



Date: Tuesday, 6 December 2016

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Linda Jeavons, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257716
Email: linda.jeavons@shropshire.gov.uk

SOUTH 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

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 6th December 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:
8	16/03288/FUL Parking bays at Woodberry Close, Bridgnorth	Ward Member Cllr Les Winwood
<p>I am sorry I cannot be with you and attend the planning meeting, but I feel strongly about the Woodberry Close project and how essential it is.</p> <p>To the majority of 60 plus houses and residents it will help.</p> <p>This project will put right years of abuse ,it will give the vast majority in this lovely Close a much better environment and much needed parking. We have built on their garages and the parking scheme will not only benefit the few houses that will not have access but all residents. ,it is a narrow carriageway and will help keep the Highway clear for residents and emergency vehicles.</p> <p>The planting and bollards will restore the green to its former self and keep the pathways Clear of mud. It is the best opportunity to improve the area for all and although we looked at other ideas nothing else was financially viable.</p> <p>Please support the scheme and all its benefits.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	16/03288/FUL Parking bays at Woodberry Close, Bridgnorth	Neighbour
<p>A few weeks ago the highway advice note was posted and promptly disappeared. When it went up again a few days later we took screen shots of it and sure enough it disappeared again. With comments such as: "Do not approve on the grounds that it is considered by the introduction of the formal parking spaces will cause a conflict with the existing driveways of houses within Woodberry Close", "The driveways are existing and as such need to be rationalised as part of any scheme being introduced here. A suggestion to lay a strip of Grasscrete to provide access to the frontages could be considered." and "...this scheme needs to be reconsidered in light of the existing residential driveways with which it is in direct conflict." our hopes were raised that this would be in our favour for the planning committee to reject the council's current unworkable plan. You can imagine our surprise then when the detailed refutation of the plans was replaced by a short email (screenshot also attached) saying the highways agency "raised no objection to the granting of consent".</p> <p>We'd be very grateful if you could let us know how the Highways agency came to that conclusion after their consultation indicated exactly the opposite. We'd also feel this should be aired publicly at the planning committee meeting next week, and the committee be presented with the original highway advice note. The reason for committee determination is stated to be because it is an application by the council. We assume this is so that there is a process whereby the council cannot simply 'rubber stamp' its own application. As such as we feel it is important that the committee is aware that the council</p>		

appears to be deleting documents from the planning application that do not fit with its desired outcome, then writing their own documents that state the opposite.

On the previous occasion that the committee considered these plans common sense was allowed to prevail. This time round the process is giving the impression that something underhand is going on.

Officer Comment:

The Highways Development Control Manager South has explained that Shropshire Council currently commission the majority of planning responses to Engineering consultants Mouchel. Mouchel provide a technical review of planning applications, however it is at the discretion of the Commissioner to identify applications for additional review and scrutiny. In terms of this application, the response was intended to be reviewed by the Commissioner prior to issuing formal comments, regrettably this did not occur on this occasion. The Mouchel comments should not have been posted direct to the Council's website.

The original withdrawn planning application, reference 14/00199/FUL was submitted by Shropshire Council, however was designed by Mouchel. This application was subsequently withdrawn following comments received from South Planning Committee. The revised application currently under consideration was re-submitted without the technical support of Mouchel, this application was then reviewed by Mouchel, and formal comments submitted on the 18th November.

This reviewed identified a number of valid issues with the proposed design, as a result, a meeting was held with Shropshire Council's Estate team and the Highways Development Control Manager to review the comments received by Mouchel, to establish any amendments to the design would be possible. A revised design was then submitted and reviewed by Mouchel, without the knowledge of some of the design limitations.

Mouchel's recommendation was not intended as an objection to submitted application, they considered that some of the previously submitted comments had not been addressed. As stated above, regrettably when the application was reviewed they were not aware of discussions that had taken place between the applicant/submitting team and the Highways Development Control Manager.

With regard to points raised by the Mouchel comments, each is set out below with an Officer response:

Mouchel: The green amenity space forms a barrier to the frontages of houses 6-12 but the majority of these dwellings have installed driveways for parking even though there is no legal access. The options explored by the applicant include an access road for which they have asked for economic contributions from the residents affected. As this has not been forthcoming, the applicant has resorted to introducing more parking spaces plus the physical means to block vehicular access to the green amenity area.

The driveways are existing and as such need to be rationalised as part of any scheme introduced here. A suggestion to lay a strip of Grasscrete to provide access to the house frontages could be considered.

Officer Comment: The exiting driveways have been established over a number of years, as per Mouchels comments on this matter the driveways are not legal, which has

created a situation whereby vehicles are driving along the verge and footway compromising the safety of other road users, and the proposed scheme seeks to eliminate these manoeuvres. It is understood that an access arrangement to the hardstandings within the curtilages of the dwellings was explored with the owners, but that they were unable to contribute financially to the provision of an access for their benefit. It should be noted that the installation of bollards up to 1 metre in height to prevent vehicular access over the land could be done without the need to obtain planning permission, due to the provisions in Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended.

Mouchel: Four bays on the plan are for disabled vehicle users and grasscrete is not an acceptable surface as people with impaired mobility need a stable, flat, smooth surface. A tarmac path has been added around the disabled user bays.

Officer Comment: Any adjustments needed to the surfacing of the disabled parking bays can be addressed through the recommended condition 6.

Mouchel: The plan shows that the four disabled user bays are to be placed together to the south-west of the connecting path. It would be preferable to site them two together, either side of the footpath to keep them as close as possible to this connecting path.

Officer Comment: The above Mouchel comment is expressed as a preference. It is not considered to warrant a request to the applicants to re-design the proposed scheme.

Mouchel: It should be further considered as to the need for this many or even any disabled user bays and whether or not any request for such has been forthcoming from any residents. There is no legislation stating that these bays need to be installed and guidelines would only offer that one be installed. This amount seems excessive for a residential scheme where it is likely that they will either lie empty causing frustration or they will be abused which will devalue them.

Officer Comment: The above observations strays from the Mouchel highway safety remit. It is understood that this point has been considered by the applicant to establish if the proposed level of disabled parking is appropriate. The number of proposed spaces is consistent with the original design, and maximises the number of parking spaces provided, this matter was explained by the applicant. It is a matter for the applicant to decide the number of disabled parking spaces they wish to include in a scheme of this nature to meet present and future requirements.

Mouchel: In addition, two sets of several garages in the close have been demolished and additional houses with their own parking have replaced them. If the loss of the parking provided by the garages were to impinge on the parking in the close, it would seem perverse for this to have been allowed to happen in the light of this application.

Officer Comment: The loss of the parking courts was a matter considered in the assessment of the planning application (ref 13/02433/FUL) for the erection of affordable dwellings on them, and included details showing their underuse.

Mouchel: Most people affected by this proposal have acquired their own parking and do not require the parking spaces proposed which, with the addition of bollards, will effectively bar them from using their own driveways to park or cause them to drive along footpaths rather than just cross them.

Although emergency vehicles will 'manage' from the road, they are more effective when close in to a property and the bollard scheme will block their option of attending directly outside one of these properties.

As such, this scheme needs to be reconsidered in light of the existing residential driveways with which it is in direct conflict.

Officer Comment: The properties in question have not received the consent of Shropshire Council to drive over public open space grass to reach parking areas formed within their residential curtilages, and the applicants have not been able to come to an agreement with the property owners on a scheme that would maintain such access. The Highways Development Control Manager has advised emergency vehicles will be able to access properties, and this will not be compromised, but there is a requirement to restrict the current vehicle movements occurring.

In view of the above, the Highways Development Control Manager considers that the proposed works are acceptable from a Highways perspective, and there are no grounds to raise a Highway objection to the application.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9	16/01597/FUL – Dwelling to the South of Hopesay Farm, Hopesay	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Shropshire

CPRE Shropshire would like to object to this application on the grounds that it does not fulfill the aims of SAMDev in which "sites for infilling should be small scale and meet local demand." The proposed house is too large and will be unlikely to meet local demand. The design is inappropriate in the conservation area.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9	16/01597/FUL – Dwelling to the South of Hopesay Farm, Hopesay	Cllr Boddington

Cllr Boddington requested details of the current number of open market houses with planning permission within the Community Cluster for the plan period. The figures are set out below: -

Cluster Settlement Cluster Guideline - 15	Number of <u>Open Market</u> houses permitted between 2006 – 2016	Planning references
Hopesay	0	
Aston on Clun	6	16/03508/FUL – 1 dwelling; 16/01679/FUL – 2 dwellings (conversion) 16/00142/FUL – 1 dwelling 14/02697/OUT – 1

			dwelling 14/01573/FUL – 1 dwelling
Broome	7		14/033453/OUT – 5 (1 affordable) 12/00640/FUL – 1 (conversion) 13/04702/OUT - 1 dwelling
Beambridge	0		
Long Meadow End	0		
Round Oak	0		
Rowton	0		
Total Number of open market houses permitted	<u>13</u>		

Officer Notes: -

Of the above planning permissions granted two are for outline planning consent (the first for a total of 5 of the units (including 1 affordable dwelling) and the second for a single unit). The reserved matters applications have yet to be submitted.

In addition to the above planning consents since 2006 planning permission has also been granted for two replacement dwellings in Aston on Clun (13/01211/FUL and 15/0222/FUL). In Hopesay itself there has been one planning permission for an affordable dwelling, SS/1/09/21621/F, land off Red Lane, Hopesay, occupancy restricted by S106.

Core Strategy CS4 and SAMDev policy MD1 relate to the provision of new open market dwellings and therefore, for the purposes of the number houses permitted which would contribute towards the settlement guidelines in the SAMDev, housing with restricted occupancy such as affordable or rural workers dwellings would not be included in the count as these dwelling types are subject to separate planning policies and maybe permitted in rural locations regardless of whether a site is a community hub or cluster.

The cluster guideline for around 15 dwellings would not be exceeded if the current proposal is granted planning permission.

This page is intentionally left blank