



Date: Thursday, 30 June 2016

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Shrewsbury/Oswestry Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Contact: Shelley Davies, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257718
Email: shelley.davies@shropshire.gov.uk

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 30 June 2016		
NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	15/05091/FUL	Neighbour/third party
<p>Copy of letter circulated to committee members by third party:</p> <p>Re: Application by Douglas Davies to build 2 houses in the Radbrook Valley adjacent 38 Longden Road. Ref:- 15-05091-FUL</p> <p>The residents of Longden Road are very concerned that the Planning Officer has done an About Face on this application and is now recommending approval after having been so strongly opposed to previous similar applications. The last application was dismissed on appeal to the Planning Inspectorate, on conservation grounds.</p> <p>The narrow single track lane that accesses the site would become the scene of regular conflict as vehicle traffic is likely to increase 5 fold with an extra 2 cars to each house on top of the single car From No 38 that presently uses the whole of the lane</p> <p>There is no evidence that the former small holding ever had more than an occasional motorized vehicle visit. We recall produce being taken out by wheel barrow, but as can be seen, the site has been out of use since the mid 1980's and the greenhouse in a state of decay with 2 decaying Riley cars inside it.</p> <p>The Planning Officer's Report to the 26th May Central Planning Committee Meeting states at paragraph 4.1.7 that there is no objection from SC Highways however that is not the true picture. The full Highways Advice Note (attached) from consultant Mouchel, also lays down a Condition that the lane should be widened to allow vehicles to pass. Also it is only a Desk Top Study. A previous objection from SC Highways is also attached.</p> <p>There is no up to date tree removal plan for the revised application dated April 2016, which shows the 2 houses in new positions. The plan shows all trees being removed from the central part of the site and along the southern boundary apart from one damson tree, actually about 50 trees in total. The back gardens of the houses on Longden Road would be opened up to the new development. There should at least be a condition for new hedging.</p> <p>I understand that a montage has been requested for the view of the site from the north (Bee Hive Lane) side but what about the view from the south where most people live?</p> <p>What is paramount is that the Radbrook Valley should not be eroded further by development contrary to our own Council's Planning policies for the area.</p>		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	15/05091/FUL	Neighbour/third party

Copy of letter circulated to committee members from third party:

Dear Councillors, we are grateful that you have agreed to hear this application in the interests of our Shrewsbury community.

Our local Councillor and Shrewsbury Town Council have made eloquent representation on the need for the protection of this Conservation area, enshrined in previous Council policy decisions. Conservation in its widest sense, not just on the visual aspects of the intrusion of the development into the green lung of the Rad Valley.

Even if these visual aspects were the only issue, the Applicant's revised drawing 17th June (sectional drawings of site) shows that the houses will be seen from across the valley - particularly in the winter months when the deciduous trees have lost their leaves. The conditions propose only to protect new tree planting for a period of 5 years - a very short time - and much less than the age now of the trees proposed to be cut.

The current proposed design places the driveway to plot 2 curving around Plot 1, deep into the site and parallel with the long NW boundary with the field below. This will have detrimental consequences for the Conservation area as a whole as it brings vehicles including delivery vehicles, and particularly diesel vehicles into much nearer proximity with this field - with consequences for light, noise and atmospheric pollution levels.

The conditions mention bat boxes and matters pertaining to external lighting. But no mention of the effects of vehicle headlights, possibly on full beam in the long hours of darkness during the day in the winter months.

We at 38 will be particularly affected by this as headlights emerging from Plot 2 will shine directly into our lounge and bedroom windows particularly in the dark daytime hours of winter and our hedge is deciduous.

We ask Councillors to give detailed consideration to the safety issues detailed by the Highways Department previously and the observations and photographs we, and neighbours, have submitted which give some evidence as to the problems.

Councillors will want to ensure that the access to the development from Longden Road does not risk the safety and well-being of other road users. Particularly children on foot or cycle. No figures have been provided by the Planning Department for the increase in vehicle traffic on Longden Road between years 1988 and 2016. A period of 28 years of rapid change, with much increased car use, life style choices, and delivery vehicles associated with on-line shopping, and the reorganisation of secondary schools nearby. Nor the more recent housing developments taking place in the area. Longden Road is often the route of choice for vehicles accessing English Bridge.

If it is proposed any work is done to improve the access way, then we would wish Cllrs. If they can to make provision in the conditions to prevent flooding onto our property.

We would also ask Cllrs. if the application is approved to set any conditions they can relating to the digging up of the access way to provide services such as to enable to access our neighbours and our own property, and to ensure that our telephone line is not damaged by high vehicles.

We ask Councillors to follow up the question we put today to the Planning Officer- concerning the Site Area "Whether ALL **Page 2** shown edged in red on the location plan

is within the ownership of the applicant as it would appear this may not be the case.”

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	15/05091/FUL	Agent

Further letter submitted by agent in support of the application:

We listened carefully to the comments made at the previous meeting and in response we have walked the length of the public footpath (Shropshire Way) on the other side of the valley and taken a number of photographs from selected points along the route. The photos are attached for reference. The route is heavily screened and you can see virtually nothing of the site from this side of the valley.. We would ask that you consider walking the route on Thursday to see first-hand how limited the impact of development will be.

There is no public access to the land in the valley itself however we have provided an additional cross-section (attached) to illustrate a view from the valley. Please note this is taken assuming the land is level. In reality it falls away relatively steeply thus further minimising the impact of the development proposals. Whilst the representations shows the trees in full growth all of these will be protected and retained as part of the development proposals. There will also be a further 15 metre planting belt on western boundary.

Finally we would maintain that the proposed design of the dwelling is appropriate having regard to the scale and design of existing properties in the vicinity of the site. Great care has been taken to ensure the ridge height of the development is no higher than the neighbouring property and each plot will benefit from ample parking and amenity space.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	15/05091/FUL	Planning Officer and Agent

Following the issue of whether the whole of the site edged red in the application submission is owned by the applicants, Officers have requested confirmation from the applicant’s agent that all of the land included in the red site outline is within their client’s ownership. Their response is set out below:

There is a small section of land between the proposed site and my client’s land which is outside their ownership. This is shown hatched attached (drawing SA19375/03). My client has full access rights to the site and this is confirmed in his title deeds. We have also served the necessary notice.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	15/04910/OUT	Agent

Members are reminded that they originally resolved to approve the application on 04th February 2016.

The Inn on the Green is owned by the applicant for this proposed development.

The existing public house would be retained as part of the proposal with the beer garden relocated elsewhere – It is therefore difficult to acknowledge how the application would

result in a conflict with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CS8.

Members are reminded that if they are minded to refuse the application, they are not properly exercising their development management responsibilities and their actions are delaying development which should be permitted.

Should the application be challenged at appeal, an award of costs claim would be made by the appellant.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	15/04709/EIA	Applicant
Additional information has been submitted by the applicant in relation to access routes. In order for Officers to consider the information the recommendation is to defer a decision.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	16/02049/FUL	SC Ecology
The Ecological Report that has been submitted is only a summary of findings so far. No formal comments will be provided until the full survey report has been submitted.		
Should the Ecological Report be submitted in advance of Committee and provided SC Ecology are able to supply a consultation response, this will be provided as a verbal update at Committee.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9	16/01776/FUL The Beach, Hills Lane	Planning Officer
The report states that the existing floor area of the Beach is 316 sqm and the floor area of the proposed additional first floor is 215sqm. Licensing has confirmed that the licence does not restrict the number of customers but that it is covered by the Fire Risk Assessment.		
I have contacted the applicant who has confirmed that the existing capacity downstairs is 350 and that upstairs would be an additional 225.		