

Date: Tuesday, 6 September 2016

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Emily Marshall, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257717
Email: emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk

NORTH 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

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 6 th September 2016		
<p>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</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	15/02839/FUL (Shawbury)	Agent
<p>The agent has responded as follows to the request from the Highways (Development Control) officer for a vehicle routing restriction to avoid Wem:</p> <p><i>'We are more than happy to agree to a routing restriction condition. Our clients have always worked with the local authority on open or confidential base and we will continue to do so, even if little extra mileage cost for benefit of local community. We would suggest the following:</i></p> <p><i>The route would be right turn in Quina Brook to the A49 South and then left on to the B5063 for loads on manure being delivered to the digester only'.</i></p> <p>The vehicle routing restriction will need to form part of a section 106 Legal Agreement in the event that the application is approved.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/01575/FUL (Warrant Road)	Local resident – objection
<p>Further representation summarised as follows (full representation is available on the planning file/online planning register):</p> <p><u>Noise:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is an error in the noise report in the calculation used to estimate the sound reduction index of the hangar - This has grave implications for Dutton Close residents as it is probably over-estimating the sound reduction effects of the hangar - An independent sound specialist should examine the claims made by the applicant's noise consultant - Updated noise report states that the walls of the hangar are of solid masonry 0.25-0.35 metres thick and not at least one metre thick as previously stated, but the predicted values for the sound reduction have not changed, nor has the estimated noise impact on the nearest sensitive operators - In addition the noise insulating properties of the building are likely to be further reduced due to the gaps under the door - Site was very noisy the other day with vehicle beepers clearly audible along with various other construction type noises - If this is before the facility opens residents will be forced to take out repeated civil actions against the business for unreasonable levels of noise if it becomes operational - As the Greenvale potato factory closed in 2014, the correct background environmental noise levels to compare the proposed traffic volumes with are the current (post Greenvale) traffic volumes, not that experienced during the Greenvale operation - The Environmental Permit does not cover the travel of vehicles outwith the site, therefore the environmental nuisance and health implications of this increased traffic has not been factored into the noise report - Baseline measurements of noise is based on one set of continuous measurements carried out in May; not an accurate reflection across the year; 		

<p>noise levels are disproportionately high during this period due to birdsong; stochastic events like helicopter flying are not adequately modelled</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs to be some evaluation of the impact of the wind on noise; noise assessment uses wind data from a site 50-60 miles away; query why data from Shawbury was not used, as this is closer to the site - Noise report contains unwarranted bias: states that intervening buildings may screen noise from sensitive locations, however it does not mention that these buildings could act as a source of echo as sound waves are reflected off solid structures - Report claims 'subjectively the crusher will be inaudible' but this is unlikely given that construction noise and sound of beepers is already very loud and clearly audible at present - Noise report does not evaluate effects of multiple pieces of equipment being operated simultaneously, so will underestimate noise impact - Noise-attenuating properties of the hangar have not been fully evaluated - Query what the impact of leaving doors open during operations will be - Crusher should be brought on to site so that noise can be measured - Maurice Chandler building should also be included as a nearest sensitive operator - Frequency of use of crusher should be specified <p><u>Environmental Permit:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns about the legality of the Environmental Permit - Concerns over lack of public consultation in respect of the application for an Environmental Permit - Formal complaint has been made to the Environment Agency over lack of public consultation 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/01575/FUL	Local resident – objection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Already a reasonable amount of noise pollution from the A41, the sawmill and weekend racing somewhere nearby - Sound and smells carry a significant distance in this area 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/01575/FUL	Local residents – objection
<p>A petition has been submitted, signed by 194 residents, objecting to the proposals. It states that it is from: concerned citizens who urge our Councillors to act now to object to this planning application.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/01575/FUL	Local residents – objection
<p>A copy of an electronic petition has been submitted, objecting to the proposals, on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Far too close to residents, Maurice Chandler Sports Centre; for health issues and noise/dust/traffic; going 24 hours 7 days a week; polluting the area. <p>The petition has support from 104 residents.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/01575/FUL	Local residents – objection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal will not help the Stoke Heath as a Community Hub which will provide for a limited amount of future housing growth - Over 150 people live within the Hub, some already with health issues, i.e. breathing illness, which will be affected by the development - Impact on over 600 people attending Sports Centre per week; on residents of Warrant Road; on HM Prison staff and inmates 		

- Cyclist route		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/01575/FUL	Local resident – objection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have heard a video of several working mobile crushers and the noise is horrendous; additional noise with HGVs (one every 2 minutes), public vehicles visiting the site; fork lift trucks; diggers; loads being dumped - Having a waste site less than 200 metres away is not a fair balance between human rights Article 8 for the right to respect private and family life, and Article 1 for peaceful enjoyment of possessions, and the rights and freedoms of others 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	15/05047/REM (Chester Road)	Officer
<p>Paragraph 3.1 of the officer report is not complete and should read: <i>The Town Council view is contrary to the officer recommendation and raises material planning considerations which the local member, chair and vice chair agree are material planning considerations and should be debated at committee</i></p> <p>The affordable housing contribution noted at 6.1.2 is incorrect and should be £18,000.</p> <p>The following amendment to condition 2 is also recommended: <i>The proposed surface water drainage scheme for each dwelling shall be installed in accordance with the approved drainage plan and details prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved.</i> <i>Reason: To ensure that the surface water drainage systems are adequate and to minimise flood risk.</i></p> <p>Condition 3 should be deleted as the landscaping plan has been submitted and can be approved as part of the list of approved plans and the retention of the trees is dealt with by condition 11 on the outline consent and condition 4 on the reserved matters consent.</p>		

This page is intentionally left blank