 33A, why Local Planning Authorities dependent on, follow unsound Localism Act 2011? What is Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012? How it relates, Schedule of Further Main Modifications?

What is Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012? How it relates, Schedule of Further Main Modifications?

I have tracked down, the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 [SI No. 767]: “local plan” explanation encompass “site allocation policy” means a policy which allocates a site for a particular use or development, thus the “site allocation policy” is the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012: regulation 17 “decision statement” (a), it relates to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 21 (1)(a) “he may at any time before the document is adopted under section 23 direct the local planning authority to modify the document in accordance with the direction” and here, we got the consequences of that bias direction, is the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2 principally.

Why Local Planning Authorities dependent on, follow unsound Localism Act 2011? What is Localism Act 2011: ss. 33A?

The Localism Act 2011, is a unsound legislation, like most things come from Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty and a lot of bad laws, except these Human Rights Act 1998 and Equality Acts, Civil Partnership Act 2004, Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Act 2013 I do support, protect, defend.

The Shropshire Council – Site Allocation and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan: Legal

Compliance Checklist July (2014) says “Section 33A of the Act (introduced by the Localism Act 2011) introduces a duty of cooperate. . .”, but the Localism Act 2011 has no section 33A and it as ss. 33 (1 – 2)(a) and the Shropshire Council – Site Allocation and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan: Legal Compliance Checklist July (2014) says “Section 33A of the Act (introduced by the Localism Act 2011) introduces a duty of cooperate. . .” says that, to clarify the reference for the Shropshire Council Planning Advisory Service (PAS) they should re-read the Localism Act 2011 again, it is Localism Act 2011: ss. 33(1)(a) refers to ss. 31(4).

Section 3 Positively prepared

1 What is the credibility of NPPF: para 182 Positively prepared?

- The National Policy Planning Framework (2012): para 182 “**Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared on a strategy which meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirement, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development”.

The National Policy Planning Framework (2012), is incompatible with the Planning Policy Statement 12: creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (2008). The NPPF (2012) remains, a unsound national planning policy!

2 The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2 Positively prepared?

	NPPF: para 182 <i>Positively prepared</i>	Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report (July 2014): sustainability appraisal – table 14A: SA summery appraisal for the Final Plan	Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2 <i>Positively prepared?</i>
1	“The plan should be prepared on a strategy”	MD8 Policy, is compatible with Shropshire Council LDF Core Strategy.	MD8 Policy & FMM1, FMM2 have not prepared or not sites allocation for renewables energy wind turbine stations, etc.
2	“Which meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirement”	MD8 Policy has neglected renewables energy sector, has part of the Shropshire renewables infrastructure.	FMM1, FMM2 are unsound and they are conjuncture, speculative, the Secretaries of State don't prepare anything,

			to support their decision statements to be tested.
3	“Including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities”	MD8 Policy is not cooperating with other neighbouring authorities, no cooperation on renewables energy mentioned in MD8 Policy of the SAMDev Final Plan.	FMM 1 – 2, is incompatible with Positively prepared criteria 'neighbouring authorities' on renewables energy sector.
4	“Where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development”		FMM1, FMM2 are NOT positively prepared, they were not pre-emptive by the Shropshire Council or not pre-emptive by stakeholders too, and the Secretaries of State undue influencing planning process is unsound, has the Conservative Manifesto 2015 itself is unsound, groundless. The FMM1, FMM2 are incompatible with LDF Core Strategy, SAMDev Final Plan (Pre-Submission Final Plan) and the Secretaries of State “decision statements”, are irrelevant, should be dismissed.

The Schedule of Further Main Modifications FMM1, FMM2 are not compatible with anything any where and the national policy guidance is groundless, should not be followed, no reasonable persons' follows a groundless 18th June 2015 national policy guidances.

3 Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report (July 2014): 11.1 “Therefore, it is essential that the SAMDev Plan does not conflict with any principles established within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Shropshire Council Adopted Core Shropshire 2011”, the FMM1 – 2 want to appear to be compatible with unsoundness of the National Planning Policy Framework, is it sound?

The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) is unsound, unreliable, its bias on side of economics role over environmental and social roles.

The Ministerial Written Statements of 18th June 2015, are collectively groundless and unsound, its inappropriate for Shropshire Council to be compliant with a unsound Ministerial Written Statements of 18th June 2015.

The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are Positively prepared *unsound*.

Section 4 Justified

1 Original Planning Policy Statement 12: creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (2008): para 4.36 and the unsound National Planning Policy Framework (2012): para 182.

- The Planning Policy Statement 12: creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (2008): para 4.36 Core Strategies must be justifiable: they must be: (1) found on a robust and credible evidence base; and (2) the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (2012): para 182 Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considers against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.

Which of the two, is the most reliable and genuie Guide to General Local Consultees? I won't follow, the unsoundness current National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and, a choice of two evils, I decide to follow the Planning Policy Statement 12: creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (2008): chapter 4 Core Strategy: soundness test pointers.

2 Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): (Schedule of) Further Main Modifications *Justified?*

The Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are NOT justified and the Secretary of State Ministerial Written Statement of 18th June 2015, is NOT evidence to change Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) contents, wording, sentences, paragraphs, MD8 policy.

3 Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are groundless and can't be Justified, FMM1 – 2 are NOT justified, endorsing a unsound Schedule of Further Main Modifications, where's the rationale?

The Ministerial Statement on wind turbine 18th June 2015, is a groundless Statement and the Secretary of State Ministerial Written Statement should not be used, by Local Planning Authorities and local communities, should refute Secretary of State Ministerial Written Statement!

The FMM1 – 2, are NOT justified and NOT rationale, and the Secretary of State Ministerial Statement on wind turbines, should not be taken has evidence in Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), has part of the Planning Inspectorate considerations equally too, its irrational behaviour by the Planning Inspectorate to include, a groundless Secretary of State Ministerial Statement on wind turbines.

The FMM1 – 2 are NOT justified and the Secretary of State Ministerial Statement on wind turbines, is NOT justified, while the Onshore Wind: Economic Impacts 2014 (April 2015), by Renewable

UK, is evidence base compared to the Secretary of State Ministerial Statement on wind turbines is groundless!

Mean while, the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) relies, on doubtful evidence to make unsound Public policy, is same across the HM Government Departments national policies all have groundless evidence base. The DECC relies heavily on, phenomenology research methods, like International support for onshore wind (Frontier Economics) by a report prepared for DECC June 2013, but Frontier Economics research don't qualifies has Research according to Sciences (Hypothesis, Null Hypothesis, Data Analyst, Experiments to Test Theories, to prove or disprove Theory or Hypothesis), thus Frontier Economics research is quasi research!

Section 5 Effective

1 Original Planning Policy Statement 12: creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (2008): 4.44 “Core Strategy must be effective: this means they must be: deliverable, flexible; and able to be monitored” and the unsound National Planning Policy Framework: para 182 Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.

- Planning Policy Statement 12: creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (2008): 4.44 “Core Strategy must be effective: this means they must be: deliverable, flexible; and able to be monitored”.
- National Planning Policy Framework: para 182 Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.

Which of the two, is the most reliable and genuie Guide to General Local Consultees? I won't follow, the unsoundness current National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and, a choice of two evils, I decide to follow the Planning Policy Statement 12: creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (2008): chapter 4 Core Strategy: soundness test pointers.

2 Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): (Schedule of) Further Main Modifications *Effective?*

The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2 are *effectively* unsound.

Section 6 Consistent with national policy

1 My questions:

- Further Main Modifications Ref FMM 1 – 2, why Shropshire Council and Planning Inspectorate amending their position in line, with unsound Secretary of State Statement on 18th June 2015?
- What is the hidden harm, from Secretary of State hypocrite Statement on 18th June 2015?
- Why Inspector's Note to Council, is selective and failed to mentioned, hidden harm from Secretary of State hypocrite Statement on 18th June 2015?
- Is the National Planning Policy Framework compatible or incompatible, with the country of Shropshire?
- What is the environmental consequences of the Secretary of State and the unsound National Policy?
- Secretary of State on side of NIMBY anti Wind farms?
- And national policy on side, of NIMBY anti wind farms, where is the impartiality and

fairness?

- What are the consequences upon local wind farms projects by Secretary of State bias and unsound Statement on 18th June 2015?
- Contradiction between Secretaries of State on issue of wind turbines development projects, why believe hypocrisy and contradictions of whatever Secretaries of State?

The 'hypocrite statement' by Secretary of State, e.g., “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications”. The impact of the irresponsible Secretary of State Ministerial Written Statement is upon, the Shropshire Council **Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)** and Shropshire residents, are supporters of wind energy developments projects.

1 Further Main Modifications Ref FMM 1 – 2, why Shropshire Council and Planning Inspectorate amending their position in line, with unsound Secretary of State Statement on 18th June 2015?

Proposed wind energy development

Yes, it did mention “proposed development site is in an area identified for suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan and”, so far, I am aware no Local Plans in Shropshire and no Place Plans in Shropshire, do mention wind energy developments, thus is a gap between LDF SAMDev DPD and Bridgnorth Local Plan 2014 – 2015, Plan Plan 2014 – 2015, as well also further gap between LDF Core Strategy DPD and local proposed wind energy developments.

Local Planning Authority part of the problem or part of the solution, of increasing number of Wind Energy Developments? Public support is lacking, because of lack of education to general public on benefits of wind energy developments, why Local Planning Authorities and Secretary of State continually fail, to be responsible citizens' to Earth Climate and Environments?

The “following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the proposal reflects the planning concerns of affected local communities and therefore has their backing”, that may sound great, but if the Local Planning Authority is environmentally responsible of encouraging renewable energies, public support of renewable energy projects and encouraging citizens' to be more Greener, mean while in fantasy worlds of Whitehall Secretary of State and Westminster Parliament MPs, promote opposite to environmental responsibility and; foolishly, the local consultees and many local residents, will follow bad habits of elected politicians prejudices to be anti onshore wind farms, has a consequence the national policy will reflect unsoundness of whatever public policies!

If the Local Planning Authority, is progressive thinking of encouraging renewable energies and wind energy development projects, it has my support, however the rest of local consultees of Shropshire and Bridgnorth are objecting to wind energy developments, means the rest of local consultees and the Shropshire residents are environmentally irresponsible! The anti onshore wind farms stance, by many politicians and residents, are groundless.

If both the Local Planning Authority and the local consultees, are anti onshore wind farms, than those Local Planning Authorities and local consultees, local residents are environmentally irresponsible. They are damaging, the Shropshire environment and global environments, by objecting to onshore wind farms, as well also Secretary of State not supporting onshore wind energy developments, the Secretary of State is also part of the problem!

The Conservative Party Manifesto 2015: STRONG LEADERSHIP, A CLEAR ECONOMIC PLAN, A BRIGHTER, MORE SECURE FUTURE: Guaranteeing you clean, affordable and secure energy supplies (page 57) – halt the spread of subsidised onshore wind farms, “Onshore wind now makes a meaningful contribution to our energy mix and has been part of the necessary increase in renewable capacity. Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support, however, and are unable by themselves to provide the firm capacity that a stable energy system requires. As a result, we will end any new publicly subsidy for them and change the law so that local people have a final say on windfarm applications” (page 58), the national policies stems from unsoundness of Conservative Manifesto 2015!

The “Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support”, why Local Planning Authorities and MPs, Councillors' failed to be responsible citizens' of encouraging public support of the onshore windfarms? I am well informed and I had education, about wind energy development has part of my college education doing a Human Sciences course, but the rest of local consultees and local residents, average MPs and an average Councillors' don't have my education from Sciences, so their policy making, decision making, national policy making are fundamentally rooted in naïve realism and ignorance, prejudices. Windfarm has my support, I learnt about it on my college course at Shrewsbury College of Arts and Technology (S.C.A.T) a long time ago, however the average voters and average MPs, average Councillors don't have my same education to understand, to study sciences, like Environmental Sciences, learn about Renewable Energies has part of Biology. The ignorant are elected, to be policy makers and decision makers, while the intelligent sit back and watch, the amusement of policy makers and decision makers, to make fools of themselves on serious issues.

These Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Further Main Modifications, FMM 1 – 2, are trying to be unsoundness like the, unsoundness of the Ministerial Statement on wind turbines, I find very amusing. I am disappointed with Planning Inspectorate and Shropshire Council, are following the unsoundness of the Ministerial Statement on wind turbines and the national policy is fickle, at the whims of elected MPs has Secretaries of State, thus national policy on whatever issue are not necessarily valid or legitimate.

2 What is the hidden harm, from Secretary of State hypocrite Statement on 18th June 2015?

The closure of Renewable Obligations (RO) means, local communities can't get financial support to establish wind energy developments and the Local Planning Authorities, are disabled of fulfilling their responsibility to be environmental responsible because the Secretary of State prejudices and unsound Ministerial Written Statement on 18th June 2015.

3 Why Inspector's Note to Council, is selective and failed to mentioned, hidden harm from Secretary of State hypocrite Statement on 18th June 2015?

	Allegedly Inspector says		Irresponsible Secretary of State says
1	<i>Inspector's Note to Council</i>	“The proposed development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or	<u>County Planning Authority policy making errors</u> The Local Planning Authority, has not

		<p>Neighbourhood Plan; and”</p>	<p>identified suitable sites for onshore wind turbines farms in their LDF Core Strategy DPD, SAMDev Plan, Sustainability Appraisal (Submission).</p> <p>Plus, the Place Plans DPD omitted or neglected, to consider or include, suitable sites for onshore wind turbines farms, renewables energy stations. Example, the Bridgnorth Place Plan and surrounding area 2014 – 2015 DPD, has not identified suitable sites or not tried to identify suitable sites for wind turbine farms, renewables energy stations.</p> <p><u>Towns and Parish Councils' Planning Authorities policy making errors</u></p> <p>Even, the local immediate Towns and Parish Councils' level, have no credible Plans to be supportive of renewables energy sector and; the Towns and Parish Councils, have failed to identify suitable sites for their local community energy projects to generate energy, from renewables energy.</p>
2	<i>Inspector's Note to Council</i>	“Following consultation, it can be a demonstrated that the proposal reflects the planning concerns of effected local	“The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people

		communities and therefore has their backing”	have final say onshore wind farm applications”
3			The Secretary of State said “I am now setting out proposals to end new subsidises for onshore wind, specifically in relation to the Renewable Obligation (PO)”, how many General Local Consultees' Bodies know Renewables Obligation is?

The other General Local Consultees, should do research first before making a decision, to support or object to, Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2. To simply endorse, the unsoundness of the Ministerial Written Statements (MWS) without considering consequences of that MWS. The Secretaries of State are being divisive, dividing the local communities in to Local Consultees on side of the NIMBYees, Secretaries of State and the Local Consultees on side of reason and environmental responsibility, responsible businesses, e.g., The Electricity and Gas (Energy Companies Obligation) Order 2014

4 Is the National Planning Policy Framework compatible or incompatible, with the country of Shropshire?

The National Planning Policy Framework, remains incompatible with the county of Shropshire and every county, up and down the UK.

5 What is the environmental consequences of the Secretary of State and the unsound National Policy?

The United Kingdom will be environmentally damaged, by both the NIMBYees of Conservatives supporters and NIMBY Secretary of State. The UK will be behind, the rest of Europe and the world, on having more wind energy developments, and all because, the Secretary of State bias on side of NIMBY anti onshore wind farms.

The Conservative Party Manifesto 2015: STRONG LEADERSHIP, A CLEAR ECONOMIC PLAN, A BRIGHTER, MORE SECURE FUTURE: Guaranteeing you clean, affordable and secure energy supplies (page 57) – halt the spread of subsidised onshore wind farms, “Onshore wind now makes a meaningful contribution to our energy mix and has been part of the necessary increase in renewable capacity. Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support, however, and are unable by themselves to provide the firm capacity that a stable energy system requires. As a result, we will end any new publicly subsidy for them and change the law so that local people have a final say on windfarm applications” (page 58), the conservative ideology Manifesto 2015, has serious consequences upon UK environment. From Conservative ideology Manifesto to national policy bias, on side of anti onshore wind farms, in turn UK seriously hit by Climate Change rise and eventually consequences, upon UK environment rising from Shropshire NIMBY anti onshore wind farms and nationally NIMBYees anti onshore wind farms, this is the link between ideological and national policy, eventually unsound Public Law on side of NIMBY anti onshore wind farms. Mean

while, the Planning Inspectorate enforcing whatever unsoundness of national policy, from whatever political party in Public office, then the environment be effected by irresponsible Secretaries of State and Councillors'.

6 Secretary of State on side of NIMBY anti Wind farms?

Yes.

7 And national policy on side, of NIMBY anti wind farms, where is the impartiality and fairness?

The national policy of Conservatives, is on side of NIMBY anti onshore wind farms, makes the Secretary of State position is NOT impartiality and NOT fairness, to supporters and project developers of onshore wind farms. Fairness to local community residents, who object to onshore wind farms, allowing NIMBY anti wind farms voice to obstruct onshore wind farms, by Secretary of State bias, seems the national policy is unsound has usual! I seen wind farms on coast, are off shore wind farms and I have seen onshore wind farms, in Lake District, as well also Germany, Switzerland, Wales, I don't have a problem with onshore wind farms.

I studied environmental sciences has part of my BTEC National Diploma (Human Studies) Human Sciences at college, a long time ago, I appropriate wind farms, compared to the average Shropshire residents and consultees have no training in Sciences, they simply object to onshore wind farms on basis of their ignorance of wind farms benefits and reduction of CO2 emissions, mean while the Secretary of State is mirroring same ignorance mentality of NIMBY anti onshore wind farms.

8 What is consequences upon local wind farms projects by Secretary of State bias and unsound Statement on 18th June 2015?

The Secretary of State bias on side of NIMBY anti wind farms, means local wind farms projects in Shropshire be impacted by unsound Secretary of State statement, e.g., unfairness and damaging impact on Planning Reference **15/00532/FUL Wind Turbine 2.1 miles away from Bridgnorth.**

The Secretary of State on side of NIMBY, are anti wind farms onshore, means the Secretary of State is bias, and the national policy is bias, on side on anti wind farms onshore is the Conservatives prejudice and ideological prejudice, to be anti Renewable energy and anti Environmental responsibility.

The national policy perspective is permanently unsound, regardless it is from Coalition Government or a Conservative Government, or a Labour Government.

9 Contradiction between Secretaries of State on issue of wind turbines development projects, why believe hypocrisy and contradictions of whatever Secretaries of State?

	Secretaries of State: Energy and Climate Change	National policy	
1	Edward Davey MP	Community Energy Strategy: Full Report 27 January 2014	Para 22 "Community energy' covers many types of community getting involved in many different ways: a

			<p>group of local people setting up their solar installation or wind turbine”</p> <p>Figure 3: indicative costs of community electricity project (pre-construction phase) Wind resource assessment (onshore)</p>
2	Amber Rudd MP	<p>“The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications”, “I am now setting out proposals to end new subsidises for onshore wind, specifically in relation to the Renewable Obligation (PO)”, “The Energy Bill will devolve powers out of Whitehall so that applications onshore wind farms are considered by democratically elected councils”</p>	
3	Greg Clark MP	<p>House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24), Department for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18th June 2015: “Subject to the transitional provision set out below, these considerations will take effect from 18 June and should be taken in to account in planning decisions. I am also making a</p>	

limited number of consequential changes to planning guidance”, “When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:”, “The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and”, “Following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing”, “In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines, or similar, will not be sufficient. Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority”, “Where a valid planning application for a wind energy development has already been submitted to a local

		<p>planning authority and the development plan does not identify suitable sites, the following transitional provision applies. In such instances, local planning authorities can find the proposal acceptable if, following consultation, they are satisfied it has addressed the planning impacts identified by affected local communities and therefore has their backing”</p>
--	--	--

One Secretary of State is supportive, of wind energy development 'community energy' projects and next comes, another Secretary of State is objecting, of wind energy development 'community energy' projects, the picture of national policy is fickle at the whims of whatever elected new MP in to public office, has a new Secretary of State of whatever Government Department.

Why fuss, listening to Secretaries of State? Each one, is fickle and bias, its wrong that Local Planning Authorities and local stakeholders, local consultees' have to listen to, a lot of hypocrisy and bias from Secretaries of State, when the Secretaries of State generally, don't have anything of value is meaningful & genue, for stakeholders to consider or to accept. Few Secretaries of State are genue, do genuely care about their constituency and others constituencies', sadly a majority of Secretaries of State are self interest, bias, incompatible with common good and public interest.

The national policy is NO guarantee of consistency and NOT reliable, therefore the is it appropriate for the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Further Main Modifications to be consistent with a inconsistent national policy? I ask hard difficult questions, about national policy, while other local consultees won't dare to ask and the Councillors won't have the courage, to ask. Better to be skeptical, of national policies and pragmatist towards, whatever national policy comes from misguided Whitehall and Westminster Parliament.

It is wrong, to be dependent on national policy and it is inappropriate, to be consistency with national policy of whatever political party in Public office and; another factor to consider, the county policy of Local Planning Authority, can be progressive on side wind energy development 'community energy' projects, or a Local Planning Authority, can be transgressive and being anti wind energy development 'community energy' projects, means LDF Core Strategy and SAMDeve DPD can be unreliable too, utterly unsound because the Local Planning Authority is following whims of Secretary of State prejudices views and lastly, the community opinions can be divided between educated, informed on wind energy development projects, support them and ignorant, naïve realism, objecting to onshore wind energy development projects.

10 Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): MD8 – Infrastructure Provision: para 4 Renewable Energy infrastructure & para 4.73 are compatible, with National Planning Policy Framework (2012),

why latest Secretary of State wants to undermine legitimacy of onshore Wind Energy Developments projects?

The current MD8 policy is reasonable, includes wind energy development yet, the Secretary of State is undermining MD8 policy of Shropshire Council, as well also the Planning Inspector is undermining MD8 policy of Shropshire Council wind energy development projects criterias. The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2 are allegedly “for consistency with the recent Written Statement on wind turbine” and “The modifications is required for consistency to changes with national policy guidance”, is it the right guidance? Why is it required, to be consistent with a unsound national policy guidance? The majority of national policy guidance, etc., are wrong, unreasonableness and much of legislations, are unsound, as well also lots of Statutory Instruments (Orders, Regulations) are flawed, bias, unsound!

11 Secretary of State Ministerial Written Statement 18th June 2015, on wind turbines “The Energy Bill will devolve powers out of Whitehall so that applications onshore wind farms are considered by democratically elected councils”, are Local Councils really genuely democratically elected?

Some Town Councils, Parish Councils are elected by local residents equally, there are Town Councils, Parish Councils were the local residents', are denied a vote on who becomes, a Councillors and; the towns and villages, who don't have elected Councillors' and where's the voice of local residents? Mean while, local residents may have elected a Town Councillors' and but, the local residents are denied a vote, on who becomes the Mayor or Mayoress of whatever Town, Village, where's the democratically elected legitimacy?

Seems, the Ministerial Written Statement on 18th June 2015 is incorrect and miss informed, from Whitehall Civil Servants' and Advisor, about Local Politics and; the Ministerial Written Statement on 18th June 2015 is damaging to Shropshire renewable energies development projects' and the Secretary of State is NOT helping Local Planning Authorities to be more Greener, NOT encouraging Local Planning Authorities, like Shropshire Council to be more environmental responsible and I am aware, Shropshire Council is environmental responsible yet Secretary of State is environmentally irresponsible.

Chapter 2 Rationale Test of the Schedule of Further Main Modifications

- Sections 1 – 2: Administrative Law Principles, applied to Ministerial Written Statements, national policy statements/guidances/advice and Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2.
- Sections 3 – 5: Philosophy applied to Ministerial Written Statements, national policy statements/guidances/advice and Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2.

Section 1 Where's the Legitimate Expectation?

- “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications” (Ministerial Written Statement on 18th June 2015)

The FMM1, FMM2 are NOT rational and since, the Ministerial Written Statement on 18th June 2015, is groundless, also the Ministerial Written Statement is purely ideological basis and NOT evidence base. Its more odd, the Planning Inspectorate is endorsing a flawed Ministerial Written

Statement and expecting local communities – Local Planning Authorities, would adopt to unsoundness of the Secretary of State Statement on onshore wind turbines and; the Planning Inspectorate is NOT truly independent and impartiality, because the Planning Inspectorate is endorsing Ministerial Written Statement 18th June 2015. Where's the Planning Inspectorate fairness and independence? Why Shropshire Council is acting irrational, to adopt Secretary of State unsound national policy guidance and make this Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2?

The “reason for modification: For consistency with the recent Written Ministerial Statement on wind turbines”, this is NOT a reason or NOT a rational too, and the “for consistency”, consistency with what? A unsound Ministerial Written Statement on wind turbines and the Ministerial Written Statement 18th June 2015, is not improving UK to be more Greener and the Secretary of State is taking a NIMBY position, is anti onshore wind turbines, the Secretary of State is partisan bias on side of NIMBYees, thus the Ministerial Written Statement on 18th June 2015 is *unreasonableness*.

The “for consistency with the recent Written Ministerial Statement on wind turbines”, how recent? Two months ago, is June and its now, August and the Planning Inspectorate is late catching up with the times, late informing the Shropshire Council and the General Local Consultees', including my self, of the misguided Secretary of State Written Ministerial Statement of 18th June 2015. The FMM1, FMM2 are simply reflecting bias of Written Ministerial Statement of 18th June 2015 and the Written Ministerial Statement of 18th June 2015 is obstructing, both the Shropshire Council and the Shropshire local community of doing wind energy developments projects'. Shame on the Secretary of State, of making a bad decision and making a unsound Ministerial Written Statement of 18th June 2015, on wind turbines.

Section 2 Proportionate?

- “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications” (Ministerial Written Statement on 18th June 2015)

1 What is definition of proportionality?

A just relation between legitimate ends that a public authority pursues, and the means by which it pursues them. This is a legal definition. The legal definition is undermined or subvert, by the parliamentarians and the elected MPs, to Public ex office has a Secretary of State.

Allegedly Public Authority			
A		B	C
Local constituency citizens' (Objections)	Local constituency citizens (Supports)	Tax > Renewables Obligation Certificates' (To Large Enterprises) - Tax > Feed-in-Tariffs (TIF) (To Medium & Small Enterprises, Social Enterprises, Mutual Enterprises)	Local Social Enterprise : Wind Turbine farm.

The *legitimate ends*, is what? The legitimate ends are those, are not bias or not unreasonableness,

upon local community and not neglectful, of their responsibility to the future environment, of their own local constituencies', as well also is compatible with Convention Rights. However, the words 'legitimate end' is abused, misused by MPs in Public ex office to enact unsound political Manifesto Policies, turn unsound and bias ideological Manifesto Policies in to Law.

The *that a public authority pursues*, who is the Public authority? What constitutes, a Public authority? Is the elected political party, the Public authority? Where's the separation of political ideological bias of their prejudice policies and the Public ex office, perceived and appearing impartiality, Administration of Justice, equality, fairness? The Schedule of Further Main Modifications, are shaped and unduly influenced, by Secretaries of State ideological bias and their "decision statement" is neither 'reasonable' or 'due process', and the elected MP, is not Secretary of State, also the Secretary of State is not elected MP. And the separation of powers principle, is undermined by the Crown is the fusion of powers = conflict of interests, at the heart of the British constitutional mess and lack of transparency, accountability, openness.

The background of the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, is set against a Conservative ideological bias against renewables energy and local community renewables energy projects, the Energy Bill is purely ideological bias, much of the so called Planning Laws, which the Planning Inspectorates' accept and enforce, whatever unsound legislations upon Local Planning Authorities and they in turn, enforce the same unsound Laws from Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty.

The politics questions:

1. *Who is the Public authority?* (1) The Crown is allegedly, called Public authority, but the Crown – Royal His/Her Highness and heirs and successors, are not elected by Ludlow constituency citizens, thus the Crown is a illegal Head of State. The Crown is unelected, "chairman". The Crown is not Public. (2) The Prime Minister is not elected, by Ludlow constituency citizens, and the Prime Minister is another void, the HM Government is called "executive" of the Crown, the executive is another void. The HM Government Departments and Agencies, are simply another void, and; (3) The Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty is allegedly called "legislative" arm of the Crown, and the House of Commons and the House of Lords, are mixed up in the fusion of powers is another conflict of interests of those MPs and the Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty is no guarantee, of true separation of powers, equally too, the Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty can't be relied upon, to be defender of Libertas and Human Rights of all citizens', further more the Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty has doubtful legal foundations to be lawful or legitimate. The Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty is, another allegedly Public authority. (4) Local County Council, is another allegedly called Public authority, but the following questions. Who is the Public authority? Why any person, wants to be called Public authority? Why the Public authority? What is the credibility, legitimacy of the allegedly called Public authority? What constitutes a Public authority? The law itself, don't qualifies has a justification or a basis of a Public authority, what evidence the Public authority powers exists? Or the Public authority powers, are simply delusions of legislators, policy makers, if so why take notice of false laws from Public authorities? Legality and illegality are delusions of everyone imaginations, why believe the law exists?
2. *Is the elected political party, the Public authority?* Most Councillors and MPs, might think or say yes, the elected party of General Elections, European Elections and Local Elections are the elected Government, thus called Public authority. The Government is a neutral, generic term, however the political party bring their prejudices and party bias policies, in to Government, further policy making to further there bias engender via, making unsound legislations and unsound Statutory Instruments – Orders, Regulations, Rules, are imposed same people who had elected them. The party politics of the party policies, directly and

indirectly impacts the citizens', the policy is basis of law and the law is political object, the law is not separate from whims of politicians' prejudices, so the law can be sound is rarity or is majority unsound, who is the expert on the Law? The politicians, do both legislate legislations and executive to govern, or the judges do interpreting and enforcing whatever flawed law, came from Parliament, or the citizens', do experience the consequences of whatever unsound laws from all three the Government, the Legislators, the Judicial. The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – FMM2, are merely consequences of politicians bias in public office, effecting local communities and enterprises, want to make a Better World, while the politicians don't want a Better World, they want to balance a illusory Public Debt and illusory Public Deficit, means closure of Renewables Obligation (RO) Order 2002 by Renewables Obligation Closure (Amendment) Order 2015 and enacting Electricity Act 1989: ss. 32K, 32LA. Renewables Obligation Closure (Amendment) Order 2015, it is lawful and not necessarily right and it has not breached a Statutory Duty, yet the Conservatives Manifesto 2015 is anti renewables energy and anti subsidises of renewables energy, thus the Renewables Obligation Closure (Amendment) Order 2015 is unreasonableness. The Public authority unreasonableness is made lawful, via unsoundness of whatever legislations and statutory instruments, here the Public authorities have no credibility or no integrity, no fairness, to their own electorate. I am fully aware, the Planning Inspectorates' won't entertain questioning the “decision statements” from whatever Secretaries of State, and the national policy guidance/framework is not challenged, by Planning Inspectorates or not questioned by Local Planning Authorities, mean while the Local Consultees' do either support whatever unsound national policy guidance or object whatever unsound national policy guidances, to offer more reasonable remedies compared to unsoundness of national policy bias.

3. *Where's the separation of political ideological bias of their prejudice policies and the Public ex officio, perceived and appearing impartiality, Administration of Justice, equality, fairness?* The separation of party politics and impartiality of Governance, is some impossible to achieve and, the elected politicians bring with them, their ideological and personal opinions, in to public office, they pretend they are upholding Administration of Justice and fairness. There is a principle of the separation of powers, is valid principle yet the Crown, the Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty, the HM Government are incapable or simply incompetent, to separate their powers, here we got a fusion of powers under the Crown is clearly, a conflict of interests. The conflict of interests is every where, in HM Government, the House of Commons and the House of Lords, the Crown itself, simply listen to the News, yet is no separation of party politics bias and governance impartiality, fairness. The Schedule of Further Main Modification: FMM1 – 2, are purely political emotive by Secretaries of State and the their allegedly national policy guidance, is not in a public interest and the Secretaries of State want to, undermine local communities renewables energy projects' and undermine responsible large renewables energy companies, so FMM1 – FMM2 are on side of NIMBYees, on side of anti renewables energy sector. Seems the FMM1 – 2, are reflecting a wider problem and the politicians are unwilling, to be responsible citizens' and the objectors to renewables energy sectors, are not being responsible citizens too, appears to me the Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty is more not fit for purpose.

These considerations are equally valid, to test soundness of the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2 and I am asking difficult questions, I rationalising the irrationality of the Secretary of State and the unsoundness of national planning policy guidances. Where's the fairness? Between the indifference of tax payers and the responsible local renewables energy projects, the responsible large renewables energy companies. The Secretaries of State are on side of the indifference of tax payers and NIMBYees anti renewables energy wind turbines farms, here we got a irrational national policy guidance, verse the responsible citizens' don't follow the ignorance and prejudices of NIMBYees, oh yes, the due process is undermined by Secretaries of State political

motives, to not encourage renewables energy sectors and unfairness upon, the responsible citizens are taking a Climate Change seriously, while the Secretaries of State and politicians are doing lip service to renewables energy sectors and constituencies', making meaningless national policy guidances.

Section 3 Statutory Duty and Unreasonableness?

1 Administrative Law perspective.

	Regulations	Administrative Law Principles	Lawful? Rational?
1	Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 [SI No. 767]: “local plan” explanation encompass “site allocation policy” means a policy which allocates a site for a particular use or development, regulation 17 “decision statement” (a)	Statutory Duty	<u>Lawful?</u> Yes <u>Decision Statements Lawful?</u> Yes
2	Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 [SI No. 767]: “local plan” explanation encompass “site allocation policy” means a policy which allocates a site for a particular use or development, regulation 17 “decision statement” (a)	Unreasonableness Test, according to Administrative Law	<u>Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18th June 2015, Secretary of State Amber Rudd MP & House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24), Department for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18th June 2015, are unreasonable?</u> According to Administrative Law perspective, the national policy statements by them, appear reasonable in their act of discretionary powers to make “decision statements” onshore wind turbines farms and subsidises closure. However, decision

		<p>statements are reasonable and appear to be reasonable, but the impacts upon the large and medium onshore wind turbines farms projects developments', local communities medium wind turbine farms will be unfairly hit by bias “decision statements” of the Secretaries of State.</p>
--	--	---

The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are compatible with the national policy guidance/advice, according to Administrative Law Principles, yet the Secretaries of State decision statements are irrational, bad faith and there is potentially grounds for Unfair Process at a national level.

The FMM1 – 2, are merely effects and the Shropshire Local Planning Authority, is a puppet of irresponsible Secretaries of State MPs and the Local Planning Authority is not at fault, it is merely implementing a flawed national policy statements, however the Planning Inspectorate is not at fault, the Planning Inspectorate has no voice to challenge the unsound decision statements by Secretaries of State yet the Planning Inspectorate is expecting others, to be submissive of bad national policy guidance.

The legal principles and the law is ineffective, useless, at remedying ills of national policy madness, since the law is made by same people, who become Ministers of the State. The law itself, is fundamentally flawed, it stems from bad policy making rising from political parties prejudices, a Shropshire Local Planning Authority has no idea is bad laws are coming their way, to unfairly impact their local communities equally too, local communities are too lazy and too distracted by work, by debt worries, to be responsible citizens to question unsound laws made in Westminster Parliament, by a Conservative Party in Government.

2 From failures of Administrative Law, to Philosophy's remedy.

The Administrative Law perspective, the Statutory Instruments, the Courts and the Acts of Parliament, all of them can't be relied upon, to test the unsoundness of the national policy guidances/statements/frameworks. I turn to Philosophy, to examine the irrationality of the national policy guidance/advice/framework and while, the Administrative Law Principles I do respect them, however the Administrative Law Principles don't get to the heart of the problem of the national policies irrationality.

Section 4 Reasonable?

1 Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18th June 2015, Secretary of State Amber Rudd MP: “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications”, “I am now setting out proposals to end new subsidises for onshore wind, specifically in relation to the Renewable Obligation (PO)”, “The Energy Bill will devolve powers out of Whitehall so that applications onshore wind farms are considered by democratically elected councils” To end

subsidies for onshore, is it reasonable? To change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications, is it reasonable? Local people, are either ignorant, indifferent, simply object to wind farm applications rising from their naïve realism or educated, informative of complexity of the environmental issues and renewable energy sciences, simply support wind farm applications, which people?

Philosophical questions:

1. To end subsidies for onshore, is it reasonable?
2. To change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications, is it reasonable?
3. Local people, are either ignorant, indifferent, simply object to wind farm applications rising from their naïve realism or educated, informative of complexity of the environmental issues and renewable energy sciences, simply support wind farm applications, which people?

2 To end subsidies for onshore, is it reasonable?

The Conservative MPs want to end subsidies to onshore large and medium responsible renewables energy companies, social enterprises involved in renewables energy yet the same Conservative MPs, won't end subsidises to the Crown His/Her Majesty heirs and successors of the Crown like Sovereign Grant Act 2011, we got hypocrisy at the heart of the Conservative Government!

3 To change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications, is it reasonable?

What law?

What law? The law is a human projection, of imaginations, like a proposition, however the law itself is not proof the law exists or not proof, the law is the law and; making the law, in either House of Commons or House of Lords, don't prove the law exists, and the amending the law, is not actually amending anything, its simply prolonging a political prejudice has law; enforcing the law, its odd, no one can't enforce a law, because the law is construct of humans imaginations, like a proposition, a delusion, the law might be called Act of Parliament or a Statutory Instrument (Order, Regulation, Rule), all of these don't prove the law exists and all of these, are enforced by a Courts and Police. However the courts and parliaments, are not the law yet they are embodiments of that illusory law, many self grasp at the fantasy of the law exists, there is no evidence of the law exists in Crown Courts and Magistrates, also innumerable happenings in those Courts don't prove the law exists and; the police enforcing a fantasy of the law exists, there is no evidence of all the Laws of the Land exists, the police is not prove the law exists, the police and courts, etc., are enforcing a fantasy of a law exists.

The law can be made, can be amended, can be repealed or abolished, or can be re-established in Statutory again, all of this proves the United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty Laws don't exists, they don't exists in nature or don't exists any where on earth. The notions of legality and illegality are void, has those public policies are void, all legislations and regulations, orders, rules are all void, as well also all powers of the Parliament, Government, Judicial and Police, etc., are simply illusions of their own imaginations and those powers don't exists, in reality of Nature.

A Secretary of State is proposing 'to change the law' **so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications**, in the same breath a future Secretary of State can so easily reverse this 'to change the law' that he/she can make the decision, thus the law is relative and contradictory, hypocrisy of policy maker. It is reasonable, to live without of man made laws, there is natural harmony between citizens and communities, without of falsehoods of the police, etc, creating false

sense of security and peace, further more there is genuine peace between people rising from mutualism.

The local people, have a final say onshore wind turbine applications,
is it the right say?

The local people it sounds, like Localism and Decentralism, however the Bridgnorth Town Council blindly supports the Ministerial Written Statement without considering consequences of the Ministerial Written Statements of 18th June 2015, the Town Councils don't always represent their own Wards residents' interests, how can a Town Councils be local people? While Town Councils Councillors', may come from same town of me or you, and if the Councillors, don't connect with diversity of their own people and individuals, than Town Councils and Parish Councils have no mandate to exist.

- *Who are the local people?* I am a local, I am a resident of a town and a locality, likewise most all of the General Local Consultees' Bodies be local to my town or to my county. I am a local, like everyone else lives in my town, however some locals follow whatever prejudices and trends yet others chose to, not follow the prejudices of the rest of the community and peers'.
- *Where are the local people?* The human bodies are composed of atoms, particles, DNA, blood, bones, etc and emptiness of bodies, etc. The local community is a illusion, of everyone imaginations and the local community and community citizens' themselves, exists because they don't exist. Trying to find a existed town, in a nonfindable parts of a conceptualised local community, it may sound like metaphysics. The local community is a construct by minds, a illusion, this illusion has two mutual opposites called illusory order and illusory disorder, different people live in each and mix, criss cross. I exist, because I don't exist this is reality of Quantum Physics and Metaphysics, in turn Shropshire exists, because it don't exist, this county of mine I live is a construct of my mind and everyone else minds, living in same county. Some people, may think all of this sounds nonsense, its not nonsense to Quantum Physics and Metaphysics, its nonsense to accept flawed Ministerial Written Statements blindly and without of considering, the consequences of that Secretaries of State statements.
- *Who constitutes a local people?* I and every Local Consultees, in Shropshire.
- *Why designated local people?* Local persons are residents, of a city, a town, a village, a county, compared to a tourists are non-residents and even travellers, are local people, because he/she/they have relations or connections to a locality, for a long time. The Secretary of State discriminates, between the dwelling residents and those are semi nomadic, nomadic citizens of Britain, however the Secretary of State is bias on side of UK citizens being in settlements, dwellings compared to other UK citizens, chose to be travellers and travel up and down United Kingdom, may travel to Europe, etc.
- *Which local people, the county/town citizens' or the elected/unelected Councillors/MPs?* 'Which local people', is a valid question. e.g., A Town Council Councillors, can be from a designated Ward, the same Ward from I or from a different Ward, or from a different Village/Town, and yes, this does happen. I was so close of being a co-opt Councillor, because of Town Council prejudices against LGBT residents and the so called "Extraordinary Meeting of ***** Town Council 29th May 2013", it was funny and laughable, most of so called selected new co-opt Councillors never lived in my Ward. I am very much a local of my Ward, compared to some Councillors, never care about their Wards

and I may not be, a Councillor, I am more responsible citizen compared to Local Town Councillors'. I still help in my local community, however my contribution to the local community is discrete, I don't draw attention to my self and I don't seek awards, for helping the local community, even the local community don't appreciate me or don't value me.

- *What is local?* A Town Hall, a Police Station, a Pub(s) or a Community Centre, a Community and Sports Leisure Centre, a Night Club(s), etc., each can claim its the Town locality yet the local is relative to, another locality or localities, in the same place or different places in space. A Church nor Town Council, might be considered the centre of Town but, the centre of Town is retail shops and shopping centres, thus consumerism and retail is replacing old notions of Town Council and Church has the centre of Town. Shops provide immediate goods, services for whatever desire and want, need at a reasonable price, compared to Town Councils have very little of value or reverence to ordinary lives of citizens' and; the Churches have very little of value or reverence to ordinary lives of citizens and empty Churches, are places of quiet meditation, chilling out in and relaxing in, then return to noise of Town centre. The Police are based in locality, of the Town yet the Police neither protects or secures peace, and the Police is very little of value or reverence to ordinary citizens'. Pubs and night clubs, social bars, community centres and sports centres, are places of reverence and value to most ordinary citizens, while places of public authorities have very little value or reverence to ordinary citizens of Towns, Villages, Cities.
- *Where is this local?* Person Z, says his place is his local and person X, says her place is her local, another person B, says his place is his local, each local and each place are relative to the other. To say "local people", there is a problem to say that, and each individual has his/her notion of local is, there are multiable localities within a village, a town, a city or a county. The local people are two contradictory terms and complementary, in a ironic way and there might a street of 16 houses, a mixture of individuals and families, yet each individual has his/her perceived notion of local is, and some families and individuals connect with each other, socialise while others, are outcast from the rest of the street community or individuals and families, may chose to be isolated and don't mix with the rest of the street community. The local is relative, to another local, we got relativism.
- *Local has a place or an area, or a county or a region?* The Secretary of State MP, failed to explain the local is, and the local is subjective notion, since the Secretary of State nor Courts, can't clarify or can't explain, or can't define a local is, and all legislations, regulations, courts powers are simply follies, they can't define a local is or can't find a local is.
- *What part is the local?* A Town Hall, a Police Station, a Pub(s) or a Community Centre, a Community and Sports Leisure Centre, a Night Club(s), etc., each can claim its the Town locality yet the local is relative to, another locality or localities, in the same place or different places in space. Each place or locality, are relative to the next place or locality, the local is subjective, non locality, no one can find a exact locality, while a map will designate the locality, once in the locality – the centre if the locality is nonfindable, relative, subjective by whoever lives there.
- *Outsiders and unrepresented are locals, why under represented are not represented in Planning Process consultations?* The Statement of Community Involvement (Adopted 2011): 2.2 "Anyone with an interest, or who wants to get involved in the planning process, can be considered to be a stakeholder", is applicable to everyone in Shropshire community, including the LGBT citizens' too, and I am one of those 'hard to reach groups', and example, the Bridgnorth Town Council continually neglects, include 'hard to reach groups' on Town

Council representatives. All of my years, of being a stakeholder in the Planning Process of the Shropshire Council, I have not encountered other LGBT local consultees, disabled local consultees in these LDF Shropshire Council DPD Planning Process consultations'. The Statement of Community Involvement (Adopted 2011): 3.9 – 11 'hard to reach' groups, are always ignored by Planning Inspectorate and by other Local Consultees, as well also the Parish Councils and Town Councils are ignoring the 'hard to reach' residents in their Wards.

- *Local defined by Statutory Instrument (Order, Regulation, Rule), Legislation or by immediate locals living there?* The local is not defined, in Statutory Instruments of whatever Order, Regulations, etc., and I conclude, the legal sphere and the law is nonsensical, at times, utterly irrelevant, like the ordinary people are ignorant of man made laws of Westminster Parliament and innumerable Statutory Instruments, are simply put in a bonfire. The law is a fantasy of humans imaginations and the reality of situation, place, citizens' lives, so the law is irrelevant and it don't exists any where. People self grasp at a truly existent law, mistakenly believe a Court or a Parliament, etc., are places of the law and I see no evidence, the law exists any where. The legal definitions of whatever are subjective, conjuncture, proposition, their force is a illusion, a fantasy, a delusion, and how can anyone define a local or locality? In science, the physical phenomena are things are like geology, geography, biology, etc., all natural phenomena are identifiable and accepted, including diversity of humanity in it too, so a man made laws are not part of Nature and the man man made laws are fantasy of humans imaginations, many enforce this same fantasy.
- *Legal definition of local or refutations of both legal definitions and definitions contained in Statute?* Legal certainty is a myth! Each generation is moving on, means previous law of bias and disproportionate, is replaced by a new law is less bias and relatively proportionate, yet the law is not static, or not any where to be found. The legal definitions are very, because each Government may change or amend, or omit, or abolish, whatever definition and the so called Law in the land, is fickle, likewise the allegedly Law in the Courts are stable, yet the Courts are fickle like politicians, there is no evidence of legal certainty exists. With continuum of changes, in society, etc., the definition of local might be variable between whoever and where ever, as well also definitions in law as well, also politics will be variable too. More amusement, since the concept local is variable between citizens and more variable between politicians, civil servants, etc., each has his/her perspective/perception of local is, and the law is void, it has no place in society and it is void.

I examined, the concepts 'local', 'people' and the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2 have not presented the context behind the Ministerial Written Statements and the SAMDev Plan, has not explained context behind the 18th June 2015 Ministerial Written Statements, and; the Planning Inspectorate presents, the Ministerial Written Statement yet the Shropshire Council SAMDev Final Plan (Pre-Submission Final Plan), it not pre-emptive the Conservative government bias against renewables energy, as well also failure to forewarn the local consultees of the unsound national policy guidances from Whitehall.

4 Local people, are either ignorant, indifferent, simply object to wind farm applications rising from their naïve realism or educated, informative of complexity of the environmental issues and renewable energy sciences, simply support wind farm applications, which people?

	Which people?	Knowledge basis of the stakeholders'
1	<i>Supporter of renewables energy</i>	Educated, informed, open minded, non-judgemental.

2	<i>Objector of renewables energy</i>	Follow prejudice, ignorant of renewables energy and environmental issues, not so well informed on issues.
---	--	--

The informative approach is the right way, and learning as well, and enjoying learning, the renewables energy wind turbine farm is a hot topic, by politicians, they are can't have an adult debt on it. So, the citizens do the debating or lack of debating, on any give issue.

Reasonable doubts is valid, to test whatever policy, legislation, etc., and doubt should not be abused, misused by persons, to hide their prejudices and to use doubt, with a in built bias, means the decision making on a issue to support or object.

The doubts used correctly, is bias free and non-judgemental, fairness, compared to the misuse and abuse of the skepticism, to further a groundless bias rising from political parties manifestos'.

Section 5 Bias = Belief? National Policy is bias?

1 National Policy is bias?

- House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24), Department for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18th June 2015: “Subject to the transitional provision set out below, these considerations will take effect from 18 June and should be taken in to account in planning decisions. I am also making a limited number of consequential changes to planning guidance”, “When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:”

The political bias “When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:” and the bias of anti onshore wind turbine farms. Public policy is bias rooted, its some what impossible for a Public Administration to be truly due process, fairness, because the elected politicians do bring their personal and political bias in to, Public office, thus policy is bias.

More I learn, about the Planning Process over years of doing Public consultations on Planning Policy developments and more I see, bias from national planning policies makers', what is credible a fair planning policy or illegitimate, unsound national planning policy?

2 National Policy bias is destructive, upon Local communities?

- Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18th June 2015, Secretary of State Amber Rudd MP: “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications”.

This is a bias against onshore wind turbine farms, here it is “and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications”.

Chapter 3 What changes to Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2?

Section 1 Change(s) to FMM1

	Further Main Modification	Change(s) to FMM1
FMM1	In the case of wind energy proposals, <u>proposals will be assessed national policy guidance</u>	The Council discretion to follow unsound national policy guidance, equally it is the Council discretion to support local community renewable energy projects, contrary to national policy guidance
	Reason for Further Modification	Refutation, of the Reason for Further Modification
FMM1	For consistency with the recent Written Ministerial Statement on wind turbines	“For consistency” is reasonable, in eyes of Planning Inspectorate and Local Planning Authority, but consistency with what? A groundless Written Ministerial Statement on wind turbines.

The FMM1 is unsound, likewise the Written Ministerial Statements of 18th June 2015, are unsound.

Section 2 Change(s) to FMM2

	Further Main Modification	Change(s) to FMM2
FMM2	In the case of wind energy proposals, <u>proposals will be assessed national policy guidance, including the Written Ministerial Statement of 18 June 2015</u>	<p>The credibility of the Written Ministerial Statement is doubtful and, the LDF SAMDeve DPD: Schedule of Further Main Modification should not follow, the national policy guidance!</p> <p>Also, the Schedule of Further Main Modification: FMM1, FMM2 don't clarify which Written Ministerial Statement is it from the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) or Department of Communities and Local Governments (DCLG), thus the Schedule of Further Main Modification is misleading! Written Ministerial Statement 18th June 2015, by who? Secretary of State <i>Amber Rudd</i> MP or Secretary of State <i>Greg Clark</i> MP.</p>

	Reason for Further Modification	Refutation, of the Reason for Further Modification
FMM2	For consistency with the recent Written Ministerial Statement on wind turbines	I have already refuted this, read above.

The FMM2 is unsound, likewise the Written Ministerial Statements of 18th June 2015, are unsound.

**Chapter 4 House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24),
Department for Communities and Local Government
(Greg Clark) on 18th June 2015**

**Section 1 DCLG Ministerial Written Statement &
Refutations, of Ministerial Written Statement**

1 First two sentences and two sub-sentences.

	Ministerial Written Statement	Refutations of Ministerial Written Statement
1	<p>“Subject to the transitional provision set out below, these considerations will take effect from 18 June and should be taken in to account in planning decisions.</p> <p>I am also making a limited number of consequential changes to planning guidance”</p>	<p><u>What is the transitional provision?</u></p> <p>What is the <i>transitional provision</i>? The Secretary of State failed, to explain the transitional provision is and the local planning authorities, local communities consultees' should not accept the Ministerial Written Statement or not accept, whatever top-down considerations from a Secretary of State.</p> <p><u>Secretary of State bias against wind energy development</u></p> <p>The Secretary of State is interfering in, due process of the Planning Process and the Secretary of State is bias against onshore wind turbines, so the Ministerial Written Statement is invalid, should be dismissed by local communities.</p> <p><u>What is the credibility, of the Planning Guidances?</u></p> <p>“I am also making a limited</p>

		number of consequential changes to planning guidance”, the planning guidance is doubtful good guidance and the Secretary of State be obstructed , to local communities renewable energy developments projects.
2	“When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:”	<p>The sentence “When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:”, will be damaging upon current Planning Applications, like, e.g., Planning Reference: 15/00532/FUL Wind Turbine 2.1 miles away from Bridgnorth.</p> <p>The Secretary of State bias Statement will have a disproportionate impact upon, the Shropshire Planning Authority, thus creating a unfairness towards wind energy developments projects in Shropshire or other counties.</p>
Test 1.1	“The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and”	<p><u>Local Plan & Plan Plan failures</u></p> <p>Neither the Bridgnorth District Local Plan 1996 – 2011 or Bridgnorth Place Plan 2014 – 2015, have allocations of appropriate wind energy development sites and I am using, the Bridgnorth District Local Plan 1996 – 2011, Bridgnorth Plan Plan 2014 – 2015 for example.</p> <p>I am aware of Sharenergy, will be unduly effected by the Secretary of State bias Ministerial Written Statement 18th June 2015.</p>
Test 1.2	“Following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the	I am aware of Sharenergy website, has addressed

	planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing”	“planning impacts” and this Test 1.2 is divisive, like Bridgnorth local community is divided by supporting wind energy development and objections to wind energy development.
--	---	---

The Ministerial Written Statement will unduly influence, the Shropshire Council planning decisions' and the effecting Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), with consequences of establishing the Schedule of Further Main Modifications.

2 Two sentences.

	Ministerial Written Statement	Refutation of the, Ministerial Written Statement
3	“In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines, or similar, will not be sufficient. Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority”	<p><u>Place Plans & Neighbourhood Plans neglectful of potential wind turbine community energy projects, who is fault the Secretary of State or the Local Planning Authority, or Town Councils?</u></p> <p>For example, the Bridgnorth Place Plan 2014 – 2015: Bridgnorth and surrounding area, has no designated favourable to wind turbine farm, so the Bridgnorth Place Plan 2014 – 2015 has neglected to take an account, of the potential wind turbine sites.</p> <p>The Secretary of State is at fault, for neglectful of renewables community energy projects considerations' and; Local Planning Authority is at fault, for neglectful of renewables community energy projects considerations and also, lastly the Town Councils & Parish Councils are at fault, for neglecting their own Wards residents interest in renewables community energy projects.</p> <p><u>Site Allocations and Management of Development</u></p>

		<p><u>(SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), it did not pre-emptive the Secretaries of State “decision statements”, why Shropshire Council did not include designated wind turbine farm sites?</u></p> <p>The SAMDev Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), ought to, should include maps displaying of potential favourable onshore wind turbine farms sites'.</p> <p><u>Local community support of small or medium scales wind turbine farm, is evident?</u></p> <p>The “Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority”, the Planning Reference: 15/00532/FUL Wind Turbine 2.1 miles away from Bridgnorth. Example of, local community e.g., Bridgnorth Tasley residents do mistakenly believe the Wind Turbine is 1 mile away, from their Tasley Estate. Public education of renewable energy benefits, remedy NIMBYees ignorance and prejudices against renewable energy sciences'.</p>
4	<p>“Where a valid planning application for a wind energy development has already been submitted to a local planning authority and the development plan does not identify suitable sites, the following transitional provision applies. In such instances, local planning authorities can find the proposal acceptable if, following consultation, they are satisfied it has addressed the planning</p>	<p>“Where a valid planning application for a wind energy development has already been submitted to a local planning authority and the development plan does not identify suitable sites, the following transitional provision applies”, the planning application of the wind turbine farm is successful and the LDF (Local Development Framework) DPD (Development Planning</p>

	<p>impacts identified by affected local communities and therefore has their backing”</p>	<p>Documents) have failed to plan, for inclusion of renewables energy stations and suitable sites for renewables energy sites, mean while the immediate LDF SAMDev Plan (Pre-Submission Plan)/(Submission Plan) and Core Strategy DPD omission of not including suitable sites for wind turbine farms and other renewable energy stations, what is the transition provision?</p> <p>What planning impacts of renewables energy projects, upon the local environment and local communities? A perceived planning impact or an actual planning impact, and the policy makers do mistakenly place, the perceived impact over actual impact, might be zero. Actual impact is minimum with renewables energy yet the perceived impact is blown out of proportion, e.g., ignorant people believe Crime is high, the Police mistakenly believe they are fighting Crime, while the Crime Statistics from Police is misleading has the Police themselves, a sharp difference between perceived Crime of stakeholders and actual Crime of police misuse of powers, local authorities and central authority abuse of powers, innumerable people effected by bad faith of Police, etc. This example is hypothetical.</p>
--	--	--

The Schedule of Further Main Modifications FMM1 – 2, as well also the Inspector's Notes to Council may be approved nor claimed to be rational, sound, and neither the Schedule of Further Main Modifications FMM1 – 2 or Inspector's Note, provide any evidence of the soundness of the Secretary of State “decision statement” and; the Secretaries of State “decision statements”, have not tested to destruction and the Secretaries of State offer no evidence to General Local Consultees' Bodies, all what is offered by Secretaries of State a Written Ministerial Statements and the flawed Energy Bill to us General Local Consultees.

The Written Ministerial Statement is groundless, he/she have not alternative or not offered a remedy, to the placement of Renewables Obligation (RO). Simply closing the Renewables

Obligation Order 2002, without offering to replacement, in transitioning between RO to renewables energy companies and closure of RO to renewables energy companies, it is amusing the Secretaries of State only think of short termism of their own self interests, not the interests of their local constituencies are supporting Renewables energy sectors.

Section 2 Energy Bill: ss. 59 – 60

- “The Energy Bill will devolve powers out of Whitehall so that applications onshore wind farms are considered by democratically elected councils” (Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18th June 2015, Secretary of State Amber Rudd MP)

1 The Energy Bill: ss. 59 – 60 PART 4 WIND POWER.

The wind power is a political subject, it can't be kept from Planning Inspectorate notional guidance on the Schedule of Further Main Modifications. While, the Planning Inspectorate and other Local Consultees' want to focus on FMM1, FMM2 as directed by Planning Inspectorate, I am not ignoring context. “Context is everything” and the FMM1, FMM2 are set in the context of the political sphere and of the HM Conservative Government bias against onshore wind turbines farms', I am taking account of the Political sphere in this Schedule of Further Main Modifications.

2 Energy Bill: ss. 59 Electricity Act 1989: ss. 36 (1D) “(1D) Subsection (1) does not apply to an England or Wales onshore wind generation station”, what is Electricity Act 1989: ss. 36?

The Electricity Act 1989: ss. 36 Consent required for construction etc. of generating stations. The consent of the Secretary of State, if the Secretary of State is progressive, he/she supports and gives consent to large onshore/offshore wind turbines farms and generating stations or if the Secretary of State is transgressive, he/she objects and don't consents to large onshore/offshore wind turbines farms and generating stations, here is the problem!

The Secretary of State, is the problem! The HM Government, is the problem! The Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty, is the problem! The problem begins, with a political party first and then, the problem transforms in to Elected governmental in Public office, here we got a threefold problems, the Westminster Parliament is put the problem in to law (legislative unsoundness) and the HM Government is putting, the problem in to national policy (executive unsoundness), the Secretaries of State personal and Ministerial bias, is putting the problem in to national policy guidance (Ministerial unreasonableness and unsoundness), lastly the Planning Inspectorate, is putting the problem in to Planning Decisions and Planning Examinations (planning policy unsoundness), in turn Local Planning Authorities put the same problem in to their county LDF DPD too, we got a (local planning policy unsoundness), where's the rationale in this unsound British constitution and flawed Government Institutions, Departments, etc?

The begins in political ideological sphere, like the Conservative Manifesto 2015:

- “Onshore wind now makes a meaningful contribution to our energy mix and has been part of the necessary increase in renewable capacity. Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support, however, and are unable by themselves to provide the firm capacity that a stable energy system requires. As a result, we will end any new publicly subsidy for them and change the law so that local people have a final say on windfarm applications” (page 58).

from a political ideological sphere to a allegedly HM Government – Ministerial Written Statements sphere:

- Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18th June 2015, Secretary of State Amber Rudd MP: “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to

change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications”, “I am now setting out proposals to end new subsidises for onshore wind, specifically in relation to the Renewable Obligation (PO)”, “The Energy Bill will devolve powers out of Whitehall so that applications onshore wind farms are considered by democratically elected councils”.

&

- House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24), Department for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18th June 2015: “Subject to the transitional provision set out below, these considerations will take effect from 18 June and should be taken in to account in planning decisions. I am also making a limited number of consequential changes to planning guidance”, “When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:”, “The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and”, “Following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing”, “In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines, or similar, will not be sufficient. Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority”, “Where a valid planning application for a wind energy development has already been submitted to a local planning authority and the development plan does not identify suitable sites, the following transitional provision applies. In such instances, local planning authorities can find the proposal acceptable if, following consultation, they are satisfied it has addressed the planning impacts identified by affected local communities and therefore has their backing”.

Next becomes unsound Legislation sphere:

- Energy Bill: ss. 59 – 60, ss. 59 Electricity Act 1989: ss. 36 (1D) “(1D) Subsection (1) does not apply to an England or Wales onshore wind generation station”, ss. 60 Onshore wind power: closure of renewables obligation on 31 March 2016, Electricity Act 1989: ss. 32LB – ss. 32LC (1) “No renewable obligation certificates are to be issued under the renewables obligation order in respect of electricity generated after 31 March 2016 by an onshore wind generating station which is accredited after that date”.

The Energy Bill: ss. 59 – 60, effects large scale wind turbines generation stations projects' are commercial and rising from, the Renewables Obligation (RO) Regulations upon the commercial onshore wind turbines farms and; it may indirectly effect medium and small scales onshore wind turbines generation stations projects are local community energy projects and rising from Feed-in-Tariffs (FITs). It may effect

Finally we got a unsound, flawed Law sphere:

- Energy Act 2016: ss. 59 – 60.

The future Secretaries of State consent to future large scale onshore wind turbines farms, will be seriously undermined by this Energy Bill/Energy Act 2016, and the Secretaries of State lack of experience or knowledge, of environmental sciences and renewables energy sciences, also the Secretaries of State naïve realism, disrespect towards local communities and enterprises are interested in, encourage large scale onshore wind turbines farms across the country.

The Energy Bill, is merely a Bill yet it has immediate impact upon this Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), with

consequences of establishing the Schedule of Further Main Modifications and this current Public consultation invited representations from Local Consultees representatives' from Shropshire to comment on FMM1, FMM2. The Energy Bill is not Law, why Planning Inspectorate is getting Local Planning Authorities and local communities, to be in line a prior allegedly Energy Act 2015 becomes Law? The Energy Act 2015 is simply, a NIMBYes Charter to obstruct large scale onshore wind turbines farms and the Secretaries of State Ministerial Written Statements', do further obstruct onshore wind turbines farms, we got NIMBYes MPs in Government.

Further more to add, there is a hypocrisy at work here comes to renewables energy obligation and renewables energy issue, connected to Electricity Act 1989: ss. 32, 36 Consent required for construction etc. of generating stations – the consent of the Secretary of State, is the decision of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has made a Ministerial Written Statement, like House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24), Department for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18th June 2015: “Subject to the transitional provision set out below, these considerations will take effect from 18 June and should be taken in to account in planning decisions. I am also making a limited number of consequential changes to planning guidance”, “When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:”, “The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and”, “Following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing”, “In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines, or similar, will not be sufficient. Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority”, “Where a valid planning application for a wind energy development has already been submitted to a local planning authority and the development plan does not identify suitable sites, the following transitional provision applies. In such instances, local planning authorities can find the proposal acceptable if, following consultation, they are satisfied it has addressed the planning impacts identified by affected local communities and therefore has their backing”, here is the Secretary of State conflict of interest!

His/her political party opinion and his/her Ministerial Secretary of State decision making, so the DECC Propriety Guidance: For Ministers and Officials dealing with Department Consent applications (December 2011), the so called “Propriety Guidance” is a joke, because the Conservative Party Manifesto 2015 undermines whatever legitimate impartiality of Ministerial Office and the Conservatives Manifesto 2015 is political prejudice has made as national policy guidance. Here is the conflict of interests, of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State is publicly anti onshore wind turbines farms, is a obvious incompatibility with Propriety Guidance and the Secretary of State is obviously bias, if a large scale wind turbines farms do appear on Secretary of State desk and plus, is no funding of renewables community energy projects under the irresponsible HM Conservative Government.

Sadly, the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is unduly influenced by the HM Conservatives Government with consequences of establishing, the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2.

3 Energy Bill: ss. 60 Onshore wind power: closure of renewables obligation on 31 March 2016, Electricity Act 1989: ss. 32LB – ss. 32LC (1) “No renewable obligation certificates are to be issued under the renewables obligation order in respect of electricity generated after 31 March 2016 by an onshore wind generating station which is accredited after that date”, what is the Renewable Obligations? Why Renewables Obligation Certificates, are being stopped?

What is legitimate, of the Energy Bill: ss. 59 – 60? How the closure of the Renewables Obligation Certificates effect proposed Planning Applications of large wind turbines farms and generating stations?

I ask difficult questions, no one else is daring to ask and no one is willing to rise, such questions at National level of the House of Commons, House of Lords nor Local level, of the Shropshire Council and Planning Inspectorate Independent Examinations of Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Further Main Modifications. I consider all relevant information and political, science, etc., considerations indirectly effects FMM1, FMM2 and directly effects FMM1, FMM2 of the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan). While others fail, to consider to consequences of the Secretaries of State unsound Ministerial Written Statements and I consider, those consequences upon Shropshire renewable obligations and Shropshire community renewables energy projects.

What is the Renewable Obligations?

The Utilities Act 2000: ss. 62, Electricity Act 1989: ss. 32 “(1) An order under section 32 may make provision generally in relation to the renewables obligation imposed by order, and may in particular specific -” and ss. 64 “Green certificates”, links to the Renewables Obligation Order 2006 (SI) 2006 No. 2004.

Why Renewables Obligation Certificates, are being stopped?

Its purely political, on the part of the Conservative MPs in Public office, has Secretaries of State to emphasisement to NIMBYees of their own local constituencies' who don't engage in Public consultations at local level, simply complain out of their ignorance or who do engage in Public consultations, do publicly object to whatever proposed planning applications of small, medium or large onshore wind turbines farms, from their ignorance naïve realism mentality and don't offer, any alternatives to current UK and Shropshire energy crisis, flawed Public policy of national levels nor local levels.

What is legitimate, of the Energy Bill: ss. 59 – 60?

Its purely political and not about, the law or not about environmental responsibility on part of the Secretary of State or any Minister of the State, they avoiding responsibility to the environment, to their local communities constituency citizens, to local large and medium renewables energy companies.

How the closure of the Renewables Obligation Certificates effect proposed Planning Applications of large wind turbines farms and generating stations?

I read on, the BBC News (22 June 2015) “about 250 planned onshore wind farms are likely to be cancelled because of an early end to subsidies, the government said”, means 250 large wind farms won't happen under the HM Conservative Government is highly irresponsible and the closure of the Renewables Obligation Certificates, its not supportive of commercial large onshore wind turbines farms and by withdrawing, the subsidising to generating new enterprises in renewables energy sector.

Section 3 Bias = Belief?

The reading of the Chapter 2 Rationale Test of the Schedule of Further Main Modifications, Section

	Small Enterprises, Social Enterprises, Mutual Enterprises)		
Humans centred			Geo, earth centred
<i>Middle Way, Harmony</i>			

1 Inappropriateness of Secretaries of State, to discriminate against benefit claimants' and tax payers, why Ministerial Written Statements are wrong?

- “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications” (Ministerial Written Statement on 18th June 2015)

The Minister statement is allegedly claiming “to end subsidies for onshore wind”, is first bias by the Secretary of State and secondarily allegedly claiming “to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications”, is second bias. Bias or issue? The Secretary of State is confusing a issue, with a political agenda and the first issue, “to end subsidies for onshore wind”, is it fair to large and medium renewables energy companies? The closure of the subsidies, is to purely political and set in backdrop, of the HM Conservative Government foolish fixation to reduce Public deficit, the Conservatives are bias on side of Gas and Electricity sectors and the fairness, to tax payers. Tax payers are indifferent and generally don't care, where there taxes go, it be wrong to presume tax payers want subsidies to end going to renewables energy projects. Than I ask, who are the tax payers? Voter, tax payer, benefit claimant, employee, self employed, electorate, constituency citizen, resident, are different words for the same person and persons collectively, it is inappropriate and wrong, for Secretaries of State and MPs to discriminate against benefit claimants' and tax payers, its very divisive.

2 What is right, about subsidies to large wind farms? What is wrong, about closure of the subsidies to large wind farms?

The questions are valid, people accept whatever Ministerial Written Statements blindly and the Local Planning Authorities foolishly, endorse them, without of considering consequences upon themselves and their own local residents in there area. While, other local consultees and councillors', won't ask difficult questions and I will ask them, a philosopher does ask difficult questions, compared to politicians, etc., do ask wrong questions and do make bad national policy.

What is right, about subsidies to large wind farms?

Allegedly Public Authority			
<i>A</i>		<i>B</i>	
Local constituency	Local constituency	Tax > Renewables	<i>C</i> Local Social Enterprise

citizens' (Objections)	citizens (Supports)	Obligation Certificates' (To Large Enterprises) - Tax > Feed-in-Tariffs (TIF) (To Medium & Small Enterprises, Social Enterprises, Mutual Enterprises)	: Wind Turbine farm.
---------------------------	------------------------	--	----------------------

The Conservative Government want to closure of the Renewable Obligation (RO) subsidies to large renewables energy companies, like the Renewables Obligation Closure (Amendment) Order 2015 and the it is perceived, to be right to do closure of the RO to save, the bill payers of electricity Bills, is it the right thing? The closure of the Renewables Obligation Order 2002 & Renewables Obligation Order 2009, means voluntary sector and private sector renewables energy companies will be disproportionately impacted by the Conservative Manifesto 2015 bias against renewables energy sector, its wrong. The Conservatives are fulfilling a political object, to end subsidies to the renewables energy sector.

The HM Conservative Government is bias on side of the fracking for Gas, so the Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty is bias on side of global multi-national corporations of the Gas and Fossil fuel sectors, by closure of the Renewables Obligation Orders 2002, 2009, the unfairly impacting the renewables energy sector development in the UK and Shropshire, here we got Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are endorsing the prejudices of the Secretaries of State for a groundless economic development argument built on backs of Gas and Fossil sector.

What is wrong, about closure of the subsidies to large wind farms?

Allegedly Public Authority			
A		B	C
Local constituency citizens' (Objections)	Local constituency citizens (Supports)	Tax > Renewables Obligation Certificates' (To Large Enterprises) - Tax > Feed-in-Tariffs (TIF) (To Medium & Small Enterprises, Social Enterprises, Mutual Enterprises)	Local Social Enterprise : Wind Turbine farm.

The wrongness of the *Ministerial Written Statement*, it will damage a new source of energy development and future developments, in the renewables energy sector, so the renewables energy sector is unfairly disadvantaged by the Conservatives MPs bias to support the Gas and Fossil industry sector. The Conservatives MPs national policy bias on side of the fracking and Gas and Fossil industry sector, as well also the Conservatives are the party, is responsible for ruining the UK economy, the UK renewables energy sector, the UK environment.

The HM Conservative Government be wanting, the UK and Shropshire to be dependent on

imported Gas and Fossil fuel, imported food, imported materials, etc., and the Conservatives have no national policies, only to encourage selfish greed and emphasisement towards, the Gas and Fossil corporations companies'. The Conservative party will be responsible, for the nationwide power cuts, because the Conservatives failure to be responsible citizens to support renewables energy sector.

The national policy guidance is unreasonable, it don't solves UK emission reductions and the national policy guidance is wrong, its anti Green industry of the renewables energy sector and the same national policy guidance is on side of the NIMBYees, are anti renewables energy sector, here we got unsound national policy!

The *Local constituency citizens' (Objections)* are not looking at the environment and avoiding looking at the renewables energy, these objectors are skeptical of renewables energy benefits, however their skepticism is not Qualified skepticism. A true skeptic is bias free, and gather has much information, to examine all relevant information, evidence base to make a informed decision is fair, compared to NIMBYees and Euro skeptics, they follow their own prejudices and they ignore evidence base, information to reach a informed decision, instead they make decision of objection and not based, on reasoning, information, evidence.

Section 3 Normative Ethics

Allegedly Public Authority			<u>A</u>	The Climate
<u>A</u>		<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	The Ecosphere
Local constituency citizens' (Objections)	Local constituency citizens' (Supports)	Tax > Renewables Obligation Certificates' (To Large Enterprises)	Local Social Enterprise : Wind Turbine farm.	The Ecology - The Ecosystem - Environmental Capital
		- Tax > Feed-in-Tariffs (TIF) (To Medium & Small Enterprises, Social Enterprises,		
			<u>C</u>	

	Mutua I Enterp rises)		
Humans centred			Geo, earth centred
<i>Middle Way, Harmony</i>			

- “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications” (Ministerial Written Statement on 18th June 2015)

1 What is the right action of continuing the Renewables Obligation Order 2009? What is the right action, of discontinuing the Renewables Obligation Order 2009? Is the Renewables Obligation Closure (Amendment) Order 2015, the right action? Why the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are compliant with politically bias “decision statements” by Secretaries of State? The Conservative Manifesto 2015: STRONG LEADERSHIP, A CLEAR ECONOMIC PLAN, A BRIGHTER, MORE SECURE FUTURE: Guaranteeing you clean, affordable and secure energy supplies (page 57) – halt the spread of subsidised onshore wind farms, “Onshore wind now makes a meaningful contribution to our energy mix and has been part of the necessary increase in renewable capacity. Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support, however, and are unable by themselves to provide the firm capacity that a stable energy system requires. As a result, we will end any new publicly subsidy for them and change the law so that local people have a final say on windfarm applications” (page 58), “Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support”, to be elected to do a disproportionate impact upon, the renewables energy sector and withdraw funding to , a growing new industry, elected to do wrong action and make unsound national policy guidance?

The right and wrong, of any action, are relative and not absolutely right or not absolutely wrong, however there is no absolutes, thus notions of legality and illegality are false concepts, irrelevant. I asking these questions, is the philosophy's way and I questioning, the decision makers, the plan makers, only by questioning political issues is progress in society, to be a better society.

What is the right action of continuing
the Renewables Obligation Order 2009?

The right action, is to continue the Renewables Obligation Orders 2002, 2009, and continually supporting a good cause, of the renewables energy sector and reduction of UK carbon emissions.

The tax payers are not thinking, of the environment or the bigger picture of the world, they are only concerned for their little bit of Life existence and self centred tax payers, put simply a selfishness is contrary to the selflessness, sustainable world.

What is the right action, of discontinuing
the Renewables Obligation Order 2009?

Renewables Obligation Closure (Amendment) Order 2015.

Is the Renewables Obligation Closure (Amendment)
Order 2015, the right action?

To the local community renewables energy projects, this closure of the RO is a wrong action, compared to a people, are ignorant of renewables energy sciences and environmental sciences, instead they have a rose tainted view of art, landscape, and they mistakenly think, the renewables energy sciences is not a solution to anything. Since, they are ignorant and never learnt, environmental sciences and renewables energy sciences in colleges, universities.

The NIMBYees are happy, the subsidies to renewables energy projects proposals' won't be subsidised or won't be supported by national policy makers, and the national policy makers, are in line with the NIMBYees, perceived has a right action. The right action is to support, the renewable energy sciences, and the right action, is not based on ignorance and bias, however the right action is not corrupted, by unsound national policy or not corrupted, by unsound legislations, bad laws. An action is for equality and fairness, mutualism, everyone is sharing in the benefits of Better society, sadly Better society won't happen under the HM Conservatives Government.

Why the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are compliant with politically bias “decision statements” by Secretaries of State? The Conservative Manifesto 2015: STRONG LEADERSHIP, A CLEAR ECONOMIC PLAN, A BRIGHTER, MORE SECURE FUTURE: Guaranteeing you clean, affordable and secure energy supplies (page 57) – halt the spread of subsidised onshore wind farms, “Onshore wind now makes a meaningful contribution to our energy mix and has been part of the necessary increase in renewable capacity. Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support, however, and are unable by themselves to provide the firm capacity that a stable energy system requires. As a result, we will end any new publicly subsidy for them and change the law so that local people have a final say on windfarm applications” (page 58), “Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support”, to be elected to do a disproportionate impact upon, the renewables energy sector and withdraw funding to , a growing new industry, elected to do wrong action and make unsound national policy guidance?

There is a right action, to support and encourage, the renewables energy sector and this is the right action, however the electorate don't always know best, equally too, the politicians don't always know best. The electorate voted for the Conservative Manifesto 2015 lies, thus the voters have elected for a wrong action, is voting for the Conservative Party, also fulfilling this wrong action to end subsidies to new Green industry and growing sector, seems the electorate are misplacing their votes in Gas and Fossil corporations, the Conservatives are on side of the Gas and Fossil sector.

The wrong action, is manifested has a national policy, in turn a wrong action is imposed upon Shropshire Council to do amendment, to the SAMDev Plan (Pre-Submission Plan) e.g., Schedule for Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, to fulfil this wrong action, making a unsound planning policy.

2 What is the consequential perspective, upon the Schedule of Further Main Modifications (FMM1 – 2) and NPPF effects?

	Consequences – Cause and Effects	National policy bias & Local policy bias
1	Cause	Previous national policy
2	Effect	Previous national policy
3	Cause	The Conservative Party Manifesto 2015: STRONG LEADERSHIP, A CLEAR

		<p>ECONOMIC PLAN, A BRIGHTER, MORE SECURE FUTURE: Guaranteeing you clean, affordable and secure energy supplies (page 57) – halt the spread of subsidised onshore wind farms, “Onshore wind now makes a meaningful contribution to our energy mix and has been part of the necessary increase in renewable capacity. Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support, however, and are unable by themselves to provide the firm capacity that a stable energy system requires. As a result, we will end any new publicly subsidy for them and change the law so that local people have a final say on windfarm applications” (page 58), “Onshore windfarms often fail to win public support”</p>
4	Effect	<p>Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18th June 2015, Secretary of State Amber Rudd MP: “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications”, “I am now setting out proposals to end new subsidises for onshore wind, specifically in relation to the Renewable Obligation (PO)”, “The Energy Bill will devolve powers out of Whitehall so that applications onshore wind farms are considered by democratically elected councils”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">&</p> <p>House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24), Department for Communities and Local Government (Greg</p>

		<p>Clark) on 18th June 2015: “Subject to the transitional provision set out below, these considerations will take effect from 18 June and should be taken in to account in planning decisions. I am also making a limited number of consequential changes to planning guidance”, “When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:”, “The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and”, “Following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing”, “In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines, or similar, will not be sufficient. Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority”</p>
5	Cause	House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24), Department for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18 th June 2015: “Subject to the transitional provision set out below, these considerations will take effect from 18 June and should be taken in to account in planning

		<p>decisions. I am also making a limited number of consequential changes to planning guidance”, “When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:”, “The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and”, “Following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing”, “In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines, or similar, will not be sufficient. Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority”</p>
6	Effect	Inspector's Note to Council: Wind Energy Development
7	Cause	Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2
8	Effect	The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2 & “for consistency with the recent Written Statement on wind turbine” and “The modifications is required for consistency to changes with national policy guidance”, FMM2 In the case of wind energy proposals, <u>proposals will be assessed national policy</u>

		<u>guidance, including the Written Ministerial Statement of 18 June 2015</u>
9	Cause	The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2 & “for consistency with the recent Written Statement on wind turbine” and “The modifications is required for consistency to changes with national policy guidance”, FMM2 In the case of wind energy proposals, <u>proposals will be assessed national policy guidance, including the Written Ministerial Statement of 18 June 2015</u>
10	Effect	Local Consultees: To Support or Object?
11	Cause	Local Consultees: To Support or Object?
12	Effect	Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Further Main Modifications (Adopted)?
13	Cause	Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Further Main Modifications (Adopted)?
14	Effect	Planning Reference: 15/00532/FUL Wind Turbine 2.1 miles away from Bridgnorth.

The consequentialism (teleology) perspective, I see a chronological chain of cause and effect, from General Election 2015 to NOW! Schedule of Further Main Modifications FMM1 – 2, the policy maker does creates a chain of effects upon local communities. The elected politicians, want to change the society, the world, but the local citizens' can change the society too, without of dependency on elected politicians. Politicians don't always do right, beneficial actions. Politicians are inappropriate persons, to be in authority nor government.

3 Is, the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, the right action?

From all, of the evidence of the national planning policy and decision statements by Secretaries of State, the evidence points to a wrong action. The *right action* is supporting, the environment and the *wrong action* is supporting, the Gas and Fossil industry, also the policy making can lead to either right action or wrong action.

The right action, is a sound decision. While, the wrong action is unsound decision. The normative ethics, applied to the Schedule of Further Main Modifications FMM1 – 2.

Section 4 Applied Ethics: Environmental sphere

1 Policy consequences upon, the *Climate*, the *Ecosphere*, etc.

Allegedly Public Authority			<u>A</u>	The Climate
<u>A</u>		<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	The Ecosphere
Local constituency citizens' (Objections)	Local constituency citizens' (Supports)	Tax > Renewables Obligation Certificates' (To Large Enterprises)	Local Social Enterprise : Wind Turbine farm.	The Ecology - The Ecosystem - Environmental Capital
		- Tax > Feed-in-Tariffs (TIF) (To Medium & Small Enterprises, Social Enterprises, Mutual Enterprises)		
Humans centred				Geo, earth centred
<i>Middle Way, Harmony</i>				

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is bias towards economic role and the NPPF don't fulfils, the environmental and social roles. The national sovereignty debt and deficit, is interconnected with NPPF economic role bias, the economic bias is the basis, for the ending subsidies to the renewables wind energy developments.

The economics bias is the behind, the NPPF and the national policy statements from, the HM Conservative Government are bias on side of the pollution sector, of the Gas and Fossil industry sectors, pressuring Local Planning Authorities to emphasise unsound national planning policy makers.

The HM Conservative Government are bias on side, of the humans centred, e.g., cutting the illusory UK sovereign deficit/debt, emphasisement to corporations and Gas and Fossil industry, selfishness of NIMBYes, anti renewables energy industry sectors.

2 Economics over environmental, is it right? Environmental over economics, is it right?

The economic over environmental, is the Conservative party bias verse, the environmental over economics, is the Green party, every political party are humans centred = selfishness, thus the PUBLIC POLICY, e.g., NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY, are examples of selfishness of politicians. The humans life is impermanent, from birth to certainty of death and place of our death, where of our death, are uncertain.

What is right? Conservatism on side of enterprise capitalism and flawed capitalism model, oh yes, the United Kingdom economy is permanently flawed and it can't escape, from the certainty of the entropy! Economic growth creates economic recession, there is stagnation is between illusory growth and illusory recession, but the economic recession is a illusion, but the UK economy permanently in Quantitative Easing (QE) & Credit Easing (CE), low interest rates is favourable for debtors' to service their mortgages and loans, are there debt! Low interest rates is favourable for debtors to creditors, but creditors are themselves debtors is the irony and here, is the underlining flawed of capitalism. High interest rates is favourable, for responsible citizens' have built up there savings and generating there Capital, the savers are the wealth creators, compared to politicians and law makers, policy makers, HM Governments and the HM Treasury, HMRC are on side of generating debt and indebting citizens to more loans, to keep people in debt, means they have debt it keep them, in employment to service that debt. The enterprise capitalism, is a flawed model. However, the employees are 'wage slaves' to the whims of employers and capital gains, are not distributed to the employees verse, the self employed they keep there own capital gains, but the HM Government and policy makers, law makers are bias on side of employers', means the self employed are unfairly disadvantaged by United Kingdom laws and public policies, the public policy is always unsound.

The United Kingdom economy is on side, of unsoundness of the employers', enterprise capitalism, appreciateships, interinships, selfishness, earnings inequality and discrimination of benefits claimants', the minimum wage is a lie! The conservatism are anti renewables energy sectors, they are bias on side of the Fossil and Gas industry sector, importing Fossil and Gas in to the UK and the HM Conservative Government is incapable, of being a genuie environmental responsible.

The economics growth under enterprise capitalism of the UK, e.g., businesses growth, jobs growth, all are misleading. Growth becomes entropy. Economic recovery/growth = recession/stagnation, the cycle of economy, only proves capitalism under HM Government is a permanent flawed model. Mean while, right sort of self employed do propoity even when, the rest of companies and businesses are dissolving, winding up, oh yes, self employed keep their own capital verse normal businesses – the businesses capital gains are kept by employers' and not always distributed, to the employees. Employees are unfairly disadvantaged, by simply working for a employers whims'. However, responsible small and medium companies, do business environmentally responsibly verse most large corporations do business irresponsibility to the environment, especially like the USA!

Europe and the United Kingdom, should never lower its environmental responsibility standards, to the debase corrupt business practices of the USA and the average US citizens' health, medicine, environment, etc., are polluted, contaminated and ruined by US companies, corrupt Local Governments and corrupt Federal Government Departments. The USA has excellent wilderness and excellent environmental projects, are positive for the world yet, the USA other national policies are totally corrupt, from both Republics and Democrats and corporations unduly influencing politics of the USA.

Chapter 6 Politics Considerations Test

Section 1 Philosophy Questions

1 All other considerations, upon the Politics.

I have completed, the Soundness Test, the Ethical Test, upon this Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2.

2 The Public consultation on, the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, kept separate from the Politics sphere, is the line of the Planning Inspectorates', but the Politics sphere is inseparable with the daily Life of ordinary citizens'. I will conclude a brief Politics considerations test, on this Schedule of Further Main Modifications FMM1 – 2. No Acts of Parliament, no Statutory Instruments (Orders, Regulations, Rules), no Courts, no Governments, no Parliament are above Philosophy enquire and questions!

I continually ask, the right questions while, the elected representatives, like Members of Parliament and Councillors, always ask wrong questions and they keep, to the Party line by Whips and by Government Whips. The debate of whatever subject, risen by constituencies citizens and the subject is not risen or the MP, or Councillor fails to ask the right questions.

Mean while, the constituencies citizens and Local Councils Wards' residents, don't ask the right questions too, because they are distracted by employment, by unemployment, money worries and by debt, by daily problems of simply living in Britain. The electorate are distracted, kept in debt by the elected policy makers and this disconnection, between the electorate and the politicians, is self evident. The unemployed are in fortunate space, to have free time and they the unemployed, don't try to observe the mess of society, they are living in equally too, the so called employed are distracted by work worries and stress, they fail to observe the mess of their work and Life imbalance, because the work disproportionately impacts the Life of employed. So who, is in right place to ask right questions? The self employed, are potentially in right space to observe the mess made by politicians, like the unemployed are directly experiencing mess made by politicians, while the unemployed don't have the means and ways to remedy injustices made by politicians yet the self employed do have the means and ways to remedy injustices made by politicians. The philosophy is a skill, any one can intuitively learn or go to university, to learn, however the unemployed and the retired, the self employed are fortunate to be in the right place to observe society mess made by UK politicians.

Can a unemployed ask, the right questions to MPs? Can the self employed ask, the right questions to MPs? Can a employee of company, ask the right questions to MPs? The philosophy is not a belief or not a disbelief, and the practise of philosophy, is questioning and enquiry, by testing propositions made by religions, governments, courts and businesses, than outcome be either object or refute, whatever proposition.

- *Is the policy legitimate?* That depends, on the validity and correctness of the General Election 2015 outcome, as well also the policy basis is ideological bias. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is inheritly flawed and The Conservative Party Manifesto 2015: STRONG LEADERSHIP, A CLEAR ECONOMIC PLAN, A BRIGHTER, MORE SECURE FUTURE: Guaranteeing you clean, affordable and secure energy supplies (page 57), has doubtful genuineness. The allegedly Public policy is, rooted in bias and opinions of political party and the public policies are a list, of the conjunctures and propositions. Further more, the political parties policies' are subjective and doubtful evidence base, due process doubtful, because the political ideological subjectivism projectionism.

- *Is the policy justified?* That is doubtful. The Secretaries of State “decision statements”, will justify themselves by the party politics manifesto policies' mandate and they elected, to implement these doubtful legitimate policies, they turn policies in to law. The policy is groundless, rising from prejudices and the groundless policy equals, the unsound Bill/Act of Parliament, in turn unsound Royal Asset.
- *Is the policy right?* E.g., The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is inheritly flawed and The Conservative Party Manifesto 2015: STRONG LEADERSHIP, A CLEAR ECONOMIC PLAN, A BRIGHTER, MORE SECURE FUTURE: Guaranteeing you clean, affordable and secure energy supplies (page 57). The party politics policies, are not always right! The political party or parties, are not always right! The example of above, is not right. The Conservative ideology is not right, equally too, the Labour ideology is not right, the Liberal-Democratics ideology is not right, the UKIP ideology is not right. Each politics party policies, are wrong and they base, their policies on groundless evidence base and they use misleading statistics, to the public. No political party, is a moral authority! Neither HM Governments or Courts, Parliaments, Churches are moral authority too, and no religions are a embodiment of moral authority.
- *Is the policy legal?* The policy has neither Statutory Instrument or Act of Parliament basis, also the policy has no legal basis or no legitimate expectation, and the policy of whatever subject, have no evidence base or no reasoning. The policy is, not the law. The policy has no grounding in daily Life, and the policy, is void. The policy has no basis, likewise all Bills and Acts of Parliaments, as well also Statutory Instruments (Orders, Regulations, Rules) are void, since the Royal Assets have no basis. The public policies are essentially void.
- *Is the policy correct?* The Secretaries of State decision statements' are incorrect, why? The Secretaries of State, are bias against onshore wind turbine farm, is the first and obvious, I have clearly stated in my presentation and my representation. The national policy appears, fair to both objectors to wind turbine farm and supporters to wind turbine farm, but the national policy is bias on side of the objectors, further more the Planning Inspectorate are telling Local Planning Authorities to be, in the same line with the unsound national policy. I am amused, by the unsoundness of the national public policies from whatever political parties, and sadly, the Local Consultees do blindly accept these national policy has a norm, unwittingly supports them. The decision statements of 18th June 2015, are incorrect and unreasonableness.
- *Is the policy and the legislative, all void?* The political party policy basis is wrong, unsound, in turn the national policy is wrong, unsound, lastly the legislation Bill/Act is wrong and unsound. The law remains unsound, irrelevant. The parliament is making unsound Bills, in turn the courts are enforcing unsound law and the local authorities, are enforcing unsound law, is a false law. The Prime and Secondary legislations, have doubtful rationale and the By-Law, have no rationale too, so the law is unsound and both the legislations and the national policies, national guidances are essentially unsound and the House of Commons and the House of Lords, do make a lot of unsound laws, very few are legitimate and fair, genue, beneficial to UK citizens and local communities. The national policy or policies, are rooted in naïve realism, not actually rooted in fairness and evidence base, rationalism, majority of political parties manifestos policies' are groundless, every national policy from the HM Government are unsound and every Draft Bill, every Bill from the HM Government and every Act of Parliament, after Royal Asset on half of the HM Government are unsound. The United Kingdom laws are groundless and no courts, no parliaments, no governments, no institutions, no constitution have any legitimacy or legal foundations, as well also the

every Nation have no legal foundation, no legitimacy, in each Kingdom and each Monarchy of those Nations, have no consent from the people and no legality.

- *Is the policy incorrect?* Read, above the is the policy correct?

I have used, the Soundness Test is approved method and endorsed by Planning Inspectorate, but the Soundness Test alone is not enough, to question, to examine a local policy nor a national policy, a legislation, a national guidance. I continually question and enquire, to root out unsoundness of local policies and national policies, public laws.

Section 2 Politics Questions

1 Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2 & Inspector's Note to Council: Wind Energy Development, these statements are valid and correct, I have responded to them, however these statements by Planning Inspectorate and the Shropshire Council, have omitted or neglected to say, mention things, connected to the closure of the subsidies to onshore wind turbine farm developments. What things are neglected are said? Ending of subsidies to onshore wind turbine development, but what other things are effected by ending of subsidies? What other things, are effected by unspoken and hidden behind, the decision statements? These are first questions, most obvious, I discovered and find out, about the Renewables Obligation & Renewables Obligation Order 2002 is the basis for the funding and subsidies to, the onshore wind turbine farms and I tracking down, the Renewables Obligation Closure (Amendment) Order 2015, thus lead I to ask further new questions to come. Who is equip, to ask the right questions? The Planning Inspectorate can't ask, the right questions, because they are part of the Crown and the HM Government, equally too, the MPs can't ask the rights, because they are either part of the HM Conservative Government or back bench MPs, kept in line by Party/Government Whips. The Local Councillors, won't ask the right questions nor the Shropshire residents, won't ask the right questions too, so who is equip to ask the right questions? The journalists, will ask wrong questions and get partially right answer, however the courts, won't ask the right questions, they bias on side of the HM Government and enforcing whatever unsound national planning laws, so who is equip to ask the right questions?

Daily life is Politics, I realised this! Daily life of ordinary citizens, is politics and ordinary citizens, neglect there obligation to question the governments, the courts, the laws and the parliaments, the government departments', is wrong! Yet the same ordinary citizens, do elect representatives called MPs and Councillors, to be there representatives and make decisions on there behalf, in there bast interests, but the elected representatives do make bad public policies, bad laws, they ordinary citizens experience the consequences of unsound Bills/Acts of Parliament and unsound, bias, flawed Statutory Instruments.

Yes, daily life is politics! Public consultations are opportunities for citizens, the stakeholders to contribute, to the politics and to participants in politics and politics is NOT exclusively, the realm of the House of Commons and House of Lords, HM Government, Planning Inspectorate. Ordinary citizens, should not neglect politics and should not leave politics, to politicians and civil servants. Equally too, ordinary citizens should not neglect or not abandon politics, to religious leaders'.

What things are neglected are said?

The Renewables Obligation Order 2002 its basis, is the Utilities Act 2000: ss. 28.

The basis of the subsidies, to the onshore wind turbine farm and offshore wind turbine farm.

1. Renewables Obligation Order 2002: reg. 3 (1).
2. Renewables Obligation Order 2009.

The basis of the closure of the subsidies, to the onshore wind turbine farm and offshore wind turbine farm.

1. Renewables Obligation Closure Order 2014.
2. Renewables Obligation Closure (Amendment) Order 2015.

The closure to the subsidies, to who? Large scale onshore wind turbine farm companies.

The closure of subsidies, the closure of RO (Renewables Obligation), the proposed replaced is called the Contract for Difference (CfD) scheme.

What other things are effected by ending of subsidies?

The Renewables Obligation Orders 2002, 2009 are aimed at “biomass”, “energy crops”, “permitted ancillary purposes”, “waste”.

The closure of the RO (Renewables Obligation) also impacts upon, the large scale solar PV, is clearly stated in the ogfem e-serve Renewables Obligation: closure of the scheme to large-scale solar PV: 2.1. “From April 2015 the RO closed to large solar PV stations. A large solar PV station is defined in the RO Closure Order 2015 as “a solar PV station where the total installed capacity of the RO capacity of the station is more than five megawatts”. The decision statement is a lot of smoke and I seeing, through the smoke to see the fire, the contents of the statement and viewing, the why. The Statutory Instruments under whatever HM Government, are misleading on their contents purposes, e.g., renewables energy sector, and yet the Statutory Instruments are disproportionate and unfair upon, the local citizens, e.g., Universal Credits Regulations 2013. The policy making and the policy can be deceiving, misleading, unfair and ultimately unsound.

What other things, are effected by unspoken and hidden behind, the decision statements?

The Contract for Difference (CfD), is the hidden problem and, the ending, closure of the Renewables Obligation Orders 2002, 2009. The Contract for Difference is a subsidy, to the renewables energy sector but, at a discounted payment and the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) of 2013, is dishonest to renewables energy sector and local communities involved, in the renewables energy sector, simply read the Contract length analysis for Feed-in-Tariff with Contract for Difference: Summary of onshore and offshore wind analysis (August 2013 DECC).

The hidden content of the decision statement, is the political object. The ending of subsidies, to the wind turbine farm (effect) and the public statement, did not mention the Contract for Difference (CfD) and the Contract for Difference is discounting, the value of the renewables energy sector. The Renewables Obligation (RO) it, was replaced with Contract for Difference (CfD) and the CfD, is potentially replaced by Feed-in-Tariff (Fit). The FIT (Feed-in-Tariff), is aimed at the small and medium renewables energy sector generators.

2 Further questions.

- Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18th June 2015, Secretary of State Amber Rudd MP: “The Government was elected with a commitment to end subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have final say onshore wind farm applications”.

The Conservatives MPs are expected at making bad public policies, bad laws, always the wrong public policies. Under the Liberal-Democrats – Conservative coalition government (2010 – 2015), there are Equality Act 2010, Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Act 2013, but we got a Conservatives back in government again is bad news for Europe, United Kingdom of Great Britain.

Right decision, to give Planning Permissions to small and medium onshore wind turbine farm yet discriminate against large onshore wind turbine farms, is it really right?

The right decision, is debated issue in House of Commons and less so, in the House of Lords, even more less so in Local Authorities, mean while the ordinary citizens do what? Sit back allow, bad decision making take place in United Kingdom or sort to remedy, the bad decision making of governments.

I do respect Local Planning Authorities do give Planning Permissions, to small and medium, large onshore and offshore wind turbine farms, as well also gives Planning Permissions to other types of renewables energy developments, however finding a responsible Secretaries of State are supportive of the large, medium and small onshore, offshore wind turbine farms and other types of renewables energy developments is a rarity. Most MPs appear irresponsible, towards the global environment and the Local Planning Authorities, are taking a responsibility towards, the global environment and their local communities, seems the Local Planning Authorities are more responsible towards Geo, earth, compared to party politics nonsensical behaviour of Westminster Parliament and Whitehall.

Right decision to give Planning Permissions to large onshore wind turbine farm yet the Conservative Secretary of State MP, is obstructive of its development, who is right the local authority or impropriety of the Secretary of State undue process of his/her decision statement?

The right decisions have happened, in the Lake Districts, Scotland, Wales and England too, giving Planning Permissions to large, medium and small onshore and offshore wind turbine farms, other types of renewables energy generation stations to reduce CO2 emissions, I give my praise to those Local Planning Authorities are responsible to support the global Geo, environment over fantasy of national interests.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 20 (5) (a), 19 (1), 19 (2) (a – b), 19 (2)(a) “national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State”, 26 (2) (a) “If the Secretary of State directs them to do so”, 21 (1)(a) “he may at any time before the document is adopted under section 23 direct the local planning authority to modify the document in accordance with the direction”, plus the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 [SI 767]: regulation 29 “Where the Secretary of State gives a direction under the section 21(1) of the Act in respect of a local plan, the local planning authority. . .”, regulation 30 “The provisions of Schedule 1 apply to the Secretary of State gives direction under section 21(4) of the Act”, all of these equals undue process, obstructing local planning authorities making Green decisions, upon local planning authorities are doing, the right thing is a Green decisions for there local communities and for the world benefits.

The local planning authorities, who are responsible and fair, supportive to their local communities and the local environments of their county, area, are the right people but, the Secretaries of State decision statements on 18th June 2015 are contrary to responsible behaviour and reasonable. The world of Geo, earth is bigger the fantasy of national interest, public interest, since the national interest is tainted by party politics bias and it has no credibility, no merits, no legitimacy, regardless the General Elections say.

The Secretaries of State, can give a right direction is, simply continue support of large, medium, small onshore and offshore wind turbine farms developments projects is the responsible thing to do or can a wrong direction, like Ending new subsidies for onshore wind, 18th June 2015, Secretary of State Amber Rudd MP & House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS24), Department for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18th June 2015. Wrong directions, wrong national policy/guidance/advice should not be followed, by local planning authorities and by local communities.

The local planning authorities, are not perfect yet they are lesser evil, compared to the Secretaries of State collective irresponsibility of the HM Government is greater evil, if local authorities do truly represent there local communities diversity of views and citizens, than local authorities should continue question Whitehall and Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty unreasonable public policies and unsound legislations, bad laws. Or a local authorities, want to keep to the HM Government line, compatible with unsoundness of the national policies and flawed directions from Secretaries of State, than those local authorities are a disgrace to their local communities citizens'.

Right decision to stop further Renewables Obligation certificates,
in turn stops further onshore wind turbine farms and solar PV farms developments',
thus the local community objectors and
the bias Conservative Secretaries of State MPs are pleased,
but its not right, there irresponsibility to the global environment
is damaged by their NIMBYees attitude, is it right decision?

The Geo, earth is more important then follies of national interests and the national interests is always, a political party interests, here is the conflict of interests at the heart of the United Kingdom constitutional and governmental set up. The right decision is allegedly called the Public Interest, so far, the Public Interest is tainted by party politics bias and hypocrisy of Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty. One party supports onshore and offshore wind turbine farms, second party objects to onshore and offshore wind turbine farms, the misinformed voters do vote for the second party, thus irresponsibility begins at national level of the HM Government, the Westminster Parliament Sovereignty and Whitehall, eventually the irresponsibility impacts level level of local authorities, they start behaving irresponsible and unreasonable to, their own local communities all because, the same voters did voted for second party, where is the sense or reason, or logic in irrational of both electorate and elected MPs? I am amused by national policies, they are laughable and funny, disconnected from Reality and the national policies on whatever subject, by whatever political party are always amusement to read, to question. Employed electorate, continually make wrong decisions comes to voting, let alone on national planning policy making and national policy direction.

Economics truly corrupts policy making of whatever government, any where in the world and Europe, mean while the disadvantaged and vulnerable, unemployed survive by whatever means and ways, necessity of doing things to live, to be happy, to earn money to survive injustices imposed on them by elected politicians bias. Single mums, pensioners, widows, disabled, unemployed all experience injustices, from unsound bias and flawed national policies, from whatever political party in government.

1. *Right decision to stop further Renewables Obligation certificates, is it right decision?* That is debatable. More I researched in the context and background, of the Renewables Obligation (RO) and more I looked at the both, the funding and the renewables energy sector, I think the Secretaries of State have made wrong decisions as usual. Ideological decision, not a decision of common good of the people of Britain and of nature, the ideological decision is deeply flawed. The words 'Renewables Obligation Certificates', refers to two parts of the same legislation, the Renewables Obligation to wider suppliers,

- UK, Europe and world, as well also receive subsidies to start up renewables energy companies, social enterprises and the 'Certificates', the supplier of renewable energy receives a Green Certificate authorization to supply Green energy.
2. *Stops further onshore wind turbine farms and solar PV farms developments', is it really the right decision?* Its certainly a wrong decision at national level, local level. It is neglect of responsibility, to the Geo, earth ecology, ecosystems of the world and the politicians irresponsibility to avoid taking responsibility, for the mess of there national policies bias and unreasonable bad laws, made from ideological bias, e.g., Conservatism. Solar PV farms are not a problem equally too, the onshore wind turbine farms and offshore wind turbine farms are not a problem, the problem is national policy makers themselves' and the irresponsible local communities citizens, failing to be responsible citizens to humanity and to nature, to live in peace with our neighbours without of wars.
 3. *The local community objectors and the bias Conservative Secretaries of State MPs are pleased, but its not right, there irresponsibility to the global environment is damaged by their NIMBYees attitude, is it right decision?* Its not right. Shropshire and the rest of UK ecosystems and ecology, will suffer from irresponsibility of the Conservative Secretaries of State MPs and Councillors, the politicians are putting economics first before the environment, is wrong. Businesses and markets, selfishness, employment don't make the world Better and Safer place. I am cynical and skeptical, of national policies on whatever subject/issue, whatever national policy and whatever Draft Bill, Bill, eventual Act of Parliament by Royal Assent, are all unsound and wrong decisions made by wrong people, in government. HM Government is a generic term, a neutral term. The generic term HM Government is not, the problem, its the people are elected to HM Government status are the problem, thus the world suffers from ills of Conservatism, Far Right in USA and European Union, United Kingdom.

Title 2 Conclusions

Section 1 Preliminary considerations 10/08/2015

1 First impressions.

My first impressions, of reading the Inspector's Note to Council and I instantly saw, the unsoundness of the Secretary of State position, as well also Shropshire Council the lack of foresight, to be inclusive of onshore wind farms in their LDF Core Strategy, SAMDeve DPD.

2 The Immediate and long term consequences, of Secretary of State impact on Shropshire renewable wind development meeting reduction of CO2 emissions.

The wind energy development in Shropshire, will be seriously obstructed by Town Councils and by ignorant Towns' residents, all because the Secretary of State bias on side of NIMBY anti onshore wind farms.

3 Bridgnorth Town Council bias to support, the unsoundness of national policy of Secretary of State 18th June 2015 Statement and Main Modifications in line, with Shropshire Council to emphasise HM Conservatives Government.

I was alarmed and amused by, the Bridgnorth Town Council: “**Revolved:** that the Town Council had no objections to the SAMDev Schedule of Main Modifications – June 2015”, seems the Town Council is irresponsible and the Town Council, is on side of NIMBY anti onshore wind farms, is worrying to see! The ignorant are running, the Town Council. Many years of unsoundness, to come

from this Town Council decision makers on Planning Permissions, etc.

Section 2 Intermediary considerations 17/08/2015

1 Complete picture of Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, wider context considerations behind FMM1 – 2.

The Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1, FMM2, have a political background and serious consequences upon, responsible large, medium scale Renewables energy Companies as well also Social Enterprises involved in Renewables energy, like onshore wind turbines farms' across the country.

Yes, the Planning Inspectorate wants I to keep to, Soundness Test: legality, justified, effective, positively prepared, however I won't ignore or neglect, the wider context behind the FMM1 – FMM2. The national picture, is effecting the local picture of renewables energy developments' and planning permissions.

I am a responsible citizen, I consider all relevant information, etc., and beyond Soundness Test, to include other considerations upon, the Soundness Test to prove or disprove, whatever national policy, Local Development Framework DPD (Development Planning Documents), like this SAMDev Plan (Pre-Submission Final Plan) Schedule of Further Main Modifications.

I make a informed decision, upon relevant information and all information, not simply the selective bits are chosen by Planning Inspectorate and; I taken account, of the Politics, Statutory Instruments (Regulations, Orders), etc., to make a informative support or object to these Schedule of Further Main Modifications.

2 Do I object or support, the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2?

I have taken account, of all relevant information and the local, national policies. I have reviewed and questioned, I have enquired in to the issues of the renewables energy wind turbine farms and the Renewables Obligation (RO) Order 2002, 2009. I am skeptical of the national planning policy and the decision statements of the 18th June 2015. The national policy guidance/advice, is groundless, its inappropriate for the Shropshire Local Planning Authority to implement this unsound decision statements of the 18th June 2015. I object to, the groundless and baseless evidence base, of the decision statements of the 18th June 2015. therefore, I am objecting to the unsoundness of the Schedule of Further Main Modifications FMM1 – 2.

Section 3 Final conclusions 24/08/2015

1 My relevant considerations.

I have considered, the immediate soundness test has usual comes to public consultation and I than considered, the wider context and Statutory Instruments, national policies, Conservative Manifesto 2015, lastly I considered the ethical questions and politics questions. Through out this, I applied philosophy to this Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2.

2 My methods of enquire and questioning.

The Soundness Test:

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| • Legal compliance? | Yes & No. |
| • Positively prepared? | No. |

- Justified? No.
- Effective? No.
- Consistent with national policy? I reverse it, the national policy consistent with Shropshire locality? No.

The Rationale Tests:

- Philosophy Rationalism.
- Administrative Law Principles.
- Philosophy Relativism.

Is the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are rational? No.

The Ethical Tests:

- Meta-ethics.
- Normative ethics.
- Applied ethics – environmental ethics.

Is the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are ethically right? No.

The Politics Considerations Test:

Philosophy Enquire

- Is the policy legitimate?
- Is the policy justified?
- Is the policy right?
- Is the policy legal?
- Is the policy correct?
- Is the policy and the legislative, all void?
- Is the policy incorrect?

Politics Questions

- What things are neglected are said?
- What other things are effected by ending of subsidies?
- What other things, are effected by unspoken and hidden behind, the decision statements?
- Right decision, to give Planning Permissions to small and medium onshore wind turbine farm yet discriminate against large onshore wind turbine farms, is it really right?
- Right decision to give Planning Permissions to large onshore wind turbine farm yet the Conservative Secretary of State MP, is obstructive of its development, who is right the local authority or impropriety of the Secretary of State undue process of his/her decision statement?
- Right decision to stop further Renewables Obligation certificates, in turn stops further onshore wind turbine farms and solar PV farms developments', thus the local community objectors and the bias Conservative Secretaries of State MPs are pleased, but its not right, there irresponsibility to the global environment is damaged by their NIMBYees attitude, is it right decision?

Further sub questions, to follow.

- Where is the sense or reason, or logic in irrational of both electorate and elected MPs?

- Right decision to stop further Renewables Obligation certificates, is it right decision?
- Stops further onshore wind turbine farms and solar PV farms developments', is it really the right decision?
- The local community objectors and the bias Conservative Secretaries of State MPs are pleased, but its not right, there irresponsibility to the global environment is damaged by their NIMBYees attitude, is it right decision?

Is the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2, are politically right? No.

3 My Judgement on the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: Do I object or support, the Schedule of Further Main Modifications: FMM1 – 2?

Do I object or support, the Schedule of Further Main Modifications FMM1, FMM2?

I taken account of all relvant information and etc., and I acted fairly, considering everything informally, I making a informed decision based on number of test. I conclude, the Schedule of Further Main Modifications FMM1, FMM2 are unsound.