



Date: Tuesday, 16 June 2015

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Linda Jeavons, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 252738
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 9

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 16th June 2015		
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	15/00535/FUL	Shropshire Division Member
<p>I am unable to attend the meeting and I have the following comments to make with regard to this application as the local member.</p> <p>Having read the Officer's report in my opinion it is clear that the original intention was to allocate this area as a play area under the original planning application 69/2541 November 1969. Although no play equipment was provided it has continued to perform the role of a play area for local children and continues to do so to this day.</p> <p>This area of land offers very vital open space and is a valued green space which offers a safe place for young children to undertake informal play. It is not surplus to requirements as the top of the village which houses a high number of family homes has no other open space which allows children to meet and play.</p> <p>At 6.1.8 the report makes reference to the recreation ground and the Severn Valley Country Park. Both of these, although given as being in close proximity require supervised journeys to and from the relevant sites for young children. There is no pavement and only a permissive footpath for a section of the route to the Country Park.</p> <p>However if the Committee are indeed minded to grant planning on this site, in my opinion, as family homes are to be created it would require a play area to be created at the top of the village by the applicant.</p> <p>Finally if planning is granted that the Local Lettings Policy is applied to allow local families in need of housing to be housed within their community, as this would make the provision of affordable housing more acceptable locally in my opinion (as at Condition 18 in the Report).</p>		
<p>Officers comments:-</p> <p>With respect to the penultimate paragraph above the agents have been approached regarding the option of providing an alternative play area at the top of the village and have responded as follows:</p> <p>“STaR Housing has investigated this some months ago, and had an agreement in principle from Shropshire Council to be able to gift the triangular piece of land at the junction of Chapel Road to the Parish Council. A drawing was produced that illustrated how the land might be used and a cost plan was calculated that indicated the likely capital costs of such equipment and materials. As STaR Housing has limited budgets to build affordable homes we would not be in a position to either maintain such an area or indeed purchase the equipment. Initially we may have been able to make a contribution if policy restrictions hadn't prevented us from building a market sale unit to subsidise the scheme. Unfortunately developing small infill sites for affordable homes is a costly exercise, having no benefit from economies of scale that larger private developers enjoy.</p> <p>Discussions were had with the Parish Council about the provision of a play area, and we were told that it was something that the Parish Council could not afford either.”</p>		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	15/00535/FUL	Officer
<p>With respect to paragraph 6.2.11 of the Officer report which refers to the submission of finished floor levels the following additional condition is recommended:</p> <p>Before any development commences, details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: sections through the site (to a recognised scale) showing existing and proposed levels across the site and immediately adjoining the site; and finished floor levels. The work shall be carried out in accordance with such details as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to safeguard the amenities of nearby residential properties. This information is required prior to the commencement of the development as it relates to matters which need to be confirmed before the development proceeds in order to ensure a sustainable development.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	15/00535/FUL	Objector – Mrs Louise Hart
<p>Comments that “This green space is not only used by children to play and locals to walk dogs but also the space has been used for the air ambulance to land on!”</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	15/01238/FUL	Caynham Parish Council
<p>Caynham parish Council objects to the application. The development site is in close proximity to the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and would have a detrimental and visual impact upon the environment, character and landscape of the area. Accordingly the proposal would be contrary to core strategy policies CS5 and CS17 whereby the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	15/01238/FUL	Save South Shropshire Countryside
<p>Maintains its objection as stated in response to the original application and summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It would severely damage the character and appearance of the South Shropshire Countryside; 2) It would seriously damage aspects of the rural economy, particularly those associated with tourism and recreation; 3) The proposals for the maintenance of the site and its ultimate restoration lack consistency, credibility and capability of enforcement; 4) In view of the number of similar proposals in the pipeline, approval would set a lamentably low standard of assessment and justification for applications and, if this standard were to be consistently applied would make refusal or almost any proposal difficult. As the Council is aware there are already further proposals in preparation. <p>We accept that the Planning Committee’s decision on the previous application reduces the number of issues to be considered in this case to those set out in the reasons for</p>		

refusal. But we think that our previous objections set out above remain valid for this new application.

The visual impacts will be almost as damaging as for the previous proposal;

The energy benefits are reduced to 50% of those of the previous proposal.

The proposal does not comply with Core Strategy Policy CS5 and CS17, the applicants' policy assessment is unbalanced;

Questions the need for the development;

States that the applicant has understated the importance of the landscape;

Questions the accuracy of the ecological survey;

Advises that none of the landscaping measures is required if the development does not proceed;

Questions the benefits of the scheme and advises there would be none for the local community and there would be a negative impact on tourism.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	15/01238/FUL	Case officer

Clarifications in response to query from Councillor Boddington:

This application is made under the 'free go' provisions and so must conform with the original application area, which it does. There is nothing in the statute to prevent an applicant in such circumstances from retaining the original application area whilst reducing the area of development within it, as long as the nature of the development is the same. In this case landscaping works will take place outside of the area proposed for development but within the red line boundary. The excluded area would remain in pasture use and only the array field would be enclosed by security fencing.

The submitted layout plan confirms that there would be no development in the omitted western field and this would be defined by condition if the application is approved. Hence, whilst there is no proposal to extend into the western field under the current application, were such a proposal to subsequently come forward it would require a separate planning permission. It should however be noted that the renewable energy tariff has recently reduced and this affects the economics of developing sites in excess of 5MW (the current application is for 4.3MW).

As you will be aware, the applicant has submitted an appeal on the previous refusal which involved arrays in the western field, but has confirmed that this would be withdrawn if the current application is approved.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	15/01238/FUL	Objector, Mr Atkinson

Questioning the conclusions of the applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal underplays the effect of the proposals on the landscape and their visibility from surrounding areas and receptors.

Questioning the adequacy of the applicant's proposed screening measures.

Advising that the proposed planting will blot out views along the public footpath.

Stating that the Government advocates siting large scale solar developments in flat landscapes where not overlooked and where effective localised site screening can be achieved.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	15/01238/FUL	Applicant
Details of recent allowed solar park appeals have been provided by the applicant and the applicant for another nearby solar park development who have requested that this information is circulated to the Committee.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	15/01238/FUL	Save South Shropshire Countryside
Details of recent refused solar park appeals have been provided by the Save South Shropshire Countryside group and have been circulated to the Committee.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	15/01238/FUL	Objector - Mr McGuinness
Expressing concern about circulation of the allowed appeal information to the Committee and alleging bias in favour of the applicant.		