



Date: Tuesday, 31 January 2017

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

Agenda Item 10

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 31st January 2017		
<p>NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee.</p> <p>Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	16/01735/OUT (Aspen Grange, Weston Rhyn)	Objector
<p>Correspondence has been received from one objector raising concerns that the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and committee report do not take into account the information on the Environment Agency website that the site is at risk of surface water flooding.</p> <p>The objector has also questioned why this site is being considered ahead of the brownfield site in Rhoswiel which has been with the Council since 2014.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/03082/REM (Rush Lane, Market Drayton)	Objector
<p>Correspondence has been received raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not enough time between publication of the latest plans and the committee meeting - Issue of legality of crossing and accessing Rush Lane not clarified - No turning circle for Rush Lane residents, which is a prescriptive right - Lack of access to Meadow Close will increase impact on Rush Lane - Distance between plot 45 and Berwyn will impact on amenity - Council not enforcing conditions on outline consent - Residents of Rush Lane have not been consulted 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/03082/REM (Rush Lane, Market Drayton)	Adjacent land owner
<p>Correspondence has been received from the adjacent land owner, his planning agent and solicitor.</p> <p>The land owner has written directly to members and suggested that is willing to offer David Wilson Homes (DWH) the land which he controls to the west of Rush Lane to allow the crossing of Rush Lane to be north of the existing houses and to allow pedestrian access to Longslow Road. The land owner also comments that the retention of ransom strips along the east boundary has killed any chances of the sports pitches relocating.</p> <p>The planning agent (HOW Planning) has commented that the red line of the current application does not match the red line of the outline because of the ransom strips retained (no in DWH ownership). The agent also comments that his client can deliver his site east of Rush Lane via an alternative access but the ransom strips will prevent vehicular, bus and pedestrian linkages.</p> <p>The agent has commented on the width of some of the roads, the lack of connection to Longslow Road (which prevents future vehicular access), the removal of the pedestrian link over Meadow Close and the inability of emergency vehicles to turn from Rush Lane into the development.</p> <p>The Solicitor (on behalf of the adjacent land owner) has questioned the ability of DWH to develop the site as not all of the land is within their ownership. Considers that the</p>		

retention of control strips on the eastern boundary of the site means that DWH cannot comply with the conditions on the outline consent. Suggested a condition requiring the construction of the roads up to their clients land through a S38 agreement and comments that the decision would be legally flawed without such a condition.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/03082/REM (Rush Lane, Market Drayton)	Severn Trent Water

Having received the consultation for the above planning application, I have the following comments to make.

The submitted Drainage Layout plans (Drawings: 402 C & 401 E) shows all foul sewage is proposed to discharge to the public foul sewer, and all surface water is proposed to discharge to a swale. Based upon these proposals I can confirm we have no objections to the discharge of the drainage related condition.

Please note for the use or reuse of sewer connections either direct or indirect to the public sewerage system the applicant will be required to make a formal application to the Company under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. They may obtain copies of our current guidance notes and application form from either our website or by contact our Development Services Team.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	16/05607/FUL	Objectors

Further objections received raising the following matters:

- Developer has no knowledge of how the mast may affect the mobile phone systems that local residents rely on for internet connection
- Studies have shown that these masts can be responsible for cancer clusters and heart issues (as I have had open heart surgery and a replacement valve I am particularly concerned about this)
- Query whether any sound trials have been submitted as the type of solar panel has been changed to one with a self-contained transformer
- Query the need for the 65 ft mast
- If the mast is to be removed by October 2017 regardless of whether a fibre connection is on site or not, would query why the mast is being put up in the first place
- BBC Wales has reported that BT has said that work to deliver access to superfast broadband to homes and businesses is being delayed by the challenges of putting in fibre optic cables; issues are in getting access to land or permission to dig, and road closures
- Unclear what impacts the mast would have on public health or local internet connections
- Developer was fully aware that an internet/broadband mast was necessary for the site to become operational when the planning application for the solar farm was submitted; query whether planning permission for the solar farm would have been granted if the mast had been included at that time
- Query why the mast is proposed for 3 years when the applicant has a 'commitment' to remove the mast by 30/6/17
- Query what penalties would be applied if the applicant fails to adhere to the deadline
- Issue relating to Renewable Obligation Certificates is a business issue, not a planning issue
- 'oversight' over lack of suitable broadband connection suggests total lack of competence or blatant attempt to misinform
- Shows a creeping development strategy by the applicant

This page is intentionally left blank