



Date: Thursday, 26 October 2017

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Shelley Davies, Committee Officer  
Tel: 01743 257718  
Email: [shelley.davies@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto: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**

<b>CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS</b>		
<b>Date: 26 October 2017</b>		
<b>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</b>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	17/04172/DIS: Land at Barker Street	Shrewsbury TC
<p>The Town Clerk and a couple of members of the Planning Committee met with the architect to look at the re-design.</p> <p>As a result the Town Council is supportive of the new designs and commends the architect for his interpretation of the local vernacular reflected in the new design. With that in mind the Town Council recommends approval of the application.</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	17/04172/DIS: Land at Barker Street	Shrewsbury Civic Society
<p>The Civic Society objects to this application.</p> <p>We recognise the huge importance of this site as it is at an entrance to Shrewsbury Centre. Any decisions (albeit concerning an application for Discharge of Condition 5) will shape the future of this part of the town. We appreciated Councillors' decision to defer determination from 28th September, (although we would have liked an independent design review). The reasons stated for that deferral were to seek design modifications and a full application for the whole project in order to evaluate its full visual impact.</p> <p>The most recent plans made public on 17th October seek to address previous criticisms and we think pitched roofs are more appropriate here. We note the changes made from the previous design but this application is 'the tail that will wag the dog' for the rest of the area. Consequently, we agree with Councillors' request to see the full application. This has yet to appear and so we think this Discharge Application should be delayed again.</p> <p>We are aware of the Council's commitment to provide student accommodation and certainly wish to facilitate the university's growth. However, this should not lead to any demise of the town's visual amenity for future generations.</p> <p>The documents concerning the Discharge of Condition 5 go well beyond what should be included in a 'Condition'. The public has had precious little opportunity to comment. While for many Discharges of Condition this may be acceptable, in this case, Block C's facade may determine much of the streetscape. The timescales have again been frustratingly short. The Town Council's views were hastily changed by just two Councillors with an officer and the architect. Few others have had an opportunity to comment, although Mr Kilby kindly showed the amendments to some Civic Society members on 12th October. We were able to collate thoughts on Monday at our Planning Meeting from a dozen or so professionals and others. The planning process for this site has been wrong from the start. The perceived need for student accommodation has been dominant; restricting timescales and undermining the site's importance. The situation with designs of insufficiently high quality have been exacerbated by these factors.</p> <p>Several of our architects have detailed views about the site and the amended design but</p>		

they largely relate to Block C together with the suggested “infill”. These amended plans have been available for little more than a week and so there are few, if any, comments from the public.

Consequently, we still object. Despite the currently indeterminate accommodation need, we ask you to resist approval until a fuller picture is clear.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/04590/FUL: Wenlock Road	Cllr Parsons

I am pleased to see that the financial contribution to affordable housing has been improved to £177k although this is still a long way short of what I believe it should be.

I am disappointed that M&S are unwilling to accept an overage clause which would merely state that if they did meet a 20% return on investment that they would pay more. Despite pleading poverty re this investment maybe they are wary because they know they will make a good return.

I now take a neutral stance to this development rather than supporting or opposing.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9	17/03276/FUL: 42 Rothley Close	Neighbour at No.39

The neighbouring resident at No.39 Rothley Close has provided these additional comments ascertaining to the Officers Report:

**Dear Sirs - Re Development Management Report Public Document 9.**

May I draw your attention to various mistakes, errors and elements of bias contained in the above document.

Section 2.1 - The application site is not surrounded on all sides with boundaries formed of close boarded fencing lined in places with hedging trees and ornamental planting. Two boundaries have such fencing and there is no ornamental planting within the application site.

Section 4.1.1 The objection raised by Shrewsbury Town Council should read as relating to No 41 not No 40 (a simple mistake). Carol at Shrewsbury Town Council is attempting to contact all concerned prior to the committee meeting, unfortunately Councillor Roberts is currently unavailable due to Hospital treatment.

Section 4.2.1 Three representations have been notified not two. The one in support is from a property some 40m away set at a much lower level with a high hedge in the way - this supporter will see little if any of the proposed extensions.

Section 6.3.4 The applicants proposal to retain the close boarded fence between our property (No 39) and the application site is pointless as the fence is ours to decide on not his.

The trees to the West of the application site are deciduous and provide screening for only part of the year and will no doubt be subjected to pruning back to the boundary and major damage to root systems as increased foundations will be required for the two storey extension. Can they survive, probably not? If not no mention should be made of the screening effect!

Section 6.4.3 The existing dwelling does not adjoin No 39 and the proposed

extension together with the already erected play house and high hedge that both sit well above the fence line, will mean that very nearly 40% of the boundary (in full view from the house) will be directly adjacent to erections. This plus further views of the proposed extension seen from an angle.

Section 4.6.6 The increase in in construction directly adjacent to the boundary of No 39 will be 3.9m not 3m.

The distances from our stepped rear elevation (No 39) to the west boundary of the application site are 8.5m and 10.6m not 10.2m and 12.4m as stated.

Section 6.4.9 The perceived overlooking from the West elevation of the application has no validity as the existing window is already obscured.

#### Others

1. No mention of construction damage or encroachment is made given that the boundary between No 39 and the proposed two story extension is only 1m and the boundary belongs to No's 39 & 41,
2. At no time has the applicant felt that he should discuss his proposals with us.
3. We reiterate that we do not object in principle to extending the property at No 42 but we do object to the insensitive nature of the application as proposed and again draw attention to our proposal of single storey extension to front, west side and rear and double story in place of the proposed single story extension to the East (this would not cause a problem with the adjacent property on that side due to the angle of plots, this would give a very similar size increase to the current application.

**This page is intentionally left blank**