

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

Date: 30th May 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:
	16/05408/FUL	Public Protection

A document on the HPA webpages states that no human contraction occurred in the most recent outbreaks and therefore no risk to human health from building above is expected. A link to the document is:

http://www.hpa.org.uk/webc/hpawebfile/hpaweb_c/1274089050185

A further document states the materials and recommended amounts of fuel for pyres.

Link:

http://archive.defra.gov.uk/foodfarm/farmanimal/diseases/atoz/fmd/documents/environmental_report.pdf

The above documents state that air pollution is not considered to be a long term issue but short term increases in certain pollutants due to the burning of any carcasses as a method of disposal were likely at the time. It is stated that fallout from the pyres was not expected to cause any human health impact and therefore this element requires no further thought. Potential ground instability from decomposition resulting in voids where animals were buried may present concerns for the developer.

Gassing was likely but from 1967 burial pits is not expected to be an issue any more. Leaching from a burial pit would have been likely for around 20years and therefore this will have also ceased to be a likely issue in the locality. It would be unlikely that a soil sampling regime would be able to establish if there was any burial pit on site. Geophysical equipment may be able to show any burial pit however this service does not consider it necessary to go to the expense of carrying out such a survey as no documented evidence from the time of the burial is available to us to suggest that a burial site exists.

Having note of the documents and information above we are not of the opinion that a burial pit for livestock due to contracting foot and mouth or for welfare issues at the time of the outbreak in 1967 pose a threat of harm to human health through microbial activity, leachate to water supplies or from gassing of decomposing material. It has not been suggested that a pyre was located on site however chemical traces as a result of any pyre have been tested and documented in the above linked documents. These report that there is no major threat to health as a result of the ash material left behind after a pyre or from the fallout from a pyre. There may be traces of fuel still existing if a pyre was found on site but we have no knowledge of this taking place. Due to the fact that pyres were generally left to burn out it is unlikely that many fuel sources which could be considered as contaminants would be likely to have remained or still be present in sufficient quantities to find land to be considered likely to be contaminated. Adding to this the substantial amount of time that has passed only adds weight to this line of thought.

The Health Protection Agency website has been consulted in regard to any microbial

health affects to humans from foot and mouth and it states that foot and mouth disease is not a public health threat. I am therefore of the opinion that the land is not likely to be contaminated and require further assessment as such. A large burial site may however be a risk to the structural integrity of any development placed over the top of it. The applicant may wish to seek further information in order to establish if a burial pit is located on the proposed site and if so the position and extent.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
	16/05408/FUL	Agent

Regarding the density of the proposed development and its relationship with the built context, I am writing to explain the rationale behind our proposals.

Our starting point was to consider local development plan policy. Policy MD3 of the SAMDEV requires that sites of five or more dwellings include a mix and type of housing that has regard to local evidence and community consultation. The 2014 Strategic Housing Market Assessment states:-

“The Market Drayton’s Community-led Town Plan (2011) highlighted the need for more affordable housing in the area, with 67% of non-home owners stating that they would buy if more affordable housing was available. The Town Plan also highlighted the need for more starter homes and retirement housing facilities. This information was reiterated in the Towns Council’s response to the Place Plan Review 2012/13, which stated that there is a need for limited housing development to meet the needs of local young families and an ageing population”.

It is therefore clear that the housing need in Market Drayton is for smaller, more affordable properties suitable for first time buyers and older residents looking to downsize. Our proposals respond to this need, whereas a development of fewer, larger properties would not.

The other key consideration in preparing our scheme was the wider built context of the site. The site lies on the edge of the Market Drayton Canal Basin Conservation Area, which in our opinion is the most sensitive component of the site’s setting and therefore the most important element for the scheme to address.

Built form within the Market Drayton Canal Basin Conservation Area predominantly consists of terraced dwellings. Approximately 75% of the dwellings within the conservation area are terraced properties. Furthermore, the density of these properties is slightly higher than our proposals. The layout and density of the proposed terraces is therefore in keeping with the prevailing grain of the Conservation Area.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
	16/05408/FUL	Contributor

It should be pointed out that the Supporting statement submitted by JMI Planning 22 May 17 is rather misleading. Firstly, on the point of "Affordable Housing" It has already been pointed out that: "If the development is policy compliant then whilst the Council considers there is an acute need for affordable housing in Shropshire, the Councils housing needs evidence base and related policy pre dates the judgment of the Court of Appeal and subsequent changes to the NPPG, meaning that on balance and at this moment in time, then national policy prevails and no affordable housing contribution would be required in this instance". An important point when taken in context with the comments regarding the

existing built environment and the Canal Conservation area. The Committee should have access to the map <https://new.shropshire.gov.uk/media/1673/market-drayton-canal-basin.pdf> outlining the Conservation area which stretches from canal bridge 64 (A53) to the North and the Aqueduct to the South. All of the existing terraced housing, which is some 20 years old is confined to the North of Betton Road and has been reasonably well designed to work with the Canal and moorings. However, the proposed development to the rear of the Talbot Hotel has no such housing in the immediate area, indeed to the contrary; it is surrounded by the Talbot Hotel, Wharfdale House, Mill Cottage, Nos. 4 & 6 Betton Road (none of which fall inside the Conservation area for some bazar reason), the Granary (Mill), the canal basin, wharf, storage sheds and the two canal bridges 62 & 63, all of which date back to the 19th century.

In addition the housing to the East (Sambrook Crescent) consists of detached executive style housing which fits in reasonably well with the older period dwellings previously mentioned. To suggest that this development is within keeping is absurd!

It should also be noted that this development has no public support and is not supported by the Town Council or The Market Drayton Community Partnership, both of which have an interest in the Towns development, taking account of the wishes of the residents and their wider needs. There is also a major development that has just started on the outskirts of the Town, that will no doubt address the need for a representative proportion of affordable housing and there are a number of brown field sites in the town which desperately need to be developed.

It is quite clear that this proposal is far too dense and completely out of keeping with the immediate surrounding environment. There is perhaps a place for smaller more dense housing, but common sense if nothing else clearly demonstrates that this is not it!

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
	16/05408/FUL	Contributor

The Development Management Report added to the portal as a document on 22nd May makes the following comment

6.9.4

"Comments regarding visibility are difficult to sustain as for the public house to remain as such and the boatyard to remain operational, both would need to ensure appropriate visibility splays for themselves and as such would maintain it for the housing development."

Are we to assume from this comment that should planning be granted for the proposed housing development. Then the boatyard and the public house must always remain the same (Boat Yard and Public house and not residential) to ensure the safety of the future residents of the proposed development in relation to the visibility splays?

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
	16/05408/FUL	Agent

An additional plan has been provided showing the development in relation to development in the surrounding area of Market Drayton.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
----------	-----------------	-------------

	16/03556/FUL	Officer
<p>There are listed buildings in the locality, including 1 (The Old House) and 2 (Whitefeathers Cottage) Sandford. In considering the proposal due regard to the following local policies and guidance has been taken, when applicable: CS5 Countryside and Green Belt, CS6 Sustainable Design and Development and CS17 Environmental Networks of the Shropshire Core Strategy, MD2 Sustainable Design and MD13 Historic Environment of the Shropshire Council SAMDev and with national policies and guidance, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published March 2012 and Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 with regard to the impact on the character and setting of the listed buildings. Having regard to context, setting and the general character of the area, officers are of the opinion that the proposal will have no significant harm on character and setting of the listed buildings in the local area.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/03556/FUL	Public Protection
<p>The Public Protection Officer has advised that he does not consider the imposition of conditions 8 and 9 necessary. On this basis, it is recommended that, should Members be minded to grant planning permission, then conditions 8 and 9 are deleted and not imposed.</p> <p>Furthermore, in consultation with the Principal Planning Officer, it is recommended that, should Members be minded to grant planning permission, then the following condition be imposed in order to protect amenity and ensure the removal of manure from the polytunnels in a timely manner:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">‘Within 28 days of the de-population and removal of hens from the polytunnel(s) the manure within the polytunnel(s) shall be removed in accordance with approved waste disposal arrangements.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Reasons: To protect the amenity of the area.’</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/03556/FUL	Natural England
<p>Our ref: 215883 Your ref: 16/03556/FUL</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation.</p> <p>Natural England has previously commented on this proposal and made comments to the authority in our letter dated 16 December 2016</p> <p>The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this amendment regarding the need for an HRA to be completed.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the original application are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.</p> <p>Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the</p>		

natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. Before sending us the amended consultation, please assess whether the changes proposed will materially affect any of the advice we have previously offered. If they are unlikely to do so, please do not re-consult us.

Yours sincerely

Kate Mulveagh

Technical Support Advisor – Consultation Team
Natural England
Tel 0300 060 3900

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/03556/FUL	Objector

Neighbouring objector, Mrs Ann Ellis, has submitted photos of flies and a rat at her property. The photos are available to view on the public system.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	16/03556/FUL	Natural England

Many apologies there appears to have been a processing error on our end. I can confirm that Natural England can agree with the conclusions of your Habitat's Regulations Assessment and as the conclusion is that the proposal will have no likely Significant Effect on international sites there is no requirement for your authority to seek additional comments from us in relation to international sites.

Regards

Grady McLean
Lead Adviser - Sustainable Development
North Mercia Area
Natural England
Parkside Court,
Hall Park Way
Telford,
TF3 4LR