

#62

**COMPLETE**



**Collector:** New Link (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, April 28, 2014 5:50:49 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, April 28, 2014 8:21:40 AM  
**Time Spent:** 02:30:51  
**IP Address:** 78.147.39.180

PAGE 1

**Q1: Your details:**

Name: Margaret Row lands  
 Address:

**Q2: Are you acting on behalf of anyone?** No

PAGE 2

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

PAGE 3: Representation details

**Q4: Please give the policy/paragraph/policies map details for your first representation relates to:** Schedule S14 1a Allocation of Land off Whittngton Rd OSW004

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

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

Legally compliant No

Sound No

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

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

Keeping OSW004 in the SamDev makes it unsound for all for reasons (above). It is not legally compliant because OSW004 has been included without due consideration of the impact of a development of 117 houses on the setting and surrounding archaeology of an internationally important scheduled monument, Old Oswestry Hillfort, which would severely damage its significance and our understanding of hillforts. Old Oswestry is significant in national culture too, as the birth place of Guinevere (allegedly) and with links to Wilfred Owen, who trained here during WW1.

1. Not Positively prepared

OSW004 was submitted as part of a coordinated plan, with 002 and 003, which have been removed. They contained significant support for heritage in terms of car park, walks, access and gifted land to provide heritage gains as balance to housing development. Without these, there is no heritage mitigation. There has been very inadequate archaeological or environmental investigation of the proposed site and a serious failure by Shropshire Council to respond, or take account of, professional advice other than biased, and non-compliant (with NPPF etc) Heritage Impact report from the developers.

2. Not Justified

Shropshire Council has ignored local, national and international objections, including a petition (now at over 10,000), a heritage impact assessment produced by Prof George Nash on behalf of the campaigners, and a professionally produced Landscape and Visual Impact Report. It has ignored a request for further full and compliant archaeological assessment before including the site, from Oswestry Town Council. It is not supported by adjoining Selattyn and Gobowen Parish Council. It has based its decision on a highly criticised, non-compliant and slanted Heritage Impact Assessment produced by the developers

3. Not Effective

Any planning application would have to abide by NPPF para 131, and take account of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets...positive contribution to heritage assets..etc. which this patently does not do. and para 132, ...the more important the heritage asset the greater the weight.. given to assets conservation.. should be. Any planning application would have to abide by English Heritage's rules on setting, which this patently does not do. A development which has a negative impact on how a monument is viewed constitutes significant harm to the setting of an ancient monument (Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v. East Northamptonshire District Council (2014), and a precedent of several buildings already in the area viewed from the Hillfort does not support further development (NPPF para 130). It is most likely that this development would be rejected at the planning stage so it is absurd to count it in the SamDev. Important partners such as Oswestry Town Council, English Heritage, Shropshire Wildlife Trust, have not agreed to it. The council plan to permanently damage one of the best preserved Iron Age Hillforts, based on partial and flawed reports from vested interests.

4. Not Consistent with national policy

Not consistent with NPPF para 131, 132, and 126 (Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment'.

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

Removal of OSW004 from the plan.  
Identify alternative sites, including unoccupied town centre properties and brown field sites.  
The Sustainable Urban Extensions should be examined more closely. Only 63 dwellings are counted in the SamDev 5 year supply, out of an allotted 900. Presumably the owner is landbanking 837 plots, which makes the whole SamDev process ridiculous and dangerous for valued places such as Old Oswestry. New rules about how many times a developer can renew planning permissions should be implemented nationally, and councils have the ability to compulsorily purchase important sites such as this Sustainable Urban Extension.

**Q10: Do you wish to make another representation?** No

PAGE 4: Representation details 2

**Q11: Please give the policy/paragraph/policies map details for your first representation relates to:** *Respondent skipped this question*

**Q12: Is your representation in support or objection?** *Respondent skipped this question*

**Q13: In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map do you consider that the SAMdev is: See guidance notes sections 1 and 2 for the meanings of 'legally compliant' and 'sound'.** *Respondent skipped this question*

## SAMdev consultation 2014

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

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q15: Please specify your reason for supporting or objecting. If you are objecting, you should make clear why the document is unsound having regard to the issues of 'legal compliance' or whether the document is not positively prepared, justified, effective or not consistent with national policy.**

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q16: Explain the changes you think should be made to the SAMdev Plan in order to make it legally compliant or sound. You should explain your suggested revisions to the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map and why this change would make the plan legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q17: Do you wish to make another representation?**

*Respondent skipped this question*

### PAGE 5: Representation details 3

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

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q19: Is your representation in support or objection?**

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q20: In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map do you consider that the SAMdev is: See guidance notes sections 1 and 2 for the meanings of 'legally compliant' and 'sound'.**

*Respondent skipped this question*

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

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q22: Please specify your reason for supporting or objecting. If you are objecting, you should make clear why the document is unsound having regard to the issues of 'legal compliance' or whether the document is not positively prepared, justified, effective or not consistent with national policy.**

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q23: Explain the changes you think should be made to the SAMdev Plan in order to make it legally compliant or sound. You should explain your suggested revisions to the policy, paragraph or section of the policies map and why this change would make the plan legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

*Respondent skipped this question*

### PAGE 6: Finally...

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

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

### PAGE 7

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

I wish to counter Shropshire Councils failure to value Old Oswestry properly

## SAMdev consultation 2014

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

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