



For Shropshire
Council use

Respondent
no:

Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDEV) Plan

**Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)
17 March 2014 – 28 April 2014**

Representations Form

Please note you can also make representations to the SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft using our online form via:

www.shropshire.gov.uk/samdev

This is a formal consultation on the legal compliance and soundness of the Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for examination by an Independent Planning Inspector. For advice on how to respond to the consultation and fill in this representations form please see the guidance notes available on the Council's website at www.shropshire.gov.uk/samdev.

Your details: Who is making this representation?

Name:	Jennie De Rosa
Organisation (if applicable):	
Address:	
Email:	
Telephone:	

If you are acting as an Agent, please use the following box to tell us who you are acting for:

Name:	
Organisation (if applicable):	
Address:	
Email:	
Telephone:	

Your Representations

Please note, you must use a separate form for each representation you wish to make.

(Please refer to the accompanying Guidance Notes on Making Representations when completing this section)

In the box below please give the policy, paragraph or section of the Policies Map your representation relates to:

Policy S3, MD 3 – 4; paragraphs 1.4, 2.1 – 2.3, 2.23 – 2.25, 5.29 – 5.30, 5.33.

Is your representation in support or objection? (please tick as appropriate)

Support **Yes** **No**
Object **Yes** **No**

In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the Policies Map, do you consider the SAMDev Plan is:

Legally compliant **Yes** **No**
Sound **Yes** **No**

If your representation considers the SAMDev Plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is not (*Please tick all that apply*):

Positively prepared	
Justified Not	
Effective Not	
Consistent with National Policy	?

In the box below please specify your reason for supporting or objecting.

If you are objecting, you should make clear why the document is unsound having regard to the issues of 'legal compliance' or whether the document is not positively prepared, justified, effective or not consistent with national policy (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary).

Read my additional sheets.

Please use the box below to explain the changes you think should be made to the SAMDev Plan in order to make it legally compliant or sound? You should explain your suggested revisions to the policy, paragraph or section of the Policies Map, and why this change would make the plan legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Read my additional sheets.

Please be sure that you have provided all the information necessary to support your representations and any changes you are proposing. After this stage you will not be able to make any further representations about the SAMDev Plan to Shropshire Council. Any further submissions will only be possible at the invitation of the Inspector conducting the examination, who may seek additional information about the issues he/she has identified.

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

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

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

If you wish to attend the examination, please explain why you think this is necessary in the box below:

Do you wish to be notified of any of the following? *Please tick all that apply. We will contact you using the details you have given above.*

When the SAMDev Plan has been submitted for examination	X
When the Inspector's Report is published	X
When the SAMDev Plan is adopted	X

Please return this form by 5pm on Monday 28 April 2014

You can e-mail it to:

Planning.policy@shropshire.gov.uk

Or return it to: Planning Policy Team, Shropshire Council, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Please note, we will acknowledge receipt of representations made by e-mail.

Data Protection Act 1998 and Freedom of Information Act 2000

Representations cannot be treated in confidence. Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires copies of all representations to be made publically available. The Council will place all the representations and the names of those who made them on its website, but will not publish personal information such as telephone numbers, emails or private addresses. By submitting a representation on the Pre-Submission SAMDev Plan you confirm that you agree to this.

**UMA
AMA
DHR**

**Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development
(SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)
17 March 2014**

Ms J De Rosa – Representation

Contents

Part 1

Title I	My representation
Chapter I	Essence of the Homage to Mahamudra
Chapter II	Homage to Dao nature
Chapter IIIA	Testing SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)
Chapter IIIB	Soundness test
Section I	Justified?
Section II	Effective?
Section III	Consistent with national policy? National policy consistent with locality?
Chapter IV	Rationale test
Chapter V	Ethics test
Section I	General ethics
Section II	Specific ethics
Section III	Conservation ethics test
Chapter VI	Environmental test
Section I	Considerations of IPCC Climate Change report (2014)
Section II	Ecosystem Services Assessment
Section III	Ecosystem Services Assessment Summary
Chapter VII	Legality test
Chapter VIII	Reasoning and explanations for 'changes', to make it sound
Chapter IX	Conclusions

Part 2

Annex 1	Ecosystem Services Assessment Plan
Annex 2	Ecosystem Services Assessment Plan (Methodology)

Title I My representation

Chapter I Essence of the Homage to Mahamudra

1. Where are no mind, no nominalism, no Dharmakaya, no Guru, no Yidam, no Buddha (no Tathagata, no Sugata), no Dharma, no Sangha, no Darmapala, no definitive refuge, no interpretative refuges, no Mahamudra, no homage to Mahamudra, no homages, this is definitive homage to Mahamudra.
2. Where are no Homage, no Homage to Mahamudra, no Mahamudra, this is definitive homage to Mahamudra; where are Homage to Mahamudra, to Mahamudra, this is interpretative homage to Mahamudra.

Chapter II Homage to Dao nature

Omnipresence Dao

Heaven (Ti'an) shen and Earth (Di) shen, are manifestations of Dao Qi.

Fields spirits (shens), woods and forests shens, mountains and streams shens, are aspects of Di shen.

Wetlands shens, sun and moon shens, sky and lighting shens are, aspects of Ti'an shen.

They in turn are manifestations of Dao.

Walking in Dao, camping in presence of Dao, meditating in presence of Dao and Dao is not named!

I and Di, Tian in harmony and harmony with Dao, each moment never wasted on busyness.

Art or Science

Nature is not a commodity, not a product, not a thing or not a object to be consumed, exchanged, sold, rented, license, charge, tax and; nature recognises, no sovereignty, no constitution, no state, no nation, no governments, no man made laws, no territory, no borders, no boundary, no Judeo-Christianity, Islam false teachings beside omnipresence nature.

Studying nature is respecting Dao, like Biology, Ecology, Geology, acting in harmony with nature.

Studying nature is exploitation of nature, like commercialisation and land development, planning process, profiting, taxation, acting contrary to nature.

Live in harmony with Dao, is the most hardest and most easiest, path of selflessness, ever happiness or live contrary to Dao, is the most hardest and profitable, path of selfishness, ever self destruction and destruction of environments, neighbourhoods, communities. Choice is yours!

Meaningful absence

Cluttered mind of knowledge, selfishness, busyness is madness, wasted Life.

Cluttered house of possessions, properties, no one can hold unto them, momentary.

Cluttered lands of houses and businesses, muddy and far from simplistic, natural beauty of Life – Death.

A smile outshines dull mind of busyness, clarity of mind uncluttered the mind of busyness.

Experiencing Qi every where, one's walk and breath Qi, expensive property can't match simplistic of tent.

Stillness of a moment, experiencing a wild rose finger tips away and in stillness, entire Dao actualised.

Chapter IIIA Testing SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)

1 – Expected by representation form

Policy or policies soundness test: Policy S3 (Bridgnorth), MD3 – 4.

Paragraphs soundness test: 1.4, 2.1 – 2.3, 5.23 – 5.25, 5.29 – 5.30, 5.33.

2 – Testing regime

I am testing the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) by:

- Soundness test (Justified, Effective, National policy consistent with Shropshire)
- Rationale test (Rationality of either or both the National policy and Shropshire Council LDF e.g., SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan).
- Ethical test (biocentric ethics test, consequentialism ethics test, anthropocentric ethics test, conservation ethics).
- Environmental test.
- Legality test.
- Considerations of IPCC Climate Change report (2014).

My testing regime goes beyond, standard representation form soundness test.

3 – Top-down soundness test verse and/or complements bottom-top soundness test?

Top-down soundness & legality test: Soundness test (Justified, Effective, National policy consistent with Shropshire) and Legality test.

Bottom-top specialism tests: Rationale test (Rationality of either or both the National policy and Shropshire Council LDF e.g., SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), Ethical test (biocentric ethics test, consequentialism ethics test, anthropocentric ethics test) and environmental test (Considerations of IPCC Climate Change report (2014), Ecosystem Service Assessment).

Chapter IIIB Soundness test

Section I Justified?

(Housing) BRID020a, BRID001 & 020b. Are not credible or not appropriate, for Bridgnorth and Tasley Area, from the overwhelming objections from residents in Bridgnorth. A choice of new houses in Tasley Area, Canern Area or plant more trees, expand the Greenfields Area? Plant more trees is beneficial to, the global ecosystem and beneficial to local community of Bridgnorth, and yet restricted new housing targeted at local residents, not for Landlords or not for Rents leaseholders, not for commuters.

(Employment) ELR011a, ELR011b. Are not credible yet other objectors are willing to compromise, to have restrictive housing and limited Employment building along side.

Currently ELR011a, ELR011b are fields, as part of farm land and those fields are already employed doing a important JOB is a ecosystem and ecological function, for the biodiversity dictated by nature – environmental role of NPPF. Turning ecological – ecosystem fields in to, ELR011a, ELR011b be environmental damaging to biodiversity, ecosystem and two less fields to capture Carbon emission, is unsound.

Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) 17 March 2014: para 5.24 “Great concerns were raised by the local community about the concentration of development at Tasley and crossing the bypass, but at present time the town has little option but to extend in a north-west direction due to Green Belt, topographical and landscape constraints in all other directions. It is recognised that the Green Belt will need to be next in the next Local Plan reviewed”, the 'It is recognised that the Green Belt will need to be next in the next Local Plan reviewed' makes this SAMDeve Plan Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) unjustified. The SAMDeve Plan Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is bias towards economic role of NPPF, but the economic role of NPPF credibility is laughable and utter irrelevant, economics has no credibility and UK economy is irrelevant!

Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) 17 March 2014: para 5.30 “Land across the bypass at ELR011/a is only being released on the condition that it is for the town's long term business and industrial needs (use classes B1, B2 & B8 and appropriate sui generis uses including car dealerships) and it is therefore appropriate to reserve it entirely for such use”, but its neither appropriate for Bridgnorth, because entire Carbon emission from businesses and cars' or justified, to allocated land for ills of business and industrial whims.

Currently ELR011/a is a field, doing a excellent ecological and biodiversity function, ecosystem designated by Nature and capturing Carbon, keeping CO2 down in Bridgnorth Area.

Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) 17 March 2014: 5.31 “Land at ELR011/b will be released for the relocation of the livestock market and its associated uses. Should the livestock market close permanently, the land will be reserved for future B1, B2 & B8 uses only”, the SAMDeve Plan Pre-Submission (Final Plan) 'should the livestock market close permanently', does sounds like wishful thinking by Shropshire Council Conservative Councillors' and negativity towards Bridgnorth livestock market. Its inappropriate by Shropshire Council to say such a thing, so this SAMDeve Plan Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is further unjustified. Shrewsbury or Shropshire Council are simply jealousy, because Bridgnorth has a livestock market as part of its history and Shrewsbury has no livestock market of its own, I am aware of.

The Travellers and Gypsies may make better use, of (W039) are well “justified” according to soundness test compared to, Shropshire Council and Bridgnorth Town Council have not implemented (W039) and Shropshire Council, Bridgnorth Town Council are no longer “justified” to hold (W039). This high lights, Shropshire Council SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is again, “unjustified”. The Gypsies settlement on (W039) instantly refutes SAMDeve MD9, MD9 is no longer credible or appropriate, MD9 in context of Employment site (W039) is refuted by Gypsies presence. MD9 is irrational, land is not deployed, the wise and smart Gypsies settle on it.

The Shropshire Council Core Strategy: Policy CS12 (4) “Identifying a site for Travelling Showpeople in North-West Shropshire”, so far Shropshire Council has not identified a site for Gypsies in North-West nor South-West Shropshire and; Gypsies identified a site, to settle on (W039). SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) has not mentioned Travellers and Gypsies needs in Bridgnorth Area, South-East, South-West Shropshire.

The considerations of BRID001, 020a/020b based on Ecosystem Service Assessment (Field study) (observations), the BRID020a/020b are sedimentary rocks (sandstone, conglomerates, natural chalk) means, the soil is good for agricultural and yet the soil/rocks are dry, absorbs the water and lots of water absorbed, left is surface water – potential flooding on BRID020a, bad for housing and only immediate spring is in Abbey field Road. Excess rain water and built over fields, means problems for households. Very unsound!

Section II Effective?

Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) 17 March 2014: 5.33 “and seek to positively contribute towards local infrastructure improvements, including the provision of community benefits in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS9”, Adapted Core Strategy March 2011: CS9 “Development that provides additional dwellings or employment premises will help deliver more sustainable communities”, really? There is no such thing, a 'sustainable communities' nor 'sustainable growth', because all phenomenon do cease quickly or gradually, by entropy principle inseparable with 2nd law of

thermodynamic.

The 'sustainable communities' is a fantasy. Within my life time and I seen innumerable businesses come and go, in my life. Businesses and trade don't last! Only reinforces, entropy principle is Reality of nature, same entropy happens to all phenomenon, even businesses and UK economy are not immune from entropy principle. Entropy is a phenomenon, happens across nature, its self evident, while HM coalition Government, United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty, Whitehall, Shropshire Council, and innumerable Local Governments, businesses, economists are in denial of entropy principle happens.

The SAMDeve Plan Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b), may be deliverable, to emphasise corrupt economic role of NPPF but, at a environmental cost to Bridgnorth Area and undermining environmental role of NPPF.

Flawed Policy S3:

- Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a) are ineffective and environmental damaging to ecosystem and local ecology of North-west Bridgnorth.
- Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) are ineffective and environmental damaging to ecosystem and local ecology of North-west Bridgnorth, further undermine low carbon Shropshire footprint.

From my observations of north-west Bridgnorth Area, of were Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) be implemented.

I find Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) are ineffective and incompatible to Green Belt sensitivity and local natural environments.

Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) 17 March 2014: para 2.6 “The Localism Act 2011 emphasised the importance of community led planning, in the Neighbourhood Plans, Parish and Town Plans and Village Design Settlements”, e.g., Bridgnorth Town Plan.

I am skeptical of Town Plans and serious lack of credibility, lack of oversight, as well also Bridgnorth Town Plan had lots of flaws, ignoring key Community Mental Health (CMHT) services and other Shropshire Community NHS services covers Bridgnorth Area. Citizens' Town Plans are mirroring same or similar flaws of the Town Councils, Parish Councils.

The Travellers and Gypsies may make better use, of (W039) for Gypsies settlement purpose, compared to Shropshire Council and Bridgnorth Town Council, local industrial stakeholders have done nothing to make use of that land.

The Gypsies settlers have made (W039) “effective” while, Shropshire Council and Bridgnorth Town Council are ineffective, no longer appropriate authorities or no longer appropriate owners of (W039).

Section III Consistent with national policy? National policy consistent with locality?

1 Reversing consistence, from consistent with national policy to national policy consistent with locality:

Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan – Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) 17 March 2014: 2.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

From top-down soundness test: “consistent with national policy?”

To bottom-top soundness test: “national policy consistent with locality?”

The National Planning Policy Framework March 2012:

- Para 7 (economic role, social role, environmental role). The economic role is incompatible, with both social role and environmental role, further more the NPPF is bias towards economic role. The economic growth is incompatible with environmental role, thus the national policy itself is incompatible with local environments of Shropshire.
- Para 14 presumption in favour sustainable development. The policy/concept “favour sustainable development” is a modern myth, a fantasy, its contrary to Reality of nature is that all growth ends is called 'entropy principle'. NPPF para 14 is irrelevant!
- Para 79 – 81 (Green Belt land) does applies to Shropshire totally and all Shire's counties in England. SAMDeve Plan Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): MD6, MD6.1 Map Green Belt, and Shropshire LDF Adapted Core Strategy 2011: CS5 Countryside and Green Belt, para 4.75 apply to Bridgnorth and Bridgnorth is inside the Green Belt! NPPF: para 80 applies to this SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b)). NPPF: para 80 (3) “to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”, oh yes (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) are regarded encroachment on Green Belt lands, therefore these (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) are unnecessary and unacceptable.
- Para 109 (Natural environment) certainly applies to SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b)! NPPF: para 109 (2) “recognise wider benefits of ecosystem” does apply to whole of Shropshire and Bridgnorth Area. NPPF: para 116, should apply to SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b)! The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) is incompatible with NPPF para 109.
- Para 126 (Historic environment). NPPF para 126, does applies to whole of Shropshire landscape, Shropshire towns and Bridgnorth, Bridgnorth Area. SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) is incompatible with NPPF para 126.
- Para 165 – 166, 169 – 170 (Natural and historic environments). NPPF para 165 – 166, 169 – 170 do apply to, SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) and the Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) are incompatible with both paras 165 – 166 and paras 169 – 170.
- Para 171 (Health and well being). The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) has ignored the health and well beings of Bridgnorth residents health, has a consequences of these Policies and planning applications, planning permissions. Thus, SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) is incompatible with NPPF para 171.
- Para 172 (Major accidents). SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) will create a potential and actual road accidents, serious accidents dependent on types of businesses irresponsibility and types of business trade. SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) is incompatible with NPPF para 172

- Para 182 (Soundness test). The Soundness test, I support it and I use it, to test Shropshire Council, Bridgnorth Town Council Town Plan and Tasley Parish Council.

The National Planning Policy Framework generally is unsound.

The National Planning Policy Framework unsound specifics:

- Para 7 (1) (economic role). Economics is generally unsound, should not be taken so seriously and economics is harmful to, UK population health, UK (natural) environments.
- Paras 8, 9 (Economic growth). Economic growth is a myth, with growth comes recessions in a constant cycle and no such thing, a “sustainable development”, “sustainable growth”, since all growth are doom by entropy principle and uncertainty principle undermines myth of enterprise capitalism, businesses, competitive markets and UK economy. Economic growth is permanently refutable, regardless to HM Treasury, Bank of England and The London – City of London, Official and National Statistics on economics.
- Paras 11 – 16 (Presumption in favour in sustainable development), is contrary to Nature's laws and since, all sustainable development are certainly eventually cease, by entropy principle of Nature.
- Paras 18 – 22, 23 – 28 (Business bias by NPPF). Wasting tax payers money, to bail out banks and businesses, corporations, industries, private sectors is deeply wrong. All businesses are doom, by certainty of entropy principle and no amounts of profits, earnings, won't sustain a non-sustainable businesses, even businesses are on Life support i.e., loans from banks. Businesses can't escape certainty, of eventuality of cessation to trade, to recruit and/or sack worker, to earn.
- Para 69 (Promoting healthy communities). SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) are contrary to, promoting a healthy communities equally too, the National Planning Policy Framework itself is not promoting healthy communities, why? The NPPF is bias towards economic role over social and economic roles.
- Para 156 (1) (Homes and Jobs in the area). Constraints of homes building within Shropshire and Bridgnorth, however homes for local residents and not for renting, leaseholder, landlords. Jobs are irrelevant, since employment is a unnatural behaviour. Humans fixations on seeking employment and once in employment, is very amusing compared to, spiders and cats, inserts, birds, so forth, don't do a job or don't have a career.
- Para 160 – 161 (Business needs). Businesses needs are irrelevant, businesses always damage the local environment of towns, surrounding area indirectly and directly, by there activities. e.g., smoking outside the shop/properties, litters, cigarettes ends, rubbish, shop waste.

The National Planning Policy Framework is, incompatible for Shropshire natural environments, towns, villages and Bridgnorth specifically.

The National Planning Policy Framework don't mentions Travellers and Gypsies community needs, that amounts to direct and indirect, association discrimination of them, is deeply unlawful and; National Planning Policy Framework is incompatible, with Travellers and Gypsies community needs.

2 Consequences of National Planning Policy Framework upon Shropshire and Bridgnorth:

2A National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011: B4 (Natural and Local Environment/Green Infrastructure/Green Space designation): Risks “One of the risks of the new designation is that it may encourage 'NIMBYism' – local communities attempting to block essential development in their immediate area. . . and which is examined by the inspector, should mitigate

this risk”, has serious consequences upon Shropshire's consultees and wider local communities.

The Shropshire Council and the Planning Inspectorate, do selective hearing and hearing representations are moderate or bias towards, the economic agenda of the Council and; the objectors do get heard and yet objectors are not properly listen to, unfair treatment towards objectors to any essential development.

The planning process under the HM coalition Government – National Planning Policy Framework is bias towards economics and the planning process will reflect that bias, by public authorities. Equity principle is violated by economics bias of the planning process and local communities residents may feel dissolutional with politics generally, local politics specifically.

The local community is called “NIMBY” by HM coalition Government, is very disrespectful to the very constituencies electorate had voted in last General Election. NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard).

- HM Government regards NIMBY has a identifiable risk. Local communities citizens' know there own community and natural environments better, compared to any Local Government, HM Government Secretary of State. Local communities citizens' objecting to any sort, of economics interference in there local community and local environments, so citizens' defending there natural environments and towns, villages, from irresponsibility of MPs and Secretary of State of the Crown.
- HM Government done a risk assessment of NIMBY, a risk to local economy recovery? The NIMBY effecting local economy or HM Government damaging local environments? The pursuit of economics growth increases equals environmental damage increases, is called “Environmental Kuznets curve”, so the local economic recovery nor local economic growth do have damage upon, local natural environments across the United Kingdom. Simply look at Bridgnorth for a example, north-west Bridgnorth there were fields and footpaths across countryside and then, came new houses built between WenLock Road and A458, as well also new houses Hook Farm Road, Fairfield & Abbey field Roads, Marchwood Close, Beacons Field Close, Copperfield Close, before were fields and nice views across north-west Shropshire. Economics brings no benefits to Bridgnorth, only ruining local historic town and economics nor jobs creations, don't solve any problem, only create more problems for local people to deal with.
- HM Government risk mitigation of NIMBY, by giving Guidance to Planning Inspectorates to “should mitigate this risk”. The Planning Inspectors minimise NIMBY objectors in the planning process and consultation, representation is a form of not listening to any actual communities concerns, is very undemocratic and not honest, not equity to all parties and Planning Inspectors don't listens to all sides of the issue. Mitigating the risk of NIMBY, means the Planning Inspectorate don't hears both sides of the issue, thus the planning process is incomplete and lacking equity, lacking fairness.
- HM Government reviews, the Planning Inspectorate of mitigating the risks of NIMBY.

The HM Government MPs undermining there own local constituencies citizens' confidence in politics, in democracy, by HM Government MPs calling there own electorate “NIMBY”. I find unacceptable, the National Planning Policy Framework is incompatible with local communities of United kingdom. The other consultees might be offended by National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011, because the Whitehall and United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty MPs are so disrespectful towards there own citizens'.

The local community citizens' “may agree to disagree” on issues, we are a local democracy but, local community citizens know there local environments better and know there local town/village better, compared to a Shropshire Council Councillors' or Secretary of State, who don't live in the very area or part of area, will be effected by national policy and implemented via Shropshire

Council LDF SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan). Local communities, live with consequences of damaged town or countryside, or both, from national policy and Local Plans imposed against local community objections.

How can local communities mitigate the risks of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plans, SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), etc? What local communities, can do to mitigate the risks of the National Planning Policy Framework, etc? A valid questions.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a identifiable risk to, entire Shropshire and all Shire counties, across England, the NPPF is a liability to United Kingdom natural environments and local communities. There should be safeguards against national policy irresponsibility of MPs.

2B National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011: B3 (Green belt) cost
“Possible small-scale loss of Green belt”, has consequences upon Bridgnorth and Mid Severn Green Belt.

The Green Belt is a natural phenomenon, in the past and entire England was a forest, like Wales has forests today and Green Belts are shadows of former great forests covering England. Green Belts are under attack in London and yet London, has more open spaces for citizens' but, so called “Green Open Spaces” in London are Crown Land, means those Green Open Spaces in London are not truly possessions of Londoners and British citizens'. All Commons, Open Spaces, wilderness and Green Belts, Forests, Mountains, Hills, Fields, Parks belong to the people and of the people, for the people, not for Royalty, not for Peers of the Realm or not for commercial profiting, not for private ownership.

The current Green Belt covers Birmingham Area and Bridgnorth Mid Severn, having a woodlands is natural capital compared to other types of capital, like wealth capital, property capital, business capital are all deceptive and since, all businesses and national economy don't last! HM Labour Government sold Gold cheap (2000s), likewise HM coalition Government sold Royal Mail cheap (2014), or HM Conservative Government sold British Rail cheap (1980s), citizens should be weary of HM Governments' and skeptical of any national policy, since all national policies are not beneficial to United Kingdom, West Mercia and Shropshire.

Maintaining the Green Belts is, the most intelligent move and wiser decision, but the foolish majority believe in economics and jobs creations, neglectful of responsibility to natural environments. I am mindful of how fortunate, of were I live in south-east Shropshire and short walk in to woods, countryside and short walk in to town itself, compared to other citizens' live in cities don't have a opportunity to experience raw Nature at first hand. A city may have more wealth creation opportunities and more materialism temptations, more costs, more problems compared to living in a town has less wealth creation opportunities, less materialism temptations, same costs, less problems. London and capital of UK London can't match Bridgnorth for peace and quietness, slow pace of Life. Bridgnorth is superior to London, because Bridgnorth is rural town has peace and quietness, while London is inferior and its noses and stressful, materialism centre, selfishness centre, fickle fashions and; the His/Her Majesty the Crown lives in a inferior place called London.

However, Londum was once a open marsh on coast and small-scale town in distinct past of history (Stone Age, Bronze Age, Iron Age), the Londum of the past was like Bridgnorth in countryside, but London today is a urban mass and far from countryside, quietness and peace. Modern London should not be model, for the rest of United Kingdom and Shropshire should not follow misguided habits of national policy of policy makers and law makers from London, mean while Kent is ruined by London expansions in to Kent natural environments.

The Mid Severn Green Belt is vital natural environments and vital ecosystem in Shropshire, West Mercia, its wrong of national policy nor economics, to damage local ecosystems across West Mercia and United Kingdom. The United Kingdom economy, jobs, businesses are disposable, expandable, like modern consumerism of today with disposable products, brands, in turn the United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty and the Crown, HM Governments', England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are themselves expandable by the citizens' of Britain. United Kingdom ecosystems and Shropshire ecosystems are better investment, for immediate & future generations survival and health, happiness, compared to short termism whims of markets, businesses and national policy, Local Governments, HM Governments, Parliaments.

2C National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011: Specific impact tests (Greenhouse Gas) “The planning system contributes to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change” and “of increasing housing supply and encouraging economic growth, while reducing energy demand”, has consequences upon Shropshire.

Economics corrupts policy making;
economics corrupts national and local policy.

Four policy options (and one extra policy option) of SAMDev (Issues and Options; Preferred Options; Revised July 2013):

- **Option 1:** 'do minimum' 500 homes, will have costs to natural environments and yet its minimum damage to local ecosystem, local biodiversity, local geography and food web.
- **Option 2:** 'a little below mid-range' 700 homes, will increase costs to natural environments and infringe in nature's ability to capture CO2, water cycle, provide food web and sustain a local ecosystems.
- **Option 3:** 'a little above mid-range' 800 homes, serious loss of natural environments ability to capture CO2, infringe water cycle and provide sustainable biodiversity, local ecosystems.
- **Option 4:** 'do maximum' 1000 homes, deeply serious and substantial loss of local ecosystems, biodiversity, food webs across Bridgnorth and serious infringement in water cycle, lasting consequences upon Bridgnorth Area air quality and environmental pollutions of more cars, vans in Bridgnorth.
- **Option 5:** 'do zero extra new homes', no further damage to local ecosystems and biodiversity, biocentric, food web of north-west Bridgnorth. Safeguards, the Green Belt and safeguards the wider local ecosystem, local ecology, local biodiversity and biocentric natural environments.

Four policy options of SAMDev (Issues and Options; Preferred Options; Revised July 2013) but, 5th Option is not mentioned or not included, in the planning process and public consultations of any Local Government LDF DPD, means the planning process is misleading, unfair, not compatible with equity or nor covering all options for local community residents to consider.

Four policy options (and one extra option) of SAMDev (Issues and Options; Preferred Options; Revised July 2013):

- **Option 1:** 'do minimum' extra employment land
- **Option 2:** 'do modest' extra employment land.
- **Option 3:** 'do moderate plus' extra employment land.
- **Option 4:** 'do maximum' extra employment land.
- **Option 5:** 'do nothing' zero extra employment land.

The extra employment lands, will have costs to natural environments' of Shropshire and of Bridgnorth. Option 5 is perfect, preservation of the local ecosystem and local biodiversity, while

option 1 is reasonable, minimum damage to local ecosystems of north-west Bridgnorth, its still has costs to local environments. Options 2 – 4 are varying degrees of environmental vandalism, by land developers and businesses, means options 2 – 4 are bad for natural environment sustainability and options 2 – 4 are beneficial to self interests of businesses, profiting, foolish pursuits of jobs creation in north-west Bridgnorth.

Five policy options of new homes and five policy options of employment land, 25 potentialities and possibilities of the SAMDev (Issues and Options; Preferred Options; Revised July 2013):

1. Potential/possibility option 1 500 homes – option 1 'do minimum' extra employment land.
2. Potential/possibility option 1 500 homes – option 2 'do modest' extra employment land.
3. Potential/possibility option 1 500 homes – option 3 'do moderate plus' extra employment land.
4. Potential/possibility option 1 500 homes – option 4 'do maximum' extra employment land.
5. Potential/possibility option 1 500 homes – option 5 'do nothing' no extra employment land.
6. Potential/possibility option 2 700 homes – option 1 'do minimum' extra employment land.
7. Potential/possibility option 2 700 homes – option 2 'do modest' extra employment land.
8. Potential/possibility option 2 700 homes – option 3 'do moderate plus' extra employment land.
9. Potential/possibility option 2 700 homes – option 4 'do maximum' extra employment land.
10. potential/possibility option 2 700 homes – option 5 'do nothing' extra employment land.
11. Potential/possibility option 3 800 homes – option 1 'do minimum' extra employment land.
12. Potential/possibility option 3 800 homes – option 2 'do modest' extra employment land.
13. Potential/possibility option 3 800 homes – option 3 'do moderate plus' extra employment land.
14. Potential/possibility option 3 800 homes – option 4 'do maximum' extra employment land.
15. Potential/possibility option 3 800 homes – option 5 'do nothing' zero extra employment land.
16. Potential/possibility option 4 1000 homes – option 1 'do minimum' extra employment land.
17. Potential/possibility option 4 1000 homes – option 2 'do modest' extra employment land.
18. Potential/possibility option 4 1000 homes – option 3 'do moderate plus' extra employment land.
19. Potential/possibility option 4 1000 homes – option 4 'do maximum' extra employment land.
20. Potential/possibility option 4 1000 homes – option 5 'do nothing' zero extra employment land.
21. Potential/possibility option 5 0 homes – option 1 'do minimum' extra employment land.
22. Potential/possibility option 5 0 homes – option 2 'do modest' extra employment land.
23. Potential/possibility option 5 0 homes – option 3 'do moderate plus' extra employment land.
24. Potential/possibility option 5 0 homes – option 4 'do maximum' extra employment land.
25. Potential/possibility option 5 0 homes – option 5 'do nothing' zero extra employment land.

The SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): S3 (Bridgnorth) policy S3.1 para 2 “Around 1,400 homes and around 19 hectares of employment land will be delivered in Bridgnorth on a mix of windfall and allocated sites”, this sentence indicates Shropshire Council preference Option is possibility number 19 (option 4 1000 homes – option 4 'do maximum' extra employment land) for Bridgnorth is deeply alarming and damaging to Bridgnorth north-west Area, local ecosystems and local biodiversity, local biocentric environments, very unsound. Shropshire Council councillors' have not genuinely listened to, their own citizens' and councillors are emphasising foolish HM coalition Government, business community, than actually thinking about local community and nature.

The inclusion of 5th options ('do zero extra new homes' & 'do nothing' zero extra employment land) in both new homes options and extra employment land options equals 25 possibilities, is more a truer and correct view, proper considerations of the issue. Compared to 16 possibilities only has

four options, and exclusion of 5th options ('do zero extra new homes' & 'do nothing' zero extra employment land), makes the current 16 possibilities and four policy options for general public to consider, is misleading and not true representation of all options available to consultees', local communities.

The Shropshire Council councillors', Bridgnorth Town Council councillors, Tasley Parish Council councillors irresponsibility of ignoring environmental consequences of both national policy and Local Plans', it seems that Councillors are practising same bad habits, like MPs in HM Government.

These Shropshire Council policy options do, have costs to immediate and future generations of both humans and non-humans in a biocentric world, of Bridgnorth and every town, village across Shropshire. All policy options have consequences, which national policy is ignorant of and Whitehall live in a fantasy land, disconnected from daily reality of ordinary citizens' and local constituencies. Shropshire local communities residents are casualties of flawed national policy, likewise all counties across England will experience same problems, arising from deeply wrong and flawed national policy.

Building more new homes and new businesses, is not adaption to climate change!

To build new homes in Bridgnorth (from 300 – 50 homes “minimum” up to 1000 homes “maximum”) does costs to immediate natural environments, ecosystems, biodiversity, biology. Loss of fields to capture CO2 emissions and loss of fields, to provide resources to animals and inserts, etc., to survive and reproduce, as well also loss of fields does damage food web locality. The construction nor laying foundations of a building, ruins field soil ability to capture water and store water in water table, as well also interferes in water cycle, carbon cycle and interferes in ecological community of organism, microorganism, plants, inserts, flowers, so forth, and; laying of new roads create ecological damage to immediate Area of the local ecosystems.

Building new homes, supplying new homes won't mitigate risks of climate change or won't mitigate energy waste risks of making new homes and businesses units', but building new homes and businesses will increase rate of climate change. Less land available, to do ecosystems functions is less land to mitigate climate change, so Shropshire Council Core Strategy & SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) are mirroring same flawed mentality of national policy.

Permanent structures, like a house, a business unit in the Business Park or Industrial Park, do damage the natural environments and stops natural growth. Even, my Estate of were I live, was once a field attached to a greater field called “Crown Meadow” and I am conscientious of were, I am living was a once a field. People who buy new homes for freeholding and/or for leaseholding are ignorant of local ecosystems, biodiversity, geography of there area and people, live in ignorance of nature around them. People consumed by distractions, e.g., education, family, debts, mortgages, loans, seeking employment, once employment, money, holidays, self, materialism, they are ignorant of what really matters. While, education, family, debts, mortgages, loans, seeking employment, once employment, money, holidays, self, materialism are expandable, impermanent, compared to lasting peace, quietness, happiness and good health, good natural environments to live in, enjoy natural environments growing up.

Chapter IV Rationale test

Bottom-top soundness test: “SAMDeve Plan (and National Planning Policy Framework) consistent with rationality?”

Economic sense of SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft, is nonsense, contrary to nature's environments

sense is sense, why policy nor policies, strategies, repeat same flaws? The Crown, HM Governments, United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty, Shropshire Council and Bridgnorth Town Council do, repeat same mistakes and same irrationality, this irrationality is called “supporting businesses and economic growth”.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), SAMDeve Plan may appear rational to uneducated majority in employment, but LDF documents and NPPF are bias towards economic role of NPPF and since, economics and labour market, markets, careers, profiting, are most irrational behaviour humans do.

There is no evidence of National Planning Policy Framework in, the Localism Act 2011 and the NPPF is not statutory yet its not illegal, seems irrational and no reasonable grounds to have a National Planning Policy Framework nor SAMDeve Plans, UK economy.

The Bridgnorth north-west (and SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b) is a microcosm of the rest of, the SAMDeve Plan and Shropshire macrocosms, why? Bridgnorth north-west high lights, irrationality of economics role of NPPF bias and with all evidence available to read, to study, to question and to decide – is this SAMDeve Plan beneficial to Shropshire and Bridgnorth? Having Green Belt lands and fields, to capture carbon is rational verse planning proposals under SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 Bridgnorth (S3.1a (BRID001/BRID020b, BRID020a), (S3.1b (ELR011/a, ELR011/b), those sites won't capture carbon or won't reduce CO2 emissions, won't be environmentally beneficial, so are irrationality.

Neither the National Planning Policy Framework or SAMDeve Plan, Core Strategy, have addressed reducing environmental impacts of insanity enterprise capitalism and free market economy, enterprises. Both the NPPF and the SAMDeve Plan, Core Strategy are illogical, irrational, they fail to consider consequences to natural environments, local communities of each locality, across Shropshire and across United Kingdom.

The NPPF and this SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): Policy C3 (S3.1b (W039) are presumed in favour for sustainable development but, (W039) 16/03/2014 I notice Travellers and Gypsies settled on (W039), here is poetic justice! Employment land (W039) is not being used, for its intended use for years and published under SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), so the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is misleading and false impressions to Planning Inspectorate. (W039) is not being used for Employment land, its good to see it being used by Travellers and Gypsies.

The Travellers and Gypsies may make better use, of (W039) for Gypsies settlement purpose, compared to Shropshire Council and Bridgnorth Town Council, local industrial stakeholders have done nothing to make use of that land. Praise to Gypsies community making use of unused land.

Chapter V Ethics test

Section I General ethics

1 Ethical Questions:

The wrongness of National Planning Policy Framework economic role bias, verse the rightness of preserving Shropshire Green Belts, natural environments?

What has credibility, the short termism of adapted SAMDeve Final Plan and selfish greed, profiting

or long termism of enhancing Green Belts lands, constraints upon developers and Local Governments, for future generations enjoyment of Green Belts lands?

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has a conflict of interests, bias at its core, one economic role bias over environmental role and social role of policy making and; two, environmental role is neglected by Local Governments and Councillors, makes Local Governments and HM Governments irresponsible towards future generations of UK citizens', enjoyment of Green Belts and nature. NPPF is itself, incompatible with ethics. Who will remedy ills of National Planning Policy Framework and ills of selfishness, within enterprise capitalism and free market economy?

NPPF Social role e.g., community spirit, mutual respect, trust, friendship, are undermined by self interests of NPPF economic role and employment ruins workers' lives, health, in turn NPPF environmental role is ignored, neglected, by selfishness of landlords, land developers, employers' and economists, policy makers, law makers, who will remedy ills of National Planning Policy Framework conflicts of interests?

National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011: B4 (Natural and Local Environment/Green Infrastructure/Green Space designation): Risks “One of the risks of the new designation is that it may encourage 'NIMBYism' – local communities attempting to block essential development in their immediate area. . . and which is examined by the inspector, should mitigate this risk”, there are reasonable objections by local communities and residents to 'essential developments' and reasonable objectors are Right, while the Local Government, HM Government, land developers, including the Planning Inspectorate are Wrong, is the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 really transparent and fair, equity?

General ethical questions, so far, neither Shropshire Council Councillors', Bridgnorth Town Council Councillors, Tasley Parish Council Councillors or HM Governments MPs, have not considered or not dared to think of, not dared to answer.

2 Ethical answers:

The wrongness of National Planning Policy Framework economic role bias, verse the rightness of preserving Shropshire Green Belts, natural environments?

Consultees and businesses, Councillors and MPs may think, say NPPF is “right” for economy and for creating jobs, for building new homes is creating jobs, is it really right?

Its a normative ethics point. Creating jobs nor building new homes, are right, such activity avoids taking responsibility by policy makers and employers and thus, hits hard on persons effected, communities effected, as well also environments effected.

Economic wealth creation is not REAL wealth nor financial wealth creation is not REAL wealth, equally land wealth creation is not REAL wealth, because all these are artificial forms of wealth and deceptive, temporary. REAL wealth is happiness, inner peace of minds, contentment and selflessness to others, selflessness community, good health, reasonable good financial wealth and good materialism wealth, zero debts, zero loans, zero mortgages, neither NPPF economic role or employment, can create REAL wealth. The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is nonsensical, has economics itself.

The pursuit of economics is wrong, the economics bias of policy over both social responsibility and environmental responsibility. Policy leads to planning proposals, in turn leads to number of new homes and new Estate form, once formed and is, social consequences, rising from a new Estate. Its

a normative! Policy makers conduct, planning Inspecture conduct, planners and developers conduct, construction firms conduct, eventually new house buyers conduct or new leaseholders conduct, to occupy those new homes, all have a impact on the environment.

The Bridgnorth infrastructure over stretched, rising from new Estate built and new residents, creating more problems on top of existing problems in Bridgnorth has, e.g., anti-social behaviour teenager, hate crime towards LGBT and disabled, fly tipping, air pollution, land pollution, drugs misuse and alcoholism abuse, boredom, limited Youth Services resources, disgraceful minimum wages. Bridgnorth may have a perceived low crime verse relatively medium crime level, for example West Mercia Police do “nothing” to combat, hate crime towards disabled and hate crime towards, LGBT citizens in Shropshire nor Bridgnorth. The West Mercia Police has no credibility, comes to combating hate crime towards LGBT and disabled citizens.

What has credibility, the short termism of adapted SAMDeve Final Plan and selfish greed, profiting or long termism of enhancing Green Belts lands, constraints upon developers and Local Governments, for future generations enjoyment of Green Belts lands?

The economics agurement proposed by Shropshire Council, HM coalition Government would support SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), because it is bias towards economic role of NPPF and Shropshire Council conservative Councillors are dismissive of Bridgnorth residents reasonable objections to whole idea of extra homes, near to Green Belts nor damaging Bridgnorth character. The economic agurement is groundless, like entire enterprise capitalism – free market economy is based on groundless justifications. The economic agurement is not a moral, and economic agurement avoids taking responsibility for consequences upon individuals and communities, natural environments. David Cameron said “its immoral to leave people living on benefits”, equally immoral is the minimum wage nor living wage, don't keep up with inflation, means employees are worst off under Contract of employment to any employer. Economic agurement has no credibility! Building new homes (BRID001, BRID020a/020b) may create localised economic growth but, its short termism and connected jobs creation of it, be deceptive has employment itself. The (BRID001, 020a/020b) will be less fields to capture CO2, is deeply wrong and deeply unsound.

The “long termism of enhancing Green Belts lands, constraints upon developers and Local Governments, for future generations enjoyment of Green Belts lands”, is rational and protects Green Belts for future generations of Bridgnorth Area residents and may be enlarge, the Green Belts land, plate new forests instead of building new homes on north-west Bridgnorth. The (ELR011a/011b) further damages ecosystem, reducing the number of fields to capture CO2 and economics makes no sense, the foolish fixation on UK economy recovery is a delusional, as well also irresponsible and; policy makers, law makers, planners, land developers and housing market, businesses are all responsible for ruining Shropshire and Bridgnorth ecosystems, natural environments. I am not a Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY)! Reasonable and “minimum” new homes in north-west Bridgnorth, abolish (ELR011a/011b) and I support new forests nor Wind farm, or both, however keep businesses out of it. The private sectors have already ruined Bridgnorth in my life time, growing up in Bridgnorth and businesses, don't do anything is responsible to Bridgnorth, some businesses have contempt for Bridgnorth residents' customers. There are a few genuie responsible businesses in Bridgnorth, while the rest of businesses, I have a healthy cynicism and skepticism. In the end, e.g., a field first, then a field is built on to establish homes nor businesses for how many years? Then, the homes nor businesses units', fall in to decline and disuse, is three, next the buildings and units eventually become ruins, gradually overgrown by nature again is four. Thus, returned back to a forest nor a field again. All houses, all shops, all towns and all cities, will eventually cease and reclaimed by nature again. The entropy principle applies to all phenomenon, from building to food, bodies, even UK economy and innumerable businesses, are not

immune from entropy principle.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has a conflict of interests, bias at its core, one economic role bias over environmental role and social role of policy making and; two, environmental role is neglected by Local Governments and Councillors, makes Local Governments and HM Governments irresponsible towards future generations of UK citizens', enjoyment of Green Belts and nature. NPPF is itself, incompatible with ethics. Who will remedy ills of National Planning Policy Framework and ills of selfishness, within enterprise capitalism and free market economy?

The NPPF is incompatible with both social aspect and environmental aspects, because the NPPF is bias towards economics is a anthropocentric (human-centred) generally, specifically self interests of Shropshire Council conservative Councillors', land developers, housing industry and marketers, businesses, HM coalition Government. Self interests is the enemy to social responsibility.

The National Planning Policy Framework is itself incompatible with ethics and deeply flawed, bias towards economics.

Economics, entrepreneurs, enterprise capitalism are manifestations of selfishness and self serving employers', self serving politicians, self serving businesses, self serving policy makers, are all contrary and incompatible with selflessness, harmony with nature.

The SAMDeve LDF Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is an anthropocentric plan, humans self centred with environmental consequences to Bridgnorth Area and wider Shropshire, all because of irresponsibility of policy makers, decision makers and law makers, economists, businesses.

NPPF Social role e.g., community spirit, mutual respect, trust, friendship, are undermined by self interests of NPPF economic role and employment ruins workers' lives, health, in turn NPPF environmental role is ignored, neglected, by selfishness of landlords, land developers, employers' and economists, policy makers, law makers, who will remedy ills of National Planning Policy Framework conflicts of interests?

United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty MPs are “not man enough”, to be genuinely responsible to their constituencies citizens and natural environments'. Meanwhile, Councillors' in Bridgnorth Town Council, Tasley Parish Council nor Shropshire Council, are not genuine to their own Wards citizens. Both Ministers of the Crown, MPs and Councillors continually emphasising private sectors, businesses community is unsound behaviour, since constituencies citizens have not elected any business person.

It's wrong, for the Crown, HM Governments MPs, Local Governments Councillors emphasising self interests of business community, since businesses damage local environments and global environments.

Neither the HM Government, United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty or the Shropshire Council conservative Councillors', Bridgnorth Town Council, Tasley Parish Council are responsible to their own communities, and all appropriate authorities are in de facto inappropriate authorities towards nature.

National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011: B4 (Natural and Local Environment/Green Infrastructure/Green Space designation): Risks “One of the risks of the new designation is that it may encourage 'NIMBYism' – local communities attempting to block essential development in their immediate area. . . and which is examined by the inspector, should mitigate

this risk”, there are reasonable objections by local communities and residents to 'essential developments' and reasonable objectors are Right, while the Local Government, HM Government, land developers, including the Planning Inspectorate are Wrong, is the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 really transparent and fair, equity?

The National Planning Policy Framework is already refutable, deeply unsound and now, the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 is in reasonable doubts, because of the National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011: B4 (Natural and Local Environment/Green Infrastructure/Green Space designation): Risks “One of the risks of the new designation is that it may encourage 'NIMBYism' – local communities attempting to block essential development in their immediate area. . . and which is examined by the inspector, should mitigate this risk”, it violates Administrative Law principle of equity (“hearing both sides of a issue”) and the Planning Inspectors are procedurally, intentionally ignoring or dismissive of, local communities legitimate concerns and Planning Inspectors act of risk mitigating local communities objectors, means the Planning process and public consultation is in doubt.

Yes, there is transparency in British democracy and local democracy and yet, 'fairness' and 'equity' of this process is in doubt. The equity is in doubt on both ethical grounds and legal grounds, because the Planning Inspectors are ignoring local communities legitimate concerns and reasonable objections to Local Government essential developments of a part of the area/county. The Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, has lost any credibility on equity and fairness, from its indirect influence of National Planning Policy Framework and bias towards economics over natural environments, local communities. Both Acts and Regulations, national policy are in reasonable doubts, questionable legality of them, as well also bias towards economics of national policy makes entire national policy, regulations and legislations deeply wrong, unsound!

Section II Specific ethics

1 Biocentric ethics:

Humans species is not a superior over Nature, thus Bible: Genesis: 2 (26) “Let us make man in our image, after his kind: and let them have dominion over the fish . . .” and the Judeo-Christianity, Islam scriptures are contrary to Nature's laws of biology, physics, ecology, Quantum physics, so forth.

The Earth is called “Geo-” (science community), “Gala” (Greeks), “Demeter” (Greeks), Juno (Latin), “Di” (Chinese), “Dema” (Tibetan), “Matris” (Sanskrit), Matres/Matronae (Celtic).

Humans are members' of Earth's community and humans, are immature children. Judeo-Christianity has ruined Mother Earth, enterprise capitalism and free market economy continually ruins Mother Earth, HM (Labour, Conservative, Coalition) Governments continually to ruin Mother Earth. Briton's earth and Shropshire's ecosystems should not be, ruined, vandalised, desecrated by Christians, land developers, land planners, Local Governments, Estate agencies, HM Governments nor businesses. The HM coalition Government HM Treasury Budget 2014: para 1.139 – 151, figure 1.1 Implementation of the government's growth commitments – planning, clearly high lights wrong values of UK governments', environmental vandalism for short termism fantasy economic growth and this, SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is in context of this irrational, nonsensical, unfair, unjustified, unreasonable HM Treasury Budget 2014.

1. *Irrational* on what grounds? Economics is a irrational behaviour, self interests is very much irrational. National Planning Policy Framework is a product, of corruptible nature of economics. Economics corrupts law making and policy making.
2. *Nonsensical* on what grounds? The entire thing, the UK economy and HM coalition

Government foolish, childish fixation on emphasising business community, deeply wrong and selfishness of governments, businesses comes first before, social responsibility to others, acts of selflessness and environmental responsibility to Nature.

3. *Unfair* on what grounds? Entirely unfair to, benefits claimants, i.e., disabled and carers, single parents.
4. *Unjustified* on what grounds? Entire Budget 2014 is bias towards, businesses and self interests of the business community, thus environmental vandalism with planning approvals up under this bias HM coalition Government. National Planning Policy Framework is part of insanity of enterprise capitalism – free market economy.
5. *Unreasonable* on what grounds? Its unreasonable, no reasonable person will let vulnerable disabled, elderly, mentally ill and women, in society to suffer, under a unjust and unfair, disproportionate Welfare cap combine with unreasonable, unlawful Universal Credit. The welfare cap hits, the vulnerable people are suffering, while same budget endorses new households in to further debts, like **Help to buy: equity schemes** and same budget endorses irresponsibility towards natural environments, of the planning reforms.

Humans are members, guests of Earth and so far, humans activities by businesses and governments are inappropriate, disgrace to Earth. Humans have polluted space atmosphere, land, sea, soil, air, and humans communities, so irresponsible. Local Governments, businesses, local communities and HM Governments should not think or presume, Earth is for humans only as a “commodity” but, humans existence is temporary, likewise humans society and innumerable governments, states, nations, countries, labour markets, careers, jobs, businesses, employment are simply follies and fantasies of immature humans.

Nature's supremacy over us all, Nature's jurisdiction:

1. No Crown – His/Her Majesty beside Nature.
2. No Crown supremacy over ecclesiastic as well as civil, in turn is no sacredness and no profane beside Nature.
3. No Christianity, including no Church of England and no Judaism, no Islam beside Nature.
4. No United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty beside Nature.
5. No HM Governments' beside Nature.
6. No Bills, no Acts, no Regulations, no Writs, no Statutory Instruments, no Orders, no Courts, no beside Nature.
7. No United Kingdom territorial space/air/land/seas, no United Kingdom borders beside Nature.
8. No England, no Scotland, no Wales, no Ireland beside Nature.
9. No West Mercia, no Shropshire beside Nature.
10. No Shropshire Council, no Tasley Parish Council, no Bridgnorth Town Council beside Nature.
11. No Bridgnorth Area, no Tasley Area, no Bridgnorth and no Tasley beside Nature.

The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is not addressing Shropshire Council commitments to **climate neutral** or Shropshire Council, housing markets, businesses, Town and Parish Councils' not demonstrated commitments to climate neutral. Also, building new houses (BRID001, 020a/020b) and Business parks (ELR011a/11b) does create **Greenhouse gases** emissions and establishing building sites, transporting materials, as well also building new homes and new businesses units will create Greenhouse gases emissions as a result of surveying, construction, promoting and buying, using. Nor plating few trees in BRID020a/020b, won't probably **carbon offset**, the destruction of Greenfields and the Greenfields, were carbon capturing in Bridgnorth Area. The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) has not **mitigated** reduction of CO2 emissions of the potential/actual construction of both BRID001, 020a/020b and ELR011a/011b.

Is the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) compatible with biocentric ethics test?

- Rule 1: *non-harm to any non-human nor human environment*. Yes, harms. Because BRID020a, BRID020b, BRID001 will harm and damage locus ecosystems, as well also damage biodiversity in the immediate and future of Bridgnorth Area. Damage Bridgnorth Area capacity, ability to reduce CO2 emission and capture CO2.
- Rule 2: *non-interference*, no interference in natural environmental. Yes, interference in nature's environments. Shropshire Council SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) with co-offendents namely Bridgnorth Town Council, Tasley Parish Council, business community, land lords, Estate owners are interfering in nature's environments, for self interests of profiting and taxation.
- Rule 3: *fidelity*, true and honest, to natural environment and animals, organism. Yes, SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is unfaithful to nature. Neither the Local Governments or businesses, farmers are being fidelity towards Shropshire's nature and Bridgnorth Area.
- Rule 4: *restitutive justice*, restore balance of justice between wrongs actions by agents and subjects are victims or officiators of the agents. "Agents" e.g., Shropshire Council, Bridgnorth Town Council, Tasley Parish Council and land developers, farmer, Estate agents, landlords. "Subjects" are humans Bridgnorth residents, Bridgnorth Area residents and entire nature's locus biodiversity, ecological community of organism/animals, etc., in Bridgnorth Area. The Shropshire wild life, natural environments across Shropshire and Bridgnorth are the victims of SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) and also, BRID001, BRID020a/20b, ELR011a/011b will substantially reduce Shropshire's ecosystem ability to reduce CO2 emission and capture CO2, via fields. Shropshire Council failing to reduce CO2 emission, especially the Shropshire Council conservative Councillors failure to be responsible authority towards Shropshire's natural environments and Shropshire residents.

The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is declared incompatible with biocentric ethics test.

2 Normative ethics: consequentialist ethics test:

Is the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) compatible with consequentialism ethics test?

1. Is the *intention* beneficial? The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is superficially beneficial, like Shropshire and Bridgnorth economy but, its not actually beneficial to local existing communities and locus nature's environments. The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is not beneficial, to either nature's environments or local communities, and towns effected by it.
2. Is the *action* beneficial? Its neither beneficial to nature's environments or beneficial to Shropshire communities, Bridgnorth community.
3. Is the *consequences* of the (SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)), beneficial or destructive? BRID001, 020a/020b, ELR011a/011b will create pollution, by construction of those buildings (homes) and units (businesses), as well also fields ability to capture CO2 emission be disabled by man made buildings, infrastructures, etc., and road pollution, sound pollution, environmental vandalism by land developers. The loss of five fields to land developments, like BRID001, 020a/020b, ELR011a/011b is deeply unsound. The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) has not offered any alternatives, to replace loss fields nor loss locality ecosystems, loss biodiversity in those five fields.

The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is declared incompatible with consequentialism ethics test.

3 Anthropocentric ethics test:

The anthropocentric position, is human-centred, self centred, like UK economy, careers, jobs, employment, seeking employment, profiting, taxation, are examples of self centred and self interests.

Mankind's seen has a superior animal on Earth and mankind's irresponsibility, destructive actions towards nature's environments and biodiversity, ecosystems across the world. Mankind has superior animal over other species and mankind regards nature's environments has a resource, to vandalised for profiting and marketing of products, minerals.

All products, like handbags, cloths, watches, etc., are made from nature's elements to make products, but foolish humans put a value on different elements and products, to profit by in a insane attitude called “enterprise capitalism”, “free market economy”, even consumerism is part of insanity of capitalism. Both employers, shops retailers', businesses and customers, do neglect to know were there food came from or were diamonds came from, or were bricks came from or were pork came from. Ignorance is enterprise capitalism normality, profiting off people ignorance and insecurities.

Is the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) compatible with anthropocentric ethics?

1. *Pollution?* e.g., BRID001, 020a/020b, ELR011a/011b will create pollution in process of laying foundations for homes, units, so forth and pollution to immediate surroundings. Economic agurement of the National Planning Policy Framework and SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) are source of problems, for immediate and future damage to, Shropshire and Bridgnorth (Area) landscape, ecosystems, biodiversity
2. *Conservation?* The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) has put no conservation plans in to place, for loss of fields and lands for misguided land management developments in turn for flawed economics. Better to have new Green Belts, expansions of Green Belts, however worst option is economic decision, plans, policies for SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan). The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) fails at conservation requirement.
3. *Preservation?* The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) fails at preservation requirement. Failure of not conserving natural environments under this, SAMDeve LDF document and economic bias of the SAMDeve LDF document is undermining policy MD6 (Green Belts) as well also, the SAMDeve LDF document has failed at conservation requirement.
4. *Population (growth)?* The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) will address and establish new homes, for Shropshire humans population growth 2010 – 2026. There are limited natural resources, environments on Earth and in Shropshire, its some what inappropriate to establish this SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan). Hypothetically there is a humans population growth 2010 – 2026, in that period and neither the Shropshire Council (adopted) Core Strategy 2010 – 2026 or this SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) has not address, the conservation and preservations, expansions of Green Belts, ecosystems for both immediate 2014 and future generations of residents in Shropshire.

The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is declared 50% compatible with anthropocentric ethics. Because, the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) will create environmental pollution and will cater for population growth, but fails at conservations of effected ecosystems and fails at preservations of effected ecosystems, so this SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is unsound and environmentally unethical.

Section III Conservation ethics test

The “conservation” of the world, Briton landscape and Shropshire ecosystems.

1 CAT conservation ethics:

The CAT (Centre for Alternative Technology) educational motto: Reduce, Reuse, Recycle and Conserve. I learnt CAT Reduce, Reuse, Recycle and Conserve on a BTEC Human Sciences (Human studies) field trip in Wales, in my college years, a long time ago. I apply Reduce, Reuse, Recycle and Conserve criterias to SAMDeve Plan:

1. Is the Shropshire Council – SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *reducing* CO2 emissions and waste, in Shropshire and Bridgnorth Area? MD8 – Infrastructure Provisions: 4 (I – III), 4.73 are positive signs of reducing Shropshire and Bridgnorth Area CO2 emissions, but Bridgnorth community objected to Wind Turbine farm is sad. I supported idea of Wind Turbine farm in Bridgnorth Area, it should be built. Better to have Wind Turbine farm and not 500 – 1500 new houses built in (BRID001, 020a/020b).
2. Is the Shropshire Council – SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *reusing* existing sites? BRID001, 020a/020b, ELR011a/011b are current, existing sites. BRID001, 020a/020b, ELR011a/011b, they are currently fields capturing CO2 and functioning has ecosystems, biodiversity. The empty houses and empty shops in Shropshire, are not being reused, why? There are empty shops in Bridgnorth, not being reused equally too, empty shops in Shrewsbury and seems, the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) has overlooked or neglected to considered, to reusing empty houses and empty shops currently, would save Bridgnorth Area Green Belt lands.
3. Is the Shropshire Council – SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *recycling*?
4. Is the Shropshire Council – SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *conserving* Shropshire ecosystems and Bridgnorth Area ecosystems, Green Belts lands? The BRID001, 020a/020b, ELR011a/011b has not integrated any conservation policy or conservation of natural environments, be effected by economic vandalism of Nature's ecosystems for short termism of economic and commercial whims, flawed national planning policy framework.

The Shropshire Council – SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is declared incompatible with CAT conservation ethics.

2 Leopold's Land ethics:

Is the Shropshire Council SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) compatible with land ethics.

1. *Co-operation* between humans and non-humans? The stakeholders are humans species and all other species in Shropshire, Bridgnorth Area, but the Shropshire Council SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) has failed to consider interests of other species, be effected by economic vandalism of Shropshire's ecosystems and Bridgnorth north-west ecosystems, biodiversity.
2. *Community* of nature? The Shropshire community is presumed to mean, humans community of humans, but in land ethics, the community is of both humans and non-humans (soil, organism, microorganism, animals, plants, birds, so forth) has a Biocentric community. The Shropshire Council has only considered, implemented, demonstrated this SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) in interests of one, humans species and two, economics bias over natural environments and local communities. The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is inconsiderate of other species and animals, in Shropshire and Bridgnorth Area.
3. *Ecological conscience*? The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): MD 6 – Green Belt, did failed to mention or include Bridgnorth in MD 6 – Green Belt policy. The MD 6 (Green Belt) policy is bias towards economic uses of Green belts, is incompatible with a

- ecological conscience and economics truly corrupts policy making, policy makers. The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) fails at, establishing a reasonable and balanced harmony between humans short termism whims and nature's long termism sustainability.
4. *Food web and ecosystem considerations?* The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) generally and the BRID001, 020a/020b and ELR011a/011b specifically, have failed to consider consequences to Shropshire-wide and locality food web, ecosystems. Two or three less fields, to provide a ecological functions to local biodiversity, food web, all because of self interests of economists and Councillors', MPs, Ministers of the Crown, is a disservice to local communities across Shropshire and Bridgnorth, as well also disservice to local wildlife in Shropshire and Bridgnorth. The BRID001, 020a/020b and ELR011a/011b come under Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 40 PCA Act 2004: ss. 61A (3b – c), 107 (1) Land Compensation Act 1973: ss. 33B (2b), 8, 33C (3), 33C (8) and probable be 33J (1a or b) or; the land owner gives, the land to Shropshire Council or the land owner offers to sell, the land to Shropshire or, the Shropshire Council procure for public purposes. Any environmental damage arises, from Shropshire Council, Estate Agents, and landlords, businesses to BRID001, 020a/020b and ELR011a/011b
 5. *Substitutes for land ethics?* Legal obligations upon Local Governments and Estates, landlords to adhere 'to have regard to' ethical considerations of land ethics, e.g., Local Government Act 2000: ss. 2 (1c) “the promotion of environmental well-being of their area”, Sustainable Communities Act 2007: ss. 1 (2) “In this Act references to promoting the sustainability of local communities, in relation to a local authority, references to encouraging the improvement of economic, social or environmental well-being of the authority's area, or part of the area”
 6. *Land health considerations?* Land health i.e., Group 1 – land has commodity-production verse Group 2 – land has a biota/biocentric. The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is bias towards Group 1, humans regard lands has a commodity-production profiting is inconsiderate of Group 2, is entire Shropshire ecosystems and biocentric, biodiversity of all species reside in Shropshire.

Even, the National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011: B3 (Green Belt): **Costs** “Possible small-scale loss of Green Belt”, B4 (Natural and Local Environment/Green Infrastructure/Green Space designation): **Risks** “One of the risks of the new designation is that it may encourage 'NIMBYism' – local communities attempting to block essential development in their immediate area. . . and which is examined by the inspector, should mitigate this risk”, this NPPF Impact Assessment high lights incompatibility of national policy with nature and local ecology, localities.

- National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011: B3 (Green Belt): **Costs** “Possible small-scale loss of Green Belt” is an admission of guilt by HM coalition Government, there be loss of Green Belts and Green infrastructures in pursuit of UK economic recovery, is deeply irresponsible and fundamentally unsound.
- National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011: B4 (Natural and Local Environment/Green Infrastructure/Green Space designation): **Risks** “One of the risks of the new designation is that it may encourage 'NIMBYism' – local communities attempting to block essential development in their immediate area. . . and which is examined by the inspector, should mitigate this risk” means, the Planning Inspectorate are cooperating, conforming with HM Government and Local Governments' acting against, local natural environments and local communities. The Planning Inspectorate impartiality is in doubt, by “the inspector, should mitigate this risk”. Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans may have no credibility or no merit, no genuineness, no beneficial benefits to local communities, so local communities and residents are justifiably object to, unsound Local Plans/Neighbourhood Plans, Local Governments' Plans. What essential development? Is it really essential? Economics is not essential. Economics corrupts national policy and local

policy. Neither BRID001, 020a/020b or ELR011a/011b are essential.

I am not a NIMBY resident, I consider SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) impact on Shropshire natural environments generally and Bridgnorth Area natural environments specifically.

I do support Wind Turbine farms, renewable energy, biomass in Shropshire but, I continually object to economics tainting Local Governments Plans and local communities natural environments.

The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) and National Planning Policy Framework are declared incompatible with Land Ethics.

3 A Cultural Strategy for Shropshire and Telford: 8.2 (Aim) Think Green, Live Green, (Strategy) Develop environmental citizenship:

A Cultural Strategy for Shropshire and Telford:

- *SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) compatible with 8.2 (Aim) Think Green, Live Green?* No. The Shropshire Council is contradicting this, Cultural Strategy for Shropshire (and Telford), as well also contradicting Shropshire Community Strategy 2010 – 2020: Priority 2 (natural environment) comes to, Bridgnorth Area north-west. SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is more Think Economics, Live Greed is opposite to, Think Green, Live Green.
- SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) compatible with 8.2 (Strategy) Develop environmental citizenship “Changing the definition of conservation from being something happens to green spaces at one-step removed from daily life, to something that embraces all parts of our life and starts in our own back yard”, its encouraging to Think Green, Live Green and Support local conservation right NOW! However, in the light of National Planning Policy Framework – Impact Assessment 2011: B4 (Natural and Local Environment/Green Infrastructure/Green Space designation): Risks “One of the risks of the new designation is that it may encourage 'NIMBYism' – local communities attempting to block essential development in their immediate area. . . and which is examined by the inspector, should mitigate this risk”, the Planning Inspectors and Local Governments are ignoring grass roots conservation, grass roots concerns of any planning proposals and LDF, means the Planning process is tainted, corrupted by economics bias over environmental responsibility. Shropshire Council – SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is in direct conflict, with Cultural Strategy: 8.2 (Strategy).

The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is declared incompatible with Cultural Strategy for Shropshire and Telford: 8.2 (Aim) Think Green, Live Green, (Strategy) Develop environmental citizenship.

Chapter VI Environmental test

Section I Considerations of IPCC Climate Change report (2014)

I have taken account of IPCC Climate Change report (2014) in to my considerations, of the Shropshire Council – SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan). Its relevant to Shropshire and Bridgnorth Area, while councillors' want to put there heads in the sand.

The Europe region temperature will continue increase *very likely*, will effect UK generally and effect Shropshire – Bridgnorth as well also, building new homes and new employment lands across Shropshire and; north-west Bridgnorth building new homes and new employment lands won't lesson rising temperature and won't reduce CO2 emission of businesses cars, private households

cars. Source Chapter 14 of IPCC report.

The temperature rise 0.3C – 1.8C across N-NE Europe and increase of warm days – nights *likely* continue and yet, decrease of cold days – nights *likely* continue, so existing homes of Bridgnorth and Shropshire MUST ADAPT to temperature increases in near-term, future of Shropshire. New homes in Shropshire and Bridgnorth must be designed differently, for the increase temperature of days – nights. My house, I live in is reasonably appropriate adaptable, to the warm days – nights and yet, its warm in cold days – nights, but other houses in Bridgnorth are not properly adaptable to near-term temperature increases nor Bridgnorth has a lot of historic buildings, built for a cold days – nights. Source Chapter 11 of IPCC report.

Oh yes, SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) planning policy options 1 (500) homes, 2 (700) homes, 3 (800) homes and 4 (1000) homes will have lasting damaging consequences upon Shropshire, north-west Bridgnorth water cycle interconnected to greenhouse effects. However, the SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan): S3 (Bridgnorth) policy S3.1 para 2 “Around 1,400 homes and around 19 hectares of employment land will be delivered in Bridgnorth on a mix of windfall and allocated sites” means what? Shropshire Council preferred option is Option 4: 'do maximum' 1000 homes and Option 4: 'do maximum' extra employment land. Shropshire Council has made a wrong choice, with a wrong choice comes consequences to Shropshire environments generally and effecting Bridgnorth north-west Area local ecosystems. The S3 Bridgnorth Development Strategy is contrary to, reasonable and soundness, as well also contrary to environmental citizenship responsibility. The Shropshire Council – Bridgnorth Development Strategy 1400 new homes and 19 hectares wasted on employment land, will change nor interference in land surface and ability of functioning water cycle, *very likely* changes to water cycle ability to do its job. Source Chapters 8, 11 of IPCC report. Shropshire residents and Bridgnorth residents, may experience problems of water supply and changes in water cycle patterns, because of unnecessary 1400 new homes built in north-west Bridgnorth and wider consequences of SAMDev Final Plan 2014, upon Shropshire ecology and Bridgnorth Area local biocentric, local ecosystems, water cycle. Bridgnorth Area local ecosystem and local climate gets ruined in near-term future, immediate future and long term future by this LDF SAMDev Final Plan, I hold Tasley Parish Council, Bridgnorth Town Council, Shropshire Council councillors' and HM coalition Government MPs accountable for ruining Shropshire, Bridgnorth natural environments for sake of short termism economic growth and political gains.

The SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) tested against IPCC Climate Change Assessment:

1. SAMDev Draft (Final Plan): MD1 – Scale and Distribution of Development. **Hazard:** MD1 policy is a hazard to, Shropshire residents and subtle hazards to Bridgnorth residents, from implementation of policy S3 (Bridgnorth). **Exposure:** MD1 policy, will expose Shropshire residents to *likely* or *very likely* exposure, arising from housing development and substantial loss of ecosystems, Green Belts and nature's ability to sustain Life, Human existence in Shropshire be impaired by SAMDev Draft (Final Plan), e.g., 1400 new homes and 19 hectares of new employment land in Bridgnorth. **Vulnerability:** SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and Core Strategy (Adopted) are exposing Shropshire residents (and Bridgnorth residents) to climate change effects, has a result of new homes and new employment land being built and using up, whatever land is categorise provisional or not in provisional. **Impacts:** the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) will have an environmental impact is *very likely*, e.g., S3 policy and sites of BRID020a/020b and ELR011a/011b. **Risks:** climate change risk is a yes, to Shropshire and Bridgnorth, while the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) has failed to consider environmental impacts nor climate change effects, from building new homes and new employment lands across Shropshire (and Bridgnorth). **Adaptation:** SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) has no adaptation plans or policy, for climate change effects and building new homes, will increase climate change consequences feedback on Shropshire. Shropshire

- Council is making Shropshire itself and Shropshire residents low resilience and high risk to climate change, this SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) is a danger to human life and no policy to prepare citizens' to climate change, no policy in place to encourage local communities to be resilience. **Transformation:** none in place or mentioned in Core Strategy, SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and; no transformation or no adaptation policy, to adapt to climate change risk and the planning issues, are ignorant of climate change and planning permissions, building new homes and employment lands contributing to increase of climate change. **Adaptations:** none in place or mentioned in this SAMDev Draft (Final Plan), Shropshire Council councillors' and Bridgnorth Town Council councillors, Tasley Parish Council councillors have not thought about consequences of this policy and its impacts on local communities ecosystems, as well also lack of preparation, lack of planning and lack of oversight, lack of responsibility to there own citizens' to be prepared and adapt to climate change, etc.
2. SAMDeve Draft (Final Plan): MD6 – Green Belt. **Hazard:** Green Belt generally and the Mid Severn Green Belt, covering Bridgnorth Area is at risk, of SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and Local Plan review, of changing Green Belt boundary to suit flawed economic interests, is contrary to local community interests is protecting Green Belt. Shropshire Council and the HM Government, National Planning Policy Framework are a hazard to Shropshire Green Belts, natural environments. **Exposure:** Green Belt boundary is exposed, to danger from Local Plan review after SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) is once adapted, the change of Green Belt boundary to suit short term economic growth fantasy of councillors'. **Vulnerability:** Green Belt boundary, Green Belt ecosystems, Green Belt biodiversity are exposed to Local Plan review to flawed mentality of economics bias over environmental responsibility. **Impacts:** any essential development near to Green Belt or in Green Belt boundary, is damaging to local ecosystems, etc., and impacts local water cycle of immediate Bridgnorth Area, as well also impacts on immediate and surrounding fields ability to provide food web, biodiversity. The essential development of towns are not essential, put in context of environmental awareness and respect for Nature, living in harmony and in constraints imposed by Nature.
 3. S3 policy – Bridgnorth. Sites of BRID020a/020b and ELR011a/011b. **Hazard:** read above hazards effecting Bridgnorth fields and Green Belts. **Exposure:** read above exposure effecting Bridgnorth and Green Belt. **Vulnerability:** read above vulnerability and exposure to Bridgnorth residents, local community, arising from S3 policy (and Bridgnorth Development Strategy). **Impacts:** immediate impacts, is this SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and near term impacts, be establishing of and construction of BRID020a/020b and ELR011a/011b, together with long term impacts on water cycle, local ecosystems, biodiversity in effected fields of BRID020a/020b and ELR011a/011b. **Risks:** the construction of BRID020a/020b and ELR011a/011b contributes to increase risk of climate change in near future, together with new households and more cars, as well also new employment lands, together with increased road traffic of vans, HGV (Heavy Goods Vehicles) on Bridgnorth roads. Further risks to Bridgnorth residents health, arising from SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) with a over stretched Local Community Hospital and Mental Health Services, etc., has a result of this Plan being adapted and together with increase greenhouse gas emissions of new cars, new households in north-west Bridgnorth will add to exposure of climate change. **Adaptations:** S3 – Bridgnorth Development Strategy is irrelevant, it don't represents any adaptation to climate change policy or sentence, paragraph, and don't equips Bridgnorth residents to be resilient to climate change or to any extreme events, situations. **Transformations:** none. Bridgnorth Town Plan, Bridgnorth Local Plan and Bridgnorth Development Strategy, don't prepare there own citizens' to be resilient to near future and now climate change, future climate change. The Local Governments are a liability to all local communities. Neglectful of environmental responsibility is councillors' standard behaviour and endangering lives of there own citizens', is very irresponsible. **Resilience:** none.

SAMDev Draft (Final Plan): MD1 – Scale and Distribution of Development, MD6 – Green Belt, S3 policy – Bridgnorth. Sites of BRID020a/020b and ELR011a/011b, currently are a Risk to Shropshire residents generally and Bridgnorth community residents.

Shropshire Council has not established any policy or plan, to develop climate change resilient in the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and if Shropshire Council can't cope a flood, or serious glorious winters, what hope Shropshire Council or any Local Council, showing leadership on climate change resilient. Currently no Local Government in Shropshire, including Bridgnorth Town Council, have dared to consider or proposed, think about climate change resilient. A serious lack of leadership at Local Governments level comes to, climate change resilient, protecting ecosystems, encouraging Think Green – Live Green.

IPCC Climate Resilient Pathways Assessment applied to, SAMDev Draft (Final Plan): MD1 – Scale and Distribution of Development.

1. Biophysical stressors.
2. Resilience space.
3. Social stressors.
4. Future outcome.

IPCC Climate Resilient Pathways Assessment applied to, S3 policy – Bridgnorth. Sites of BRID020a/020b and ELR011a/011b.

1. **Biophysical stressors.** BRID020a/020b and ELR011a/011b are biophysical stressors upon, the immediate ecosystems and biodiversity, food webs. From a natural capital (fields, heaches, plants, animals, water cycle, so forth) to *social capital* (construction of new homes) and *manufacture capital* (construction of new business parks), means the *supporting services* e.g., soil can't capture water or CO₂. A loss of three fields 6.3 (BRID001, 020b) hectares + 300 (BRID020a) hectares + 6.7 hectares (ELR011a) + 6.6 hectares (ELR011b) equals 319.6 hectares lost to SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) S3 policy site development. The loss of 319.6 ha, is a biophysical stress on the ecosystems and local biodiversity, impact on natural capital of Bridgnorth. These sites developments will impact, on the Green infrastructures of north-west Bridgnorth and wider Bridgnorth.
2. **Resilience space.** None. Bridgnorth community is totally unprepared for climate change and S3 policy further impairs, Bridgnorth community and Bridgnorth local ecosystems to be resilient, sustainable in ever changing climates of the global – national – regional.
3. **Social stressors.** Extra new homes in Tasley Estate, will have a stressing effects on Local Community NHS Hospital, Community Mental Health Teams, Dentalist Services, Health infrastructures of Bridgnorth Area and Bridgnorth itself, as well also Water and Waste Management infrastructures of Bridgnorth be over stretched. Social infrastructures of Bridgnorth, like Pubs, Bars, etc, be over stretched will a increase population in Bridgnorth and further pressures on primary schools, secondary schools, social services. Potential increase of (perceived crime) and an (actual crime) has a fallout of, new homes comes with new families and new individuals on top of, existing problems in Bridgnorth. Increased youth population in Bridgnorth, arising from expansion of Tasley Estate and increased boredom in youth, over stretched Youth Services with limited funding to support a increase youth and teenager population. With the increased population in Bridgnorth, means the most vulnerable and disabled new citizens' be effected by it, the Day Centre (Shropshire Council – Social Service) has reduced funding, reduced services to disabled people in Bridgnorth as well also, voluntary redundancies of Care Workers and Specialist staff in Bridgnorth Day Centre. So any one, who is disabled or mentally ill moving in expansion Tasley Estate in those new homes, won't have much support by Shropshire Council social services and mental health services are over stretched, from a Decentralised Mental Health

Service policy arising from Department of Health (DH).

4. **Future outcome.** Bridgnorth community is, *low resilience* to climate change and *high risk* exposure to climate change, arising from SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) Policy S3.

The Shropshire Council – LDF Core Strategy and SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) are inadequate, ineffective, useless and inappropriate, fails to meet IPCC Climate Change Assessment & Climate Resilient Pathways Assessment. Means, the National Planning Policy Framework is inadequate, fails to meet IPCC Climate Change Assessment & Climate Resilient Pathways Assessment.

Section II Ecosystem Services Assessment

I have taken account of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA), I have applied it to Bridgnorth north-west Area principally and Shropshire secondary.

Read Annex 1 – Ecosystem Services Assessment Plan.

Section III Ecosystem Services Assessment Summery

I have considered all policy options and consequences, impacts, as well also considered all direct and indirect factors, will impact Bridgnorth citizens' health and livelihoods, wider Shropshire citizens of the policy and SAMDev Draft (Final Plan).

The creeping expansion of Bridgnorth boundary and population size, means a serious loss of local habitats communities, biodiversity species and interfere with food webs/chain of species in Bridgnorth north-west, so forth.

Humans ignorance and selfish greed, flawed policy making, costs the environment and humans will suffer consequences of ill conceived policy and ills of greed, ignorance.

Chapter VII Legality test

The legal compliance test:

- Shropshire *Local Development Scheme*? (Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 15 (1 – 3). The Shropshire Council – LDF, including SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) are under Local Development Scheme, is a yes.
- *Statement of Community Involvement* (SCI)? Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 18 (2, 3). Statement of Community Involvement Adopted version 2011, is a yes.
- Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012?
- *Sustainability Appraisal Report 2010* with SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)? Yes.
- *Shropshire Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 – 2020* with SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)? Yes, Shropshire Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 – 2020: Priority 1 (economics); yes and no, Shropshire Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 – 2020: Priority 2 (natural environment) generally yes and Priority 2 (natural environment) Bridgnorth Area no.
- *Duty of cooperation*? (Localism Act 2011: ss. 110 (1).

The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is declared compatible with legal compliance.

Chapter VIII Reasoning and explanations for 'changes', to make it sound

I applied soundness test, ethical test, rationality test and environmental test, legality test to this SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) and I questioned legitimacy, rationality of national policy.

The national planning policy framework is source of the all problems! The National Planning Policy Framework is generally unsound and its another top-down imposition on local communities, like the National Health Service reforms under the Health and Social Care Act 2010 is a top-down imposition.

The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is generally bias towards NPPF (economic role) over (environmental role) e.g., Bridgnorth Area BRID001, 020a/020b and ELR011a/011b.

To make SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *justified*? Shropshire Council and the Planning Inspectorate must accept local communities reasonable objections to any essential development. The option 1: 'do minimum', is reasonable and minimum damage to Shropshire and Bridgnorth natural environments, as well also keeps Shropshire CO2 emissions down. The Shropshire Council bias towards, a option 2: 'do modest' to option 3: 'do moderate plus' number of new homes 700 – 800, with environmental consequences to the immediate localities and environmental damage to local ecosystems, biodiversity, food webs. The minimum 500 homes e.g., 500 new homes or 300 new homes, or 100 new homes, is minimum will safeguard Bridgnorth north-west ecosystems, biodiversity, food webs and natural environments for future generations of humans and non-humans to enjoy, the environment. I know, Shropshire Council says the minimum new homes is unrealistic, since the Shropshire Council Councillors' don't live close to countryside to probably appreciate it. Unrealistic is a Shropshire Council way of objecting to, safeguarding Shropshire natural environments for future generations and the Shropshire Council is short sighted, only fixation on economics side is deeply unsound. Stop emphasising land developers, businesses, housing markets and Whitehall policy makers, start listening to local communities conservation conscientious citizens'. In my lifetime growing up, in Bridgnorth and I seen, land eaten up by land developers for foolish pursuits of economics and personal gain, ruining my local environments. Still Bridgnorth is facing further ruin, under this SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) and the National Planning Policy Framework. Both the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) and the National Planning Policy Framework are unjustified.

To make SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *effective*? To make SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) effective, both the Whitehall and United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty, HM Government and the Shropshire Council, Bridgnorth Town Council, Tasley Parish Council should accept, all economics, businesses and all economics growth are doom, by entropy principle. Entropy principle is a principle of Nature. Enterprise capitalism free market economy is a doom model, still HM Governments continually bail out banks, private sectors, businesses, saving non-sustainable businesses and markets. Economy goes through boom and bust cycles, only proves economics growth, sustainable growth are false concepts, mere fantasies, only for businesses and UK economy to repeat another cycle of recessions, stagnations, Administration of failing businesses and redundancies notices! Entropy principle is Reality of nature.

The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) wants market towns to be 'sustainable communities', 'sustainable development' such notions. I refuted, 'sustainable communities', 'sustainable development' notions, its contrary to Reality of nature. All phenomenon, including businesses and houses, do gradually cease or quickly cease is called "impermanence", "entropy". e.g., building new homes in north-west Bridgnorth, like all phenomenon, will become disused, neglected, abandoned and like, Council Flats in cities, they gradually fall in to disuse and

abandoned by owners, landlords, taken over by squatters and thus, a building becomes a ruin, eventually over grown, left is no trace of any building or memory of it. In Bridgnorth, I have seen businesses come and go, within one building nor businesses come and go, within a entire street or parts of a street, only proves entropy exists and no amounts of profits, investments, funding, loans, won't save any business or enterprise, company, corporation from ceasing. Both the National Planning Policy Framework and the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) are ineffective.

To make SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *constitent with national policy?* Or I put, *national policy compatible to local community?* The expected norm, is Shropshire Council and local communities, Local Plans, LDF, including SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) conformality to whims of national policy MPs. I have reversed it, the national policy compatible to local community and not a top-down approach is not subjects conforming to whims of the Crown and the Ministers of the Crown, but rather Ministers of the Crown and national policy in harmony with there own local community and constituencies citizens'. The national policy is irrational, flawed, inappropriate and unsound, not appropriate for Shropshire and Bridgnorth, therefore the national policy should be ignored by consultees'. Any consultee, do foolishly incorporate national policy in to his or her considerations of the SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan), has failed to considered consequences of national policy upon local communities and, has not thought outside the box or not questioned national policy. The national policy criteria is irrelevant, for Shropshire and Bridgnorth.

2

The integration of a Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Ecological Impact Assessment of SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan). The proposals of proposed Planning and construction of new homes, new business parks, will have a indirect and direct impact on ecosystems across Shropshire, locally Bridgnorth. Currently, this SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) and other LDF documents, have not included any EIA.

I have taken account of the Town and County Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 and yet, the LDF SAMDeve Draft (Final Plan) don't includes a EIA.

The LDF SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) has not included a Geological – Mineralogy survey of the sites of SAMDev Plan. The Geology and Mineralogy survey information, would inform policy makers and planners, of what grounds are good for living on or dangers to life.

Chapter IX Conclusions

1 Is the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) “sound” or “unsound”? And eventual SAMDeve DPD Final Plan, “sound” or “unsound”?

I am neither a supporter or objector, I follow datum.

Only datum & rationale can prove or disprove the soundness of the LDF SAMDeve Plan DPD.

1A What is my conclusion?

The SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is unsound on specifics, relating to Bridgnorth and Gypsies community needs and the National Planning Planning Framework is unsound on specifics, generally too.

Summery of above:

- SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *justified?* No.
- SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *effective?* No.
- SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *consistent with national policy?* “No”, its incompatible with environmental role. The national policy is unsound and incompatible with Shropshire's natural environments and Bridgnorth Area natural environments.
- SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) *rational?* No. Economic role bias of NPPF and the economic bias of SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft DPD, are irrational compared to, leaving Green Belt lands and natural environments untouched, reducing Shropshire and Bridgnorth South-East Area carbon emission, are rational.

The Green Belts Area/boundary constraints nor expansions safeguards, future generations enjoyment of Green Belts. “Expansions” of Green Belt Area, I support.

What I support or object?

- I support Policies MD 6 (Green Belts), should include Bridgnorth in MD6 and MD 8 (Renewal energy).
- I object Policies S3 (Bridgnorth), MD3 – 4.

2 Is the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) “sound” or “unsound”? And eventual SAMDeve DPD Final Plan, “ethical” or “unethical”?

I applied ethical tests to the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) and; SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is declared incompatible with biocentric ethics test, consequentialism ethics test and 50% compatible with anthropocentric ethics, conservation ethics.

3 And eventual SAMDeve DPD Final Plan, “environmental sound” or environmental unsound”?

I applied environmental tests to the SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) and; SAMDeve Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is declared “environmental unsound”.

4 Requesting to be notified of the following, by email:

- When, the SAMDev Plan has been submitted for independent examination.
- When, the Inspectors Report of the SAMDev Plan is published.
- Adoption of the SAMDev Plan.

Annex 1

Ecosystem Services (Assessment) Plan

contents

Preface	
Chapter I	Observed Ecosystem Services
Chapter II	Drivers of impacts on Ecosystem & Ecosystem Services
Section I	Indirect drivers of impacts on Ecosystem & Ecosystem Services
Section II	Direct drivers of impacts on Ecosystem & Ecosystem Services
Section III	Statistics & Multi-scales, Analyst
Chapter III	Policy Options and Ecosystems (Intrinsic) Value
Chapter IV	Assess Impacts on Ecosystems
Chapter V	Scenarios Assessments
Chapter VI	Uncertainty Assessments
Chapter VII	Conclusions
Chapter VIII	Summery

Preface

I have considered doing either a Ecosystem Services Assessment or a Environmental Impact Assessment, as well also I considered using either research skills or Audit skills for assessing, measuring current BRID001, 020a/020b damage on north-west Bridgnorth.

Shropshire Council has not done a Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for each market town, etc., and the SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) mentions no EIA.

I have read, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Conceptual Framework and the UK National Ecosystem Assessment Conceptual Framework.

I have applied a Ecosystem Services Assessment to Bridgnorth north-west, of where BRID001, 020a/020b are and I may not have resources, like Shropshire Council to do either a Environmental Impact Assessment or a Ecosystem Services Assessment. I have done my best, with a limited resources to do a ecosystem services assessment of Bridgnorth north-west sites of considerations/proposal under SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan).

Chapter I Observed Ecosystem Services

**Policy:
SAMDev Draft (Final Plan)**

**Bridgnorth sites:
BRID001, 020/020b**

**Field Study site:
BRID020b**

--	--

Ecosystem services	Observable
<p>Supporting service, e.g., soil, water.</p>	<p>Ecological (Biotic), biochemical components services:</p> <p>The fields and trees, provides O (Oxygen cycle), Ca (Carbon cycle), N (Nutrient cycle) and O (Water cycle).</p> <p>The biochemical cycles are unobservable and yet they, are visual e.g., <i>water</i> and <i>clouds</i> (Oxygen and Water cycle), <i>ecosystems</i> (Nutrient cycle), <i>soil</i> and <i>worms, plants</i> (Carbon cycle).</p> <p>Geological (Abiotic) services:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sandstone rock (Impermeable rock) (sediment rock) most common. Sandstone rock, may contain elements, like Iron oxide. 2. Natural chalk (Porous/permeable rock). 3. Conglomerate rock (sedimentary rock). 4. Ripple-marks sandstone rock (sedimentary rock). 5. Oolitic limestone (sedimentary rock). 6. Arkose sandstone (sedimentary rock). <p>Geological hardness test. Conglomerate rock first hard, natural chalk second hard, sandstone rock softest.</p>
<p>Provisional service, e.g., farming fields, fresh water, biochemical, hedges.</p>	<p>Open fields, with hedges and trees surrounding the fields, providing a ecological ecosystems, biodiversity and bird life within the hedges.</p> <p>There is a complex biodiversity and food chains, food web present in fields and hedges, surrounding the fields, are the biotic components.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Ecosystem diversity:</p> <p>1 Botany species – Botany diversity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elecampane (Inula Helenium) (Daisy family). 2. Blackthorn/Sloe (Prunus Spinosa) (Rose family). 3. Common Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna) (Rose family). 4. White Dead-nettle (Lamium album) (Mint family). 5. Dandelion (Taraxacum officinale). 6. Common couch (Elytrigia (Elymus/Agropyron) repens) (Grass family). 7. Small Nettle (Urtica urens) (Nettle family). 8. Monk's rhubarb (Rumex pseudoalpinus) (Dock family). 9. Common Ash (Fraxinus exceisior) (Ash family). 10. Annual Mercury (Mercurialis annua) (Spurge family). 11. Buckwheat (Fagopyrum esculentum) (Dock family). 12. Ivy (Hedera helix) (Ivy family). 13. Pedunculate Oak (Quercus robur) (Beech family). 14. Asarabacca (Asarum europeum) (Birthworth family). 15. Black Currant (Ribes nigrum) (Gooseberry family). 16. Colt's foot (Tussilago farfara) (Daisy family). 17. Black currant (Ribes nigrum) (Gooseberry family). 18. Sweet basil (Ocimum basilicum) (Mint family).

2 Worms species – worms diversity.

1. Flatworms (Platyhelminths).

3 Birds species – Birds diversity.

1. House Sparrow.
2. Siberian Tit.
3. Blackbird.
4. Great Spotted Woodpecker.
5. Rook or Carrion Crow.
6. Magpie.
7. Wood Pigeon.
8. Mallard.
9. Curlew.
10. House martin.
11. Starling.
12. House Sparrow.
- 13.

4 Endopterygota species – endopterygota insects diversity.

1. Aphids.
2. Blue bottle flies.
3. Hover flies.
4. Fresh flies.

5 Preygota species – preygota insects diversity.

1. Mayfly (Nymph ephemeate).
2. Honey Bee “Queen Bee” (*Bombus terrestris*) (Apocrita order) (Hymenoptera).
3. Honey Bee “Worker Bee” (*Apis mellifera*) (Apocrita order) (Hymenoptera).
4. House flies.
5. Grasshopper (Orthoptera).
6. Six-spot ladybird beetle (*Coccinellia septempunctata*) (Coleoptera order) (Arthropods family).
7. Whirligig beetle (*Gyrinus marinus*) (Coleoptera order).

5A Apterygota species – Windless insects diversity.

1. Spring tail (*Sminthurinus*) (Apocrita order).
2. Black ants (*Myrmica ruginodis*) (Hymenoptera order).
3. Water spider (*Argyroneta aquatica*) (Arthropods family).

6 Bryophyta species – bryophyta (mosses and liverworts) diversity.

1. *Lumularia cruciata* liverwort.

7 Lichens species – symbiosis of fungus and alga.

1. Xan-thorian lichen.

8 Fungi species

1. Jew's ear fungus (*Auricularia auricula*) (Basidiomycetes family).

9 Mammal species – rodents diversity.

	1. Rabbit.
Regulating service, e.g., carbon storage., water cycle.	<p>The fields and trees, provides O (Oxygen cycle), Ca (Carbon cycle), N (Nutrient cycle) and O (Water cycle).</p> <p>The fields provides an biotic components. The decomposition of dead plants, leafs also feed in to ecosystem abotic functions, by microorganism breaking dead leafs down.</p> <p>From the decomposition of dead plants, leafs, etc, comes a rich soil is good for agricultural.</p>
Cultural service, recreational, educational, tourism, housing, beauty.	N/A

The field studies:

- **First field study 05/04/2014 (Hedgerows of BRID020a)**, identified Botany species – Botany diversity principally and then, Birds species – Birds diversity, Honey Bee “Queen Bee” (*Bombus terrestris*) (Apocrita order) (Hymenoptera).
- **Second field study 11/04/2014 (Hedgerows of BRID020a)**, identified Birds species – Birds diversity, Endopterygota species – endopterygota insects diversity, Preygota species – preygota insects diversity and Bryophyta species – bryophyta (mosses and liverworts) diversity.
- **Third field study 19/04/2014 (Hedgerows and Church Lane Rd, looking across field of BRID020a)**, identified Lichens species – symbiosis of fungus and alga Xan-thorian lichen, Fungi species – Jew's ear fungus (*Auricularia auricula*) (Basidiomycetes family), Mammal species – rodents Rabbit, Honey Bee “Worker Bee” (*Apis mellifera*) (Apocrita order) (Hymenoptera), Brown – female Blackbird Birds species.
- **Forth field study 21/04/2014 (Hedgerows and Abbey field Rd, looking across field of BRID020a)**, identified Honey Bee “Workers Bee” (*Apis mellifera*) (Apocrita order) (Hymenoptera), Hover flies, Spring tail (*Sminthurinus*) (Apocrita order), House flies, Grasshopper (Orthoptera), Six-spot ladybird beetle (*Coccinellia septempunctata*) (Coleoptera order) (Arthropods family), Whirligig beetle (*Gyrinus marinus*) (Coleoptera order), Black ants (*Myrmica ruginodis*) (Hymenoptera order), Flatworms (Platyhelminths), Water spider (*Argyroneta aquatica*) (Arthropods family), Xan-thorian lichen, Sand stone rock (Impermeable rock) (sedimentary rock), natural chalk (Porous/permeable rock), Conglomerate rock (sedimentary rock), Magpie, Wood Pigeon, Mallard. I may have identified a Dog-rose (Rose family) or a Pomegranate (Pomegranate family) a rare native flower, a further check tomorrow.
- **5th field study 22/04/2014 (Hedgerows and Abbey field Rd, looking across field of BRID020a)**, identified Black currant (*Ribes nigrum*) (Gooseberry family), Wood Pigeon, Starling, Blackbird, House Sparrow, Sweet basil (*Ocimum basilicum*) (Mint family), Oolitic limestone? (Sedimentary rock), Arkose sandstone (sedimentary rock).

The BRID001, 020/020b sites, are rich in ecological diversity and evidence of food chain, food web, multi-tropics of the north-west Bridgnorth Area. The habitat community of variety differing species and multi-tropics in the north-west Bridgnorth Area, is overwhelming clear and those agricultural fields may not be, regarded highly from a economic and commercial self interests of land owners, Shropshire Council Councillors' and yet, those agricultural fields and hedgerows, have abundant species diversity there. Ecological diversity value outweighs, the short termism of

economics whims and bias of SAMDev Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 – Bridgnorth Development Strategy.

I have taken account of the geological evidence and the ecological ecosystems evidence, and represented a diverse ecosystems of both biotic and abiotic tropics, as well also variety of species and rocks specimens, birds species. The north-west Bridgnorth Area is not simply an agricultural fields and hedgerows, there is much happens in Nature and I appreciate my local ecosystems value as nature is supreme over humans finite pursuits, compared a land owner or land developers, Shropshire Council Councillors', Planning Inspectors see, the land has a means to sustain a non-sustainable enterprise capitalism free market economy and selfish profiting, taxation.

There is beauty, raw nature, waste grounds and hedgerows, wild flowers growing, Honey Bees collecting nectar from wild roses, breathing Life and watching Life, Decay before one's eyes.

A price of land, can't match immeasurable moment of living for Life and appreciating raw beauty of nature on my door steps and across town.

Building new houses self defeatist, the Planning authority don't have will or courage, to say "NO!" To economics and failing policy making cycles. Building new houses is not actually, solving population size problem and enlarging Tasley Estate is not solving population size problem, each new Estate or expansion of existing Estate eats up vulnerable ecosystems capacity, habitat community to reduce Greenhouse gas, CO2. I am acutely aware, of my own Estate I live in, was once a field and I am conscientious of my surroundings. Bridgnorth originally was confined to, High Street and centred around St. Leonard's Church, Bridgnorth Castle, but Bridgnorth continually consuming local ecosystems to build new Estates or expansion of existing Estates, new houses, not once local ecosystems and habitat communities, species given a space.

I am mindful of three phases of any phenomenon, including Bridgnorth:

1. *A prior* Bridgnorth, was forest and fields.
2. Bridgnorth, established and duration of Bridgnorth, until Bridgnorth becomes a ruin, ghost town. Tasley Parish Council and Bridgnorth Town Council, distinct memory, no one remembers, both the name "Bridgnorth" and the place Bridgnorth gradually cease. Even, Telford will cease to exist, likewise London, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Manchester, Leeds, so forth, will cease.
3. *post prior* Bridgnorth, walls fallen and buildings fallen and overgrown by ivy, weeds, flowers, nature reclaims this Area again.

I appreciate my local ecosystems and environments, yes I am a Town's Girl, but I enjoy outdoors too, I am both Town Girl, a Urban Chic and an Outdoors Girl, Freedom Chic. Some people are either Townie or Rural, I am both and appreciate both, I live in harmony and yet others, can't live in harmony or don't live in harmony. The BRID001, 020a/020b are expansion of man made disharmony.

Other citizens in Bridgnorth, do appreciate local environments of Bridgnorth and yet, they are not aware of this representation period of the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and don't engage it, or other citizens' do object to it in words, don't engage planning process or other citizens do engage the planning process has either objectors to SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) or foolishly support SAMDev Draft (Final Plan), unaware of the environmental consequences and damages upon Bridgnorth local ecosystems, species diversity, habitat communities.

Better to have a precious local ecosystems and biodiversity, biotic and abiotics tropics, compared to the waste of the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 – Bridgnorth Development Strategy,

massive policy errors and strategic errors.

Chapter II Drivers of impacts on Ecosystem & Ecosystem Services

Section I Indirect drivers of impacts on Ecosystem & Ecosystem Services

Regional Spatial Strategy for the West Midlands 2008: POLICY CF3 Table 1 (Shropshire), Table 3 (Shropshire).

HM coalition Government – National Planning Policy Framework (adopted) 2011.

Localism Act 2011.

Section II Direct drivers of impacts on Ecosystem & Ecosystem Services

Planning Inspector him/herself and Planning Inspector's report on SAMDev Draft (Final Plan)

Shropshire Council – LDF Core Strategy (Adopted) 2011.

Shropshire Council – LDF SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)

Shropshire Council – LDF Bridgnorth Local Plan.

Bridgnorth Town Plan – 2012.

Bridgnorth District Council – Bridgnorth District Local Plan – Inspector's report 2006: 3.5 Policy S3 – Green Belt – Bridgnorth, 15.1 – 3, 15.4 Policy BRID1, 15.5 Policy BRID2, 15.6 Policy BRID1 and BRID2, 15.7.4 Canteryn Farm, 15.7.7 Hook Farm, 15.8.2 BRID1, 15.28 Traffic Management.

Bridgnorth District Council Local Plan 1996 – 2011 (July 2006): 2.15 Policy S3, 14.9 Policy BRID1, 14.15 Policy BRID2.

Section III Statistics & Multi-scales, Analyst

1 Demographic statistics drivers:

Multi-scales	Statistics
National/United Kingdom	63.7 million (est. 2013)
England	53.5 million (est. 2013)
West Midlands	5.4 million (est.)
Shropshire	290700 – 473,900 (est.)
Bridgnorth	11,891 (2001 Census) to 12, 212 (est.), 12,000 - 51,800 (est.)

Notes:

The Bridgnorth population statistics varies, from 11,891 2001 Census to Wikipedia of 12, 212 (est.) Bridgnorth, to European Union European Social Fund (2008) statistics on 12,000 - 51,800 (est.) Bridgnorth.

The Bridgnorth population statistics is varied, dependent on whatever source the Shropshire Council uses for Policy making, means the population statistics are speculative, mere estimates further means the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) forecasts and provisions are in reasonable doubts.

1A Demographic net migration & natural change (2012 – 17) statistics drivers:

Multi-	Statistics
---------------	-------------------

scales		
National/United Kingdom	1.3 million	0.8 million
England	?	?
West Midlands	-10000	10000
Shropshire	-0.2	0.5
Bridgnorth	?	?
	Net natural change	Net migration

Notes:

The 10,000 – Net natural change, is a decrease verse 10,000 + Net Migration increase, in Shropshire and yet is no Net change population statistics, no Net Migration statistics specifically Bridgnorth. The 10,000 Net Migration population boom in Shropshire, means over stretched Shropshire Council resources and NHS, Local Communities Services, Green infrastructures be over stretched too. Local residents, are born in Bridgnorth can't get on Property ladder or can't own there, own house and so instead, local residents of Bridgnorth will or are, either (one) living with their parents more longer or (two) sadly, leaseholders and rentees dependent on landlords, or (three) moved away from Bridgnorth, (four) became homeless and trapped in cycle of homeless and Council Houses nor Private Social Housing. Shame on Shropshire Council, failing a duty of reasonable care of its own citizens' across Bridgnorth and Shropshire.

I have taken account of migration and immigration statistics, I am not anti-immigrants and not anti-refugees, not anti-asylum seekers. I have taken account of migration and immigration statistics in to my ecosystem services assessment, mean while skeptical of national/official statistics credibility.

The West Midlands, Shropshire net migration statistics is presented going up and will have a impact on Shropshire population generally, limited resources, Shropshire ecosystems and yet, I have not seen any evidence of extra new residents in Bridgnorth. Migrants may be establishing themselves in Shrewsbury and only few in Bridgnorth.

2 Economic statistics drivers:

Multi-scales	Statistics			
	GDP at Market Price	Agriculture	Industry	Services
National/United Kingdom	1.593 443 (2013)	102.4 (2013)	99.4 (2013)	106.9 (2013)
England	N/A	7121 GVA (2013)	116982 GVA (2013)	51196 GVA (E.g.,

				Administrative Services 2013)
West Midlands	N/A	830 GVA (2013)	13617 GVA (2013)	4136 GVA (E.g., Administrative Services 2013)
Shropshire	N/A	166 GVA (2011)	383 GVA (2011)	397 GVA (E.g., Business Services Activities 2011)
Bridgnorth	N/A	?	?	?

Notes:

The figures are £ GVA (Gross Value Added) million.

The Economics statistics, demonstrate a dominant Services sector in Shropshire, then followed by Industry sector, lastly farming sector and the Services sector is dominant in United Kingdom. There is no statistics of Services sector, Industry sector nor Farming sector in Bridgnorth and Bridgnorth Area.

There is a lack of statistics evidence of Bridgnorth Service sector, Industry sector and Farming sector, to base any LDF or any Local Plan, to approve or object to. The Bridgnorth Local Plan is in reasonable doubts, rising from lack of statistical evidence and Local Plan should not be approved, based on a lack of statistical evidence nor lack of evidence, means Local Governments' are a sham and counter-productive, not beneficial to Bridgnorth citizens' and community.

2A Average Annual Pay – gross statistics drivers:

Multi-scales	Statistics
National/United Kingdom	£459.60 (Female 2013) per week gross £558.30 (Male 2013) per week gross
England	£25,520.00 (2010)
West Midlands	£23,807.00 (2010) £417.10 (Female 2013) per week gross £527.00 (Male 2013) per week gross
Shropshire	£375.50 (Female 2013) per week gross £499.00 (Male 2013) per week gross
Bridgnorth	£27,439.00 (2010)

Notes:

There is currently is, a Gender Pay inequality, between women and men, at national, regional and county.

- **United Kingdom level:** £99 (82%) difference between male £558 per week gross and female £459 per week gross.

- **West Midlands level:** £110 (79%) difference between male £527 per week gross and female £417 per week gross.
- **Shropshire level:** £124 (75%) differences between male £499 per week gross and female £375 per week gross.

Women are worst off, under the current enterprise capitalism and free market economy, for the selfish greed of fe/male employers/employees counterparts.

Shropshire is a low pay/wage economy may sound beneficial to, all businesses employers' but, its harmful to both full-time and part-time employees.

2B Businesses Starts-up, duration “active” rate and closures statistics:

Multi-scales	Statistics		
	Businesses Births'	Active businesses	Businesses Closures
National/United Kingdom	265630 (2012)	2316705 (2012)	249570 (2012)
England	?	?	?
West Midlands	19650 (2012)	187420 (2012)	19930 (2012)
Shropshire	1060 (2012)	12665 (2012)	1150 (2012)
Bridgnorth	210 (2012)	2530 (2012)	265 (2012)
	Businesses Births'	Active businesses	Businesses Closures

Notes:

I enjoy Data analyst and Statistics, I don't do business.

Multi-scales of business statistics.

1. **UK level:** Businesses Births 265630 (9.3%), Active Businesses 2316705 (82%), Businesses Closures 249570 (9%).
2. **West Midlands level:** Businesses Births 19650 (9%), Active Businesses 187420 (82.5%), Businesses Closures 19930 (9%).
3. **Shropshire level:** Businesses Births 1060 (7.1%), Active Businesses (85%), Businesses Closures (8%).
4. **Bridgnorth level:** Businesses Births 210 (6.9%), Active Businesses 2530 (84%), Businesses Closures 265 (9%). Combination of Businesses Births 210 (6.9%) and an Active Businesses 2530 (84%) equals 2740 Businesses (91%) of total 3005.

The retrospective statistics Business Births and Closures, will indirectly feed in to Bridgnorth sites of ELR011a/011b considerations. Yes, I have done a Ecosystem Service Assessment of BRID001, 020a / 020b, I well aware of environmental damage, the building new houses will cause. The employment lands, I think will have a same level of habitat destruction and destruction of biodiversity, ecosystems of north-west Bridgnorth.

While, the ONS statistics are retrospective and it should not be used, to forecast Business Growth or make policy based on retrospective statistics. However, I am skeptical of retrospective statistics being used by Shropshire Council, to do its LDF Core Strategy, LDF SAMDeve Draft (Final Plan) or even, to justify LDF SAMDeve Draft (Final Plan) based on retrospective statistics.

3 Politics (policies) drivers:

Levels of politics	Levels of Governance	Levels of policy
United Nation		Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) – Climate Change (Final report) 2014. Framework Convention on Climate Change 2010. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Convention On Biological Diversity 1992.
European Union	EU – Court of Justice European Commission	Birds and Habitats Directive (2010) ESDP (European Spatial Development Perspective) Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union 1999: 2.4.1 (314).
National / United Kingdom	HM Government	HM coalition Government – National Planning Policy Framework (adopted) 2011. Localism Act 2011. Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006: ss. 40 (1) Duty to conserve biodiversity, 40 (5) “local authority” 'a county council', “local planning authority”.
England		
West Mercia / West Midlands	Regional Strategic Authority	Regional Spatial Strategy for the West Midlands 2008: POLICY CF3 Table 1 (Shropshire), Table 3 (Shropshire).
Shropshire	Shropshire Council	Planning Inspector's report on, the examination in to Shropshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (November 2010): 31, 82. Planning Inspector him/herself and Planning Inspector's report on SAMDev

		<p>Draft (Final Plan).</p> <p>Shropshire Council – LDF Core Strategy (Adopted) 2011.</p> <p>Shropshire Council – LDF SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan).</p> <p>Shropshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Final 2009 Updated Report 2010.</p> <p>Shropshire Council – LDF Bridgnorth Local Plan.</p>
	Bridgnorth District Council	<p>Bridgnorth District Council – Bridgnorth District Local Plan – Inspector's report 2006: 3.5 Policy S3 – Green Belt – Bridgnorth, 15.1 – 3, 15.4 Policy BRID1, 15.5 Policy BRID2, 15.6 Policy BRID1 and BRID2, 15.7.4 Canteryn Farm, 15.7.7 Hook Farm, 15.8.2 BRID1, 15.28 Traffic Management.</p> <p>Bridgnorth District Council Local Plan 1996 – 2011 (July 2006): 2.15 Policy S3, 14.9 Policy BRID1, 14.15 Policy BRID2.</p>
Bridgnorth	Bridgnorth Town Council	
Bridgnorth community	Bridgnorth Steering <i>Ad hoc</i> Group	Bridgnorth Town Plan – 2012
	Tasley Parish Council	

Notes:

The politics policies/strategies are drivers of change/transitioning as well also, politics has a substantial impacts on global ecosystems (Global – National – Regional – County – Local).

Politics enters domain of Nature, ecosystems, thus we have Green politics sphere and other political parties of Conservative and Labour, infringing on Nature domain.

Even, the Planning Inspector his/her assessments/report of SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) will contribute impacts on local ecosystems, since the Planning Inspector's role in listening to objectors' and yet Planning Inspector's mitigates risks of NIMBY citizens, makes the Planning Inspectors collaborator to destruction of local ecosystems across Shropshire and UK.

Such collaboration between the Planning Inspectors and the Secretary of State, means the Planning process is political and Planning Inspectors take part in the political process, damaging local ecosystems for short termism of economic growth to emphasise Secretary of State, Shropshire Council Councillors'.

The politics drivers have greatest impact on Global ecosystems, means politics is included in to my considerations and ecosystems service assessment.

I have taken account of the European Union in politics drivers generally, and I have taken account of United Kingdom HM coalition Government, United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty violations of EU laws, specifically non-compliance with Birds and Habitats Directive (2010).

The United Kingdom HM coalition Government, United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty are acting as immature children, non-conformity to EU laws and United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty, HM Governments' has no credibility comes to Europe and the European Union, both the HM Governments and the United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty are no longer fit for purpose. The EU European Commission and the Court of Justice are right, to sanctionable failures upon United Kingdom Parliamentary Sovereignty and HM coalition Government, they violated EU laws.

4 Historic maps drivers:

I tracked down Shropshire archives maps and information, to assess gradual housing expansion and rising population of Bridgnorth. I have focused on north-west Bridgnorth in Shropshire Archives and I have ignored rest of Bridgnorth.

The Bridgnorth District Council Policy S3 BRID1, 020a/020b & ELR011a/011b, later Shropshire Council Policy S3 BRID001, 020a/020b & ELR011a/011b, are concentrated around north-west Bridgnorth.

The historic maps:

1. OS Explorer 218 (2007). BRID001, 020a/020b & ELR011a/011b are fields according to map data.
2. Bridgnorth Tourist Map (2000s). BRID001, 020a/020b & ELR011a/011b are fields according to Bridgnorth Tourism Map data.
3. Shropshire Archives Fields names – Tasley Parish 1839. There is no Tasley Estate, no Innage Lane, no Queensway Drive and no Dunval Road, no anything, except Hook Farm monopoly over fields and smaller farmers fields' of the north-west Bridgnorth.
4. Shropshire Archives Fields names – St. Leonard Parish 1840. Hook Farm monopoly over a majority over fields, to the north-west Bridgnorth and Bridgnorth population relatively small, mostly centred around St. Leonard Church and High Street, Low Town of Bridgnorth.
5. Shropshire Archives Bridgnorth – Map 1903. Same again, Hook farm monopoly over fields and from lots of smaller fields under Hook Farm (1840) to fewer larger fields under Hook Farm (1903). Mean while, the Bridgnorth population remains relatively in same geographical Bridgnorth notional boundary, but the St. Leonard Parish seems has disappeared yet Tasley Parish remains current, up to today.
6. SAMDev Issues and Options 2010 page 10. The SAMDev issues and Options page 10, shows current Bridgnorth boundary and current Bridgnorth population inside Bridgnorth boundary. Also, the SAMDev Issues and Options shows *sites of considerations*, do vary from 50 hectares to 300 hectares, as well also the *sites of considerations* creates a urban mass on north-west, west, south-west and south of Bridgnorth.

From 1839 to 1903, the Bridgnorth population remained in Bridgnorth notional boundary and close to High Street, the rest of countryside remains fields providing a ecosystems services and ecosystems capacity.

Chapter III Policy Options and Ecosystems (Intrinsic) Value

Policy:

SAMDeve LDF Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)

**Bridgnorth Sites:
BRID020a/020b, 001**

LDF SAMDeve Draft (Final Plan)		Ecosystem valuation	Ecosystems Intrinsic Value		
Policy Options	Options	Economic Price	Economic Value (Benefits)	Ecosystem Value	Value results
Policy option 1	'Do nothing'	0 Dwellings = non-used land	0	25000000	25000000
Policy option 2	'Do minimum'	300 Dwellings = 1000 Hectares = £1000 (est.) = £500,00 (est.)	50000	12	600000
Policy option 3	'Do improvements'	500 Dwellings = 1680 Hectares = £840,00 (est.)	50000	9	450000
Policy option 4	'Do managed realignment (preliminary vision)'	800 Dwellings = 2670 Hectares = £133,500 (est.)	100000	2	2000000
Policy option 5	'Do managed realignment (unconstrained)'	1500 Dwellings = 5000 Hectares = £250,000 (est.)	300000	0	300000

Notes:

The economic price estimates (est.) refers to, Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: ss. 107 Occupier loss payment – Land Compensation Act 1973: ss. 33B (8) Table.

1000 Hectares / 3 equals 333.33 x 3 equals 999.99 Hectares (1000 Hectares), so 999.99 Hectares x £50 equals £49999.50 (1000 Hectares x £50 equals £500,00).

The economic value (benefits) x ecosystem value equals ***.

Chapter IV Assess Impacts on Ecosystems

**Policy:
SAMDeve LDF Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)**

**Bridgnorth Sites:
BRID020a/020b, 001**

**Field Study site:
BRID020b**

1 – Strategy/Policy/Plan Options & Ecosystem service assessment

	Strategy/Policy/Plan options				
	'Do nothing'	'Do minimum'	'Do improvements'	'Do managed realignment (preliminary vision)'	'Do managed realignment (unconstrained)'
Supporting services , e.g., soil, water.	+++	--	--	--	---
Provisional services , e.g., farming fields, fresh water, biochemical,	+++	---	--	--	---
Regulating services , e.g., carbon storage.	+++	---	--	--	---
Cultural services , e.g., recreational, educational, tourism, beauty	+++	--	++	++	++
Total	20	6	10	10	7

Notes:

“Extreme positive” 5/+++ , “Positive” 4/++ , “No effects” 0/-* (0), “Negative” 2/-- , “Extreme negativity” 1/ ---, “Uncertain effects” 0+/* (0).

The score 20, for policy option 'Do nothing' is beneficial to the local ecosystems concerned and protects local ecosystems for future generations enjoyment.

The score 6, for policy option 'Do minimum', is lower why? It endangers, the local ecosystems services of supporting services, provisional and regulating services. Undermines, the benefits of policy option 1 'Do nothing'.

The score 10, for policy options 'Do improvements' & 'Do managed realignment (preliminary vision)', have the same score 10. Both policy options have damaging consequences upon, the

ability of the ecosystem services and ecosystems.

The score 7, the policy option 'Do managed realignment (unconstrained)', the lowest score means less intention to protect the ecosystems in immediate north-west Bridgnorth and intentionally harming, damaging to local ecosystems for the sake of economic interests is always unsound.

2 – Risk Matrix Assessment

**Bridgnorth Sites:
BRID020a/020b, 001 & ELR011a/011b**

**Risk Assessment site:
BRID020a/020b, 001**

Strategy/Policy/Plan + (Likelihood x Impacts) = Risk to Ecosystem

I Risk Assessment

LDF SAMDev Plan		Risk Matrix		
Policy Options	Options	Risk Assessment		Risk Grades
		Likelihood	Impacts	Risks
Policy option 1	'Do nothing'	1	1	1
Policy option 2	'Do minimum'	3	9	27
Policy option 3	'Do improvements'	4	16	64
Policy option 4	'Do managed realignment (preliminary vision)'	5	20	100
Policy option 5	'Do managed realignment (unconstrained)'	5	25	125

The **policy option 1**, don't endangers the locus ecosystems and don't risks damage to local biodiversity of north-west Bridgnorth. 'Do nothing' secures the ecosystems and biodiversity, protects Nature and certainly stops any essential development in north-west Bridgnorth.

The **policy option 2**, subtly endangers the locus ecosystems and gradual loss of biochemical, biodiversity, still a risk to wider ecosystems. The Planning Inspector may contribute to, gradual degeneration of local ecosystems in north-west Bridgnorth, else where in Shropshire.

The **policy option 3**, is simply adding to option 2 current ecosystem damage. The increased likelihoods of option 3, gradual impacts on local ecosystems and substantial risk to local ecosystems, local ecosystem services to human health.

The **policy option 4**, is serious on both counts, its *likelihood* is 5 together, with the *impact* grade 20, serious impact on local ecosystems and massive, substantial loss of ecosystems in north-west Bridgnorth. Loss of habitants community, in north-west Bridgnorth and loss of species population in north-west Bridgnorth, as well also across Shropshire.

The **policy option 5**, is most irresponsible on part of Shropshire Council and most serious of all, its *likelihood* is 5 and *impact* is 25, deeply serious risk and loss of ecosystems in north-west Bridgnorth, across Bridgnorth and across Shropshire. Loss of habitant community, species population across Bridgnorth and across Shropshire. The policy option 5, does secures economic recovery but, at loss of vulnerable ecosystems in north-west Bridgnorth and across Shropshire. The loss of local species makes Shropshire natural capital poorer, while Shropshire other types of capital be up.

II Risk Mitigation

SAMDeve Draft (Final Plan)		Risk Matrix Assessments		
Policy Options	Options	Risk Grades	Risk Mitigation: options	Shropshire Council – SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) included either Risk Grades/Mitigation or Risk Mitigation options?
		Risks	Options	Answers
Policy option 1	'Do nothing'	1	0	No
Policy option 2	'Do minimum'	27	1	No
Policy option 3	'Do improvements'	64	2	No
Policy option 4	'Do managed realignment (preliminary vision)'	100	2	No
Policy option 5	'Do managed realignment (unconstrained)'	125	3	No

Notes:

Risk Mitigation options, one reduce risks or two, marginal risks and three, substantial risks extra measures off set risks.

I have done both a Risk Assessment, Risk Grades and Risk Mitigation options for the north-west Bridgnorth environment, local ecosystems.

Shropshire Council has not done, a Environmental Impact Assessment or not done, a Ecosystems Services Assessment or not done, a Risk Assessment and Risk Mitigations to the local ecosystems, connected to proposed planning and development of land.

Chapter V Scenarios Assessments

**Bridgnorth Sites:
BRID020a/020b, 001 & ELR011a/011b**

**Scenarios Assessments sites:
BRID020a/020b, 001 & ELR011a/011b**

Policy options	Scenarios	Scenarios assessments'
Do nothing	Scenario 1	Policy option 1 'Do nothing' retains and preserves, conserves the local ecosystems and immediate ecosystem services. Land non-used is beneficial to nature and not profitable, not taxable for no one.
	Scenario 2	Policy option 1 'Do nothing' retains and preserves, conserves the local ecosystems and immediate ecosystem services. Land non-used is beneficial to nature and not profitable, not taxable for no one, however the protection of lands for ecosystems functions. Leads to potential expansion of Green Belt and actual expansion of Green Belt, planting new trees and encouraging new renewable energy in Bridgnorth north-west.
	Scenario 3	Policy option 1 'Do nothing', means the Hook Farm declines in time and lack of profiting off, Shropshire Council SAMDev (Final Plan). The decline of Hook Farm Estate, Tasley Estate, however the decline of landlords, renting as well also decline of tenure is a further growth of Nature expansion.
Do minimum	Scenario 1	Policy option 3 'Do minimum', gets objections from existing Bridgnorth residents and yet a minimum new houses are built, in north-west Bridgnorth.
	Scenario 2	Policy option 3 'Do minimum', gets objections from Bridgnorth

		residents and new houses are built, as well also the land developer wants to make a extension to settlement, will fall into Policy 4 'Do improvement'.
Do improvement	Scenario 1	Policy option 3 'Do improvement' will increase risks to local ecological landscape and local ecosystems of north-west Bridgnorth.
	Scenario 2	Policy option 3 'Do improvement', implement construction of new homes and new businesses, with consequences to local ecosystems. Land developer proposes extension of existing land, for development.
	Scenario 3	Policy option 3 'Do improvement' implemented and the proposed extension gets a Planning Permissions, to build extra new homes and public wasn't consulted, informed. Is met with protests and objections, the land developer failed to consult public who be effected by extra new homes.
Do managed realignment – Preliminary Vision	Scenario 1	Policy option 4, is policy intent to ruin Shropshire landscape and ecosystems, for short term economics gain and fantasy UK economic recovery. The loss of fields and hedges, trees, has a result of environmental vandalism by Shropshire Council, land developers, housing market and landlords, ultimately HM coalition Government is responsible for ecosystems loss.
	Scenario 2	Policy option 4, is approved and implemented, mean while the land developer want to propose extension of existing lands for development. The north-west Bridgnorth is already ruined by the build, but now is west, south-east Bridgnorth are potentially exposed to be proposed land for development. Its a ongoing saga, ongoing objections to “unnecessary” land development of Bridgnorth. The scenario 2, high lights policy maker failures of not addressing issues, like population size limits, having homes for Shropshire residents only, keeping landlords out of housing market.
	Scenario 3	North-west Bridgnorth Tasley Estate extension is done, Shropshire Council reviewing Bridgnorth Local Plan (Green Belt) boundary, exposing Green Belt to potential/actual infringement, damaging local ecosystems of Green Belt and Shropshire Council returning to proposed sites of considerations on west, south-east, south Bridgnorth.
Do managed realignment - Unconstrained	Scenario 1	Policy option 5, is most irresponsible and policy maker failures, to address issues. Policy option 5, has massive ecosystems damage to Bridgnorth, likewise across Shropshire.

d		<p>Policy option 5, north-west Bridgnorth has extensions by land developer and loss of local ecosystems, Shropshire Council failure of meeting reduction of CO2 and greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Proposals of (returning to sites of considerations on south, south-west, west of Bridgnorth).</p>
	Scenario 2	<p>Policy option 5, north-west and west, south-west, south Bridgnorth sites are all built on, against local objections and local community wishes to protect Bridgnorth historic character.</p>
	Scenario 3	<p>Policy option 5, west, south-east, east Bridgnorth sites of considerations in later development of either Core Strategy or SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and the Shropshire Council returns to, sites of considerations west, south-east and west of Bridgnorth.</p> <p>Failure of not including any environmental impact assessment, on all policy options 5 scenarios.</p>
	Scenario 4	<p>Policy option 5, is deeply irresponsible on part of policy makers and decision makers, it brings no benefits to both local communities and local ecosystems.</p> <p>Worst case scenario, Bridgnorth absorbing Oldbury villege, Tasley villege, Ashley Abbots villege, Ditton Priors villege, Upton Cressett villege, Nordley villege, Haughton villege. With a serious loss of local ecosystems, biodiversity across a wide area, than Bridgnorth be following same mistakes of Telford.</p> <p>Bridgnorth absorbs Oldbury villege and Tasley villege, next Bridgnorth absorbs Ashley Abbots villege, Nordley villege and next Bridgnorth absorbs Upton Cressett villege, Haughton villege. Like Telford previously, Telford is imputed upon smaller villages to a create a New Town called “Telford”, and yet Telford is not a solution, nor turning Bridgnorth in to another New Town, like Telford is not a solution.</p>

Notes:

SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) is bias towards, Policy option 4 or 5, do have serious environmental and ecological consequences upon north-west Bridgnorth, but the same Policy options 4 and 5, will have lasting consequences upon rest of Shropshire ecosystems, natural beauty.

I quickly realised, that neither the LDF Core Strategy or the LDF SAMDev Draft (Final Plan), innumerable policies, including the National Planning Policy Framework have failed or ignored, to considered “humans population size” is the problem. The problem is not migrates or not immigrates. The policy makers failure to, manage UK population size and migrates, immigrates should not be blamed for UK economic, welfare, housing and crime problems. The problem is not

existing British citizens or not immigrants, its simply UK population size is not being discussed or not being limited, by policy makers and I don't blame European Union citizens' coming to Britain, they are unaware of limited resources in Britain.

Building new homes is not addressing “population size”, simply building new homes is making the problem more worst and catering for a increased population size, no attempts to reduce population size as well also, the policy makers failure to limit population growth in existing villages, towns, cities. A course, the Planning Inspector won't be thinking about “population size” nor the Shropshire Council Councillors' won't be thinking about, the same issue. Building new homes, is meeting a economics interests, financial interests of HM Government, will have consequences upon ecosystems and increased population size, failure of limiting population size in Shropshire to safeguard existing homes for Shropshire residents only, failure of limiting population size in Shropshire has consequences upon Shropshire ecosystems.

Chapter VI Uncertainty Assessments

Bridgnorth Sites: BRID020a/020b, 001 & ELR011a/011b

Uncertainty Assessments sites: BRID020a/020b, 001 & ELR011a/011b

1 – General Uncertainty Assessments

Policy options	Scenarios	Policy options consequences	Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results
Do nothing	Scenario 1	Policy option 1 'Do nothing' retains and preserves, conserves the local ecosystems and immediate ecosystem services. Land non-used is beneficial to nature and not profitable, not taxable for no one.	3	1	3
	Scenario 2	Policy option 1 'Do nothing' retains and preserves, conserves the local ecosystems and immediate ecosystem services. Land non-used is beneficial to nature and not profitable, not taxable for no one, however the protection of lands for ecosystems functions. Leads to potential expansion of Green Belt and actual expansion of Green Belt, planting new trees and encouraging new renewable energy in Bridgnorth north-west.	2	1	2

	Scenario 3	Policy option 1 'Do nothing', means the Hook Farm declines in time and lack of profiting off, Shropshire Council SAMDev (Final Plan). The decline of Hook Farm Estate, Tasley Estate, however the decline of landlords, renting as well also decline of tenure is a further growth of Nature expansion.	3	2	6
			Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results
Do minimum	Scenario 1	Policy option 3 'Do minimum', gets objections from existing Bridgnorth residents and yet a minimum new houses are built, in north-west Bridgnorth.	3	2	6
	Scenario 2	Policy option 3 'Do minimum', gets objections from Bridgnorth residents and new houses are built, as well also the land developer wants to make a extension to settlement, will fall into Policy 4 'Do improvement'.	3	3	9
			Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results
Do improvement	Scenario 1	Policy option 3 'Do improvement' will increase risks to local ecological landscape and local ecosystems of north-west Bridgnorth.	3	4	12
	Scenario 2	Policy option 3 'Do improvement', implement construction of new homes and new businesses, with consequences to local ecosystems. Land developer proposes extension of existing land, for development.	4	3	12
	Scenario 3	Policy option 3 'Do improvement' implemented and the proposed extension gets a Planning Permissions, to build extra new homes and public wasn't consulted, informed. Is	4	4	16

		met with protests and objections, the land developer failed to consult public who be effected by extra new homes.			
			Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results
Do managed realignment – Preliminary Vision	Scenario 1	<p>Policy option 4, is policy intent to ruin Shropshire landscape and ecosystems, for short term economics gain and fantasy UK economic recovery.</p> <p>The loss of fields and hedges, trees, has a result of environmental vandalism by Shropshire Council, land developers, housing market and landlords, ultimately HM coalition Government is responsible for ecosystems loss.</p>	4	5	20
	Scenario 2	<p>Policy option 4, is approved and implemented, mean while the land developer want to propose extension of existing lands for development.</p> <p>The north-west Bridgnorth is already ruined by the build, but now is west, south-east Bridgnorth are potentially exposed to be proposed land for development. Its a ongoing saga, ongoing objections to “unnecessary” land development of Bridgnorth.</p> <p>The scenario 2, high lights policy maker failures of not addressing issues, like population size limits, having homes for Shropshire residents only, keeping landlords out of housing market.</p>	4	15	60
	Scenario 3	North-west Bridgnorth Tasley Estate extension is done, Shropshire Council reviewing Bridgnorth Local Plan (Green Belt) boundary, exposing Green	4	25	100

		Belt to potential/actual infringement, damaging local ecosystems of Green Belt and Shropshire Council returning to proposed sites of considerations on west, south-east, south Bridgnorth.			
			Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results
Do managed realignment - Unconstrained	Scenario 1	<p>Policy option 5, is most irresponsible and policy maker failures, to address issues. Policy option 5, has massive ecosystems damage to Bridgnorth, likewise across Shropshire.</p> <p>Policy option 5, north-west Bridgnorth has extensions by land developer and loss of local ecosystems, Shropshire Council failure of meeting reduction of CO2 and greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Proposals of (returning to sites of considerations on south, south-west, west of Bridgnorth).</p>	5	25	125
	Scenario 2	Policy option 5, north-west and west, south-west, south Bridgnorth sites are all built on, against local objections and local community wishes to protect Bridgnorth historic character.	4	25	100
	Scenario 3	<p>Policy option 5, west, south-east, east Bridgnorth sites of considerations in later development of either Core Strategy or SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and the Shropshire Council returns to, sites of considerations west, south-east and west of Bridgnorth.</p> <p>Failure of not including any environmental impact assessment, on all policy options</p>	4	20	80

		5 scenarios.			
	Scenario 4	<p>Policy option 5, is deeply irresponsible on part of policy makers and decision makers, it brings no benefits to both local communities and local ecosystems.</p> <p>Worst case scenario, Bridgnorth absorbing Oldbury villege, Tasley villege, Ashley Abbots villege, Ditton Priors villege, Upton Cressett villege, Nordley villege, Haughton villege. With a serious loss of local ecosystems, biodiversity across a wide area, than Bridgnorth be following same mistakes of Telford.</p> <p>Bridgnorth absorbs Oldbury villege and Tasley villege, next Bridgnorth absorbs Ashley Abbots villege, Nordley villege and next Bridgnorth absorbs Upton Cressett villege, Haughton villege. Like Telford previously, Telford is imputed upon smaller villages to a create a New Town called “Telford”, and yet Telford is not a solution, nor turning Bridgnorth in to another New Town, like Telford is not a solution.</p>	2	25	50
			Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results

The Shropshire Council and construction industry of building new houses, new employment lands, will have a direct immediate effects, upon local ecosystems and immediate habitat destruction.

I have taken account, the Planning Inspectors Reports' be a contributing factor to habitat destruction of local ecosystems and indirect factor, in all scenarios and impacts. Equally too, I have taken account of other consultees be contributing factor to habitat destruction of local ecosystems and indirect factor, in all scenarios and impacts.

“Habitat community” means, the biodiversity and species diversity in the ecosystems and “habitat destruction” means, planning process is a indirect driver and planning proposals, planning permissions, construction of new houses and new employment lands are direct drivers of habitat destructions.

Below are my five considerations of all policy options and scenarios, consequences.

2 – Five considerations

1st Considerations

Policy options	Scenarios	Policy options consequences	Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results
Do nothing	Scenario 1	Policy option 1 'Do nothing' retains and preserves, conserves the local ecosystems and immediate ecosystem services. Land non-used is beneficial to nature and not profitable, not taxable for no one.	3	1	3
	Scenario 2	Policy option 1 'Do nothing' retains and preserves, conserves the local ecosystems and immediate ecosystem services. Land non-used is beneficial to nature and not profitable, not taxable for no one, however the protection of lands for ecosystems functions. Leads to potential expansion of Green Belt and actual expansion of Green Belt, planting new trees and encouraging new renewable energy in Bridgnorth north-west.	2	1	2
	Scenario 3	Policy option 1 'Do nothing', means the Hook Farm declines in time and lack of profiting off, Shropshire Council SAMDev (Final Plan). The decline of Hook Farm Estate, Tasley Estate, however the decline of landlords, renting as well also decline of tenure is a further growth of Nature expansion.	3	2	6

The Policy option “do nothing” has less impacts and less likelihood to happen, because the economics agenda is infringing upon, the local ecosystems. The “doing nothing” is most reasonable thing to do, but the economics role undermining natural balance between wider ecosystems and humans population growth, selfishness, profiting and taxations.

The Policy option of “doing nothing” is most beneficial, it protects the local ecosystems and local biodiversity for immediate, future generations and stops any further development, stops any further land use.

2nd Considerations

			Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results
Do minimum	Scenario 1	Policy option 3 'Do minimum', gets objections from existing Bridgnorth residents and yet a minimum new houses are built, in north-west Bridgnorth.	3	2	6
	Scenario 2	Policy option 3 'Do minimum', gets objections from Bridgnorth residents and new houses are built, as well also the land developer wants to make a extension to settlement, will fall into Policy 4 'Do improvement'.	3	3	9

The Policy option “doing minimum” still carries a environmental impacts upon, the local ecosystems and biodiversity, effecting the ecosystem services of the immediate Area.

3rd Considerations

			Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results
Do improvement	Scenario 1	Policy option 3 'Do improvement' will increase risks to local ecological landscape and local ecosystems of north-west Bridgnorth.	3	4	12
	Scenario 2	Policy option 3 'Do improvement', implement construction of new homes and new businesses, with consequences to local ecosystems. Land developer proposes extension of existing land, for development.	4	3	12
	Scenario 3	Policy option 3 'Do improvement' implemented and the proposed extension gets a Planning Permissions, to build extra new homes and public wasn't consulted, informed. Is met with protests and objections, the land developer failed to consult public who be effected	4	4	16

		by extra new homes.			
--	--	---------------------	--	--	--

The policy option “do improvements”, increases the likelihood and impacts upon local ecosystems, from Shropshire Council LDF (Local Developments Framework) DPD (Development Planning Documents), like the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan), Core Strategy.

The Local Planning Authority and Planning Inspectors Reports are factors, contributing to direct loss of habitat destruction and wider local ecosystems, effected by construction of the New Houses and new Employment Lands. Economics driver is the principal offender, infringing upon local ecosystems and policy makers, failure of not addressing UK population size, to reduce pressure on local ecosystems services' across UK and Shropshire.

The policy option “doing improvements” will gradually increase pollution levels in Bridgnorth, while current air pollution e.g., 19/04/2014 SALOP STREET & WHITBURN STREET and sunny, warm temperature, air pollution confined and car traffics increased pollution level, static cars and waste of car fuel/gas has CO2 emissions localised. But, the air pollution in Bridgnorth substantially increases under Policy options of “Do managed realignment – Preliminary Vision”, “Do managed realignment - Unconstrained”

4th Considerations

			Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results
Do managed realignment – Preliminary Vision	Scenario 1	<p>Policy option 4, is policy intent to ruin Shropshire landscape and ecosystems, for short term economics gain and fantasy UK economic recovery.</p> <p>The loss of fields and hedges, trees, has a result of environmental vandalism by Shropshire Council, land developers, housing market and landlords, ultimately HM coalition Government is responsible for ecosystems loss.</p>	4	5	20
	Scenario 2	<p>Policy option 4, is approved and implemented, mean while the land developer want to propose extension of existing lands for development.</p> <p>The north-west Bridgnorth is already ruined by the build, but now is west, south-east Bridgnorth are potentially exposed to be proposed land for development. Its a ongoing saga, ongoing objections to</p>	4	15	60

		<p>“unnecessary” land development of Bridgnorth.</p> <p>The scenario 2, high lights policy maker failures of not addressing issues, like population size limits, having homes for Shropshire residents only, keeping landlords out of housing market.</p>			
	Scenario 3	<p>North-west Bridgnorth Tasley Estate extension is done, Shropshire Council reviewing Bridgnorth Local Plan (Green Belt) boundary, exposing Green Belt to potential/actual infringement, damaging local ecosystems of Green Belt and Shropshire Council returning to proposed sites of considerations on west, south-east, south Bridgnorth.</p>	4	25	100

The Policy option “Do managed realignment – Preliminary Vision” have serious impacts upon local ecosystems and probable likelihoods will happen. The likelihoods are high likely, once the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) gets Adopted and increased impacts, loss of habitat community and destruction of local ecosystems, be a serious loss.

I have considered all possible scenarios, will impact on north-west Bridgnorth Area and wider Bridgnorth Area, as well also the Bridgnorth Boundary and Green Belt will be reviewed post SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) Adoption. Will feed in to contributing factors, to the local habitat community of biodiversity and local ecosystems across Bridgnorth and Bridgnorth Area.

The SAMDev Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 para (2) “Around 1,400 homes and around 19 hectares of employment land will be delivered in Bridgnorth on a mix of windfall and allocated sites”, highly loss of habitat community and loss of multi-tropics across Bridgnorth north-west, west, south, south-east, Bridgnorth Area. The Bridgnorth Development Strategy is purely bias towards, economics and attracting businesses to this Area, at a environmental cost. Neither new homes or new employment lands, are addressing Greenhouse gas emission reduction or not addressing, reduction of CO2 emissions, rising from businesses in Shropshire and Bridgnorth.

5th Considerations

			Likelihoods	Impacts	Risk Results
Do managed realignment - Unconstr	Scenario 1	<p>Policy option 5, is most irresponsible and policy maker failures, to address issues. Policy option 5, has massive ecosystems damage to</p>	5	25	125

ained		<p>Bridgnorth, likewise across Shropshire.</p> <p>Policy option 5, north-west Bridgnorth has extensions by land developer and loss of local ecosystems, Shropshire Council failure of meeting reduction of CO2 and greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Proposals of (returning to sites of considerations on south, south-west, west of Bridgnorth).</p>			
	Scenario 2	<p>Policy option 5, north-west and west, south-west, south Bridgnorth sites are all built on, against local objections and local community wishes to protect Bridgnorth historic character.</p>	4	25	100
	Scenario 3	<p>Policy option 5, west, south-east, east Bridgnorth sites of considerations in later development of either Core Strategy or SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and the Shropshire Council returns to, sites of considerations west, south-east and west of Bridgnorth.</p> <p>Failure of not including any environmental impact assessment, on all policy options 5 scenarios.</p>	4	20	80
	Scenario 4	<p>Policy option 5, is deeply irresponsible on part of policy makers and decision makers, it brings no benefits to both local communities and local ecosystems.</p> <p>Worst case scenario, Bridgnorth absorbing Oldbury villege, Tasley villege, Ashley Abbots villege, Ditton Priors villege, Upton Cressett villege, Nordley villege, Haughton villege. With a serious loss of local ecosystems, biodiversity across a wide area, than Bridgnorth be</p>	2	25	50

		<p>following same mistakes of Telford.</p> <p>Bridgnorth absorbs Oldbury villege and Tasley villege, next Bridgnorth absorbs Ashley Abbots villege, Nordley villege and next Bridgnorth absorbs Upton Cressett villege, Haughton villege. Like Telford previously, Telford is imputed upon smaller villages to a create a New Town called “Telford”, and yet Telford is not a solution, nor turning Bridgnorth in to another New Town, like Telford is not a solution.</p>			

The Policy option “Do managed realignment – Unconstrained” it most destructive impact upon Bridgnorth north-west and wider Bridgnorth Area, serious loss of habitat community, loss of substantial ecosystem services, loss of vast biodiversity across a wider Area.

The Policy option “Do managed realignment – Unconstrained” scenarios are hypothetical and yet, I have thought of future consequences of the SAMDev (Final Plan) and Planning Inspectors contribution to loss of habitat community, loss of biodiversity areas across Bridgnorth and as well also, other Consultees contribution to loss of ecosystem services in Bridgnorth Area.

The Policy option “Do managed realignment – Unconstrained” is incompatible, with IPCC report 2014.

The Europe region temperature will continue increase *very likely*, will effect UK generally and effect Shropshire – Bridgnorth as well also, building new homes and new employment lands across Shropshire and; north-west Bridgnorth building new homes and new employment lands won't lesson rising temperature and won't reduce CO2 emission of businesses cars, private households cars. Source Chapter 14 of IPCC report.

The Policy option “Do managed realignment – Unconstrained” and the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan): Policy S3 para (2) “Around 1,400 homes and around 19 hectares of employment land will be delivered in Bridgnorth on a mix of windfall and allocated sites” confirming policy option “Do managed realignment – Unconstrained”, are seriously incompatible with IPCC report 2014.

Neither new homes or new employment lands, are addressing Greenhouse gas emission reduction or not addressing, reduction of CO2 emissions, rising from businesses in Shropshire and Bridgnorth, and; the Bridgnorth Development Strategy is a failure, it fails to take responsibility for substantial environmental consequences of both SAMDev Plan Policy S3 and itself, the Bridgnorth Development Strategy. The Bridgnorth Development Strategy fails at environmental responsibility and fails to include, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and fails to consider, lasting consequences upon ecosystems, Bridgnorth infrastructures and Shropshire Community NHS infrastructures covers Bridgnorth Area.

3 – SAMDev Draft (Final Plan)

I have a feeling, this SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) is bias towards to either policy option “Do managed realignment – Preliminary Vision” or policy option “Do managed realignment – Unconstrained”. Both carries, serious environmental impacts upon Bridgnorth, wider Shropshire and the Planning Inspector's part in contributing to, environmental impacts and together with other consultees supporting this SAMDev Draft (Final Plan).

The economics is rooted in selfishness, all economic values and prices are based self-centred intrinsic value, contrary to biocentric ethics is rooted in selflessness and considerations of both humans society and wider ecosystems species. A intrinsic values can be either economics values, are selfishness, self destructive or biocentric values, are selflessness, benefits self and others. The Shropshire Council is bias towards either policy option “Do managed realignment – Preliminary Vision” or policy option “Do managed realignment – Unconstrained”, together with the Planning Inspector mitigating risks of NIMPY legitimate objections to SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and all, contribute to destruction of habitat community of the north-west Bridgnorth and wider Bridgnorth Area, Shropshire. I take a holistic view of entire planning process and all policy options, scenarios, consequences, compared to other consultees and policy makers, decision makers have ignored or not considered, not taken account of other environmental and ecosystems information, like IPCC report.

I don't know, how the planning process will play out to benefit Bridgnorth or ruined Bridgnorth, and I have considered all scenarios, consequences, likelihoods and risks connected consequences, to my local environments. I have seen Bridgnorth grown in my lifetime and I well aware of, my local environments and local ecosystems, as well also aware of Bridgnorth population growth is subtle. I am a responsible citizen, I consider everything and reflect and yet, other consultees may have a business agenda of supporting this SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and other consultees, may have financial agenda of supporting this SAMDev Draft (Final Plan), lots of persons in Suits, none of them considering consequences upon local communities across Shropshire and Bridgnorth. I am a Suits Girl and high stiletto heels, with a conscientious mind.

Chapter VII Conclusions

I have considered all policy options and consequences, impacts, as well also considered all direct and indirect factors, will impact Bridgnorth citizens' health and livelihoods, wider Shropshire citizens of the policy and SAMDev Draft (Final Plan).

The Policy S3 – Bridgnorth Development Strategy will have environmentally consequences, top of existing and current environmental consequences of past expansion of Bridgnorth in my lifetime.

The creeping expansion of Bridgnorth boundary and population size, means a serious loss of local habitats communities, biodiversity species and interfere with food webs/chain of species in Bridgnorth north-west, so forth.

The Policy S3 – Bridgnorth Development Strategy and the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) generally, have not taken account of ecosystems and ecosystems services' be effected by both the Plan and the Policy. There is no Environmental Impact Assessment or no Ecosystem Service Assessment, attached to either or both the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and the Policy S3 – Bridgnorth Development Strategy.

Policy fails to grasps raw beauty of nature, so policy and SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) ruins raw beauty, for foolish greed and egos.

Humans ignorance and selfish greed, flawed policy making, costs the environment and humans will suffer consequences of ill conceived policy and ills of greed, ignorance.

Chapter VIII Summery

I have considered all policy options and consequences, impacts, as well also considered all direct and indirect factors, will impact Bridgnorth citizens' health and livelihoods, wider Shropshire citizens of the policy and SAMDev Draft (Final Plan).

The creeping expansion of Bridgnorth boundary and population size, means a serious loss of local habitats communities, biodiversity species and interfere with food webs/chain of species in Bridgnorth north-west, so forth.

Humans ignorance and selfish greed, flawed policy making, costs the environment and humans will suffer consequences of ill conceived policy and ills of greed, ignorance.

Annex 2

Ecosystem Service (Assessment) Plan (Methodology)

Contents

Chapter I	Research
Chapter II	Field Studies
Chapter III	Review of methodology

Chapter I Research

Ref., Ecosystem Service (Assessment) Plan: Section III Statistics & Multi-scales, Analyst, Demographic statistics drivers, Demographic net migration & natural change (2012 – 17) statistics drivers, Economic statistics drivers, Average Annual Pay – gross statistics drivers, Businesses Starts-up, duration “active” rate and closures statistics, Politics (policies) drivers, Historic maps drivers.

The research was finding evidence, identifying the drivers will have a ecosystem impacts on north-west Bridgnorth principally and wider Shropshire. The statistics was retrospective, is not current 2014 data and has risen reasonable doubts about LDF SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) statistical foundations.

The Shropshire Archives of Bridgnorth Maps', were generally helpful and limited number of archive to show, Bridgnorth expansion over centuries. Whatever Shropshire Archives Maps of Bridgnorth, are most appreciated to demonstrate gradual expansion Bridgnorth Boundary, with each century Bridgnorth Boundary infringes local ecosystems and immediate biodiversity.

The research I did for my representation, is mainly finding evidence compared to, proper research is, Hypothesis, Null-Hypothesis, Experiment, gather Data and Results from Experiment, to prove or disprove a Hypothesis. I can do proper research. For this, context it was finding evidence and to make an assessment of current, available evidence e.g., statistics, historical maps, public policies.

All the research evidence, I have fined is secondary data, compared to Field studies evidence is primary data.

Chapter II Field Studies

Ref., Ecosystem Service (Assessment) Plan: Chapter I Observed Ecosystem Services.

Direct observations of ecosystems, species and identification, classifications of species and identifying different tropics of the north-west Bridgnorth Area biodiversity.

I have limited resources to do a proper extensive field studies, for my representation to Planning Inspector and I done, my best with the limited resources available.

In my observations, I have recorded and identified species in my north-west Bridgnorth Area. While, other consultees be more concerned about business interests, financial interests of supporting this SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and I taken a different stance, other consultees fail to consider consequences of supporting LDF SAMDev Plan upon local communities, local environments.

Chapter III Review of methodology

From March to April, I had a one month period. I had a few days, to get organised and do Soundness test, so forth, of the SAMDev Draft (Final Plan) and then turn to, my focus to environmental considerations.

I did my research was fairly quick and straight forward, and yet field studies was not a challenge, only a lack of resources to do my representation Justice. With limited resources and limited time, to organise and operate my field studies, in a short length of time and minimum time, has much evidence can I get, to establish my ecosystem service assessment.

My field studies were organised, I prioritised my field studies to identify each tropic or species, each field study counts and it may seem odd, I taking extra effort compared to other consultees. I don't have a business agenda, economics agenda, financial agenda, compared to other consultees and consultees representatives' will have a business agenda, economics agenda, financial agenda of supporting this SAMDev Draft (Final Plan), but I am concerned about the environment being ruined by self interests of businesses and policy makers, decision makers.

I did everything to my best ability. Using statistics were appropriate and using primary data, from field studies to represent the environmental – ecosystem services evidences, seems the Shropshire Council has over looked or ignored, or both and, my field studies observations, together with my soundness tests, sound argument to question the validity, legitimacy of this SAMDev Draft (Final Plan). I do support Shropshire Council employees', I do object to Shropshire Council Councillors' lack of sight comes to policy considerations, ecosystems services, etc.