



Date: Tuesday, 24 October 2017

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

Agenda Item 12

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 24th October 2017		
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:
6	17/00298/FUL 9, 10 and 11 Lower Forge Cottages, Eardington	Neighbour
<p>Further comments received from an objector which are summarised below. (The full text is available to view on the planning website file):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Disagree with report statement that there will not be a significant impact from overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing of neighbouring residential properties – building 2.5m x 3.75m on the property line and 3m from front door of no.8. -Does not comply with Core Strategy policy. -Would be 60cm from property boundary line. -This large wall with possibly a fence in front of extension wall not appropriate for a rural hamlet. -Existing front extensions to the three existing cottages are modest being 1.35m, 1.75m and 2.5m compared to 3.75m of proposal. -Extension out of character and distorting. -Compete with traditional appearance of existing cottages. -Would completely hedges in no.8 overwhelming it and the whole terrace. -Affect view from no.8 <p>Does not comply with section 12 of the NPPF where it states “where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of any heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -9, 10,11 will not be allowed to deteriorate as they, and the large plot that goes with them, are too valuable. -Under Article 8 of Human Rights consider that, as owner of no.8, feel there is no respect for private life and the peaceful enjoyment of the possession of a modest but charming property. 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	17/03179/FUL Russells Caravan Park, Quatford	Planning Officer
<p>The update to the Ecological Report referred to in the Committee Report and the recommendation has now been received. This advises that the surveys carried out included all the land to which the current planning application relates and, as there has been no change in the use of the land in question since 2015, a repeat site survey has not been considered necessary. There are no changes to the conclusions of the Ecological Assessment.</p> <p>The recommended condition 10 is amended to:</p> <p>10. The development shall be carried out in accordance with section 4.2.6 of the Ecological Assessment (Turnstone Ecology, October 2017, Ref TT1813).</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the protection of reptiles.</p>		

The recommendation is amended to:

Grant Permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to ensure no stationing of caravans on the alternative site area and a rolling programme to ensure that the area retains tree cover, and to the conditions set out in Appendix 1.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	17/03179/FUL Russells Caravan Park, Quatford	Neighbour

Further comments received from objector, which are summarised as follows. (The full text of the comments may be viewed on the planning website file):

- Adverse impact on adjacent residential park Hollins Park Estates Ltd.
- Question number of caravans on Russell's Park compared to licence.
- No special reasons to justify a departure from the green belt policy.
- Would overdevelop an existing site.
- Bring further noise and nuisance closer to a residential site.
- The two sites have a very different client base to the individual businesses.
- Would not wish to see a business fail, but feel Russell's caravan park has already exceeded the limitations of the site land and that further development should not be allowed by stealth or encroachment onto the green belt land.