

**CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 31 August 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:
5	17/00823/COU: Shrewsbury College Of Arts And Technology, Radbrook	David Kilby (SPFA)

Shropshire Playing Fields Association object to this application and recommend it be refused so that the provision of play and recreation facilities can be re-considered and brought into line with Shropshire Council's own planning policy.

Reasons for refusal:

Safety: Safe routes to play and recreation opportunities must be a priority.

The routes to the two play areas identified by the developer (see map attached) are clearly not safe routes to play. (video provided: https://youtu.be/9LN_-lrrfu8)

The additional two areas identified on the map are located outside the Radbrook Ward, one in Copthorne the other in Meole Brace, therefore would not benefit from the proposed £60,000 commuted sum if the proposal is supported.

Safe routes to play

The proposed route for children to access the Rad Valley Play Area by foot is in our opinion not safe for pedestrians of any age to use.

1. There is no footpath from the development site entrance to Crowmeole Lane Junction along the busy A488 highway.
2. There is no pelican crossing proposed at the site entrance to help negotiate this lack of a footpath leading to Crowmeole lane
3. Crowmeole Lane is dangerous because the route to the play area requires negotiating two way traffic along a single track lane with no footpaths and sharp blind corners with overgrowing hedgerow on either side of a lane that is poorly lit

Policy: Shropshire Council's SAMDEV Plan and MD2 policy, adopted December 2015, states:

"all development will provide adequate open space, set at a minimum standard of 30sqm per person (equivalent to 3ha per 1,000 populations)"

"It continues: the open space needs to comprise a functional area for play and recreation. This should be provided as a single recreational area, rather than a number of small pockets spread throughout the development site, in order to improve the overall quality and usability of the provision".

The decision to omit play and recreation provision is clearly against planning policy

National standards state play areas for the very young should be within 100 metres of their own home. (Source: Fields in Trust)

The decision to omit play and recreation provision means the 100 metre standard is being ignored

NPPF Paragraph 73 and 74 says a robust up-to-date open space needs assessment should be in place to help guide decision making

Shropshire Council does not have an open space needs assessment in place.

NPPF Paragraph 188: States there is a need for: Pre-application engagement and front loading, this opportunity was denied CPRE and SPFA members when requested. (see e-mail 9TH August 2017) and the opportunity to consult with Sport England a statutory consultee was not taken.

Accessibility: The video provided shows clearly that the Rad Valley Road area is inaccessible on foot or by bike by a young infant therefore contravenes the rights of young people to access open space in a safe and healthy environment as outlined by the United Nations Convention on the 'Rights of the child' and the Children's Right to play article 24

Resident's opinion: Officer Comments suggest that residents do not want a play area on the proposed development site; we suggest this is not the case.

We demonstrate this by quoting from one of the four residents who objected to the play area;

Resident: "These play areas will dramatically affect our privacy, impact on our views, will overlook our house and garden and noise levels will be increased. Members of the public walking/playing on these raised areas would have direct line of sight over the fences/hedges of these properties, particularly in the winter months when the trees are leafless.

(Source: Planning Register Shropshire Council)

Clearly the resident is objecting to the location of the play areas in the original design, not the concept of providing somewhere for children to play on the new development site

Town Council: Finally agenda 8 of the Central Planning Committee refers to the nearby Cophorne Barracks site where similar issues concerning the loss of a playing field and inclusion of a play area on the new development site are being discussed.

Interestingly as a result of pre-application engagement with Shropshire Playing Fields Association who consulted the public with regard to usage of the playing field the local community are now benefiting to the tune of £120,000 to spend on local leisure provision, whereas as it stands the community currently stand to gain nothing for the loss of the Radbrook College Playing Field.

Interestingly Shrewsbury Town Council's and Officers position regard a play area on the site at the Cophorne Barracks reads as follows:

(Page 17) 4.1.1 STC:

"Given the number of dwellings on-site members are of the view that play provision should be accommodated on site and at worst a LEAP of 400 sq metres should be provided.

Members are of the view that it is unreasonable of the applicant to expect residents of infants to have to seek play provision off-site".

(Page 30) Officers Appraisal: "for a development of this size it is essential that an equipped junior and toddler play area is provided on site and 0.75ha is more than sufficient space to provide this".

One has to question the difference between infants from the Radbrook site and those from the Cophorne Site.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/00823/COU	Selby Martin (Local resident)

The issue here is the provision of recreation and children's play areas.

Please take a look at the website for this application, document dated August 4.

This shows off-site play areas proposed by Floreat Living Ltd in lieu of on-site provision. The planning officer recommends a payment by the applicant of £60,000 to the Town Council towards the development of existing play areas off-site in the Radbrook ward.

There are two objections to this arrangement.

1. Use by future residents would mean walking on busy roads, some without a pavement. The route to Rad Valley Road along Crowmeole Lane is extremely dangerous - no pavement, blind corners and heavy traffic. No risk assessments for these routes has been carried out.

2. It is a breach of planning policy MD2 which requires "an area of functional recreational space for play, recreation, formal or informal uses including semi- natural open space"

If the shaded areas on the agenda paper plan are not suitable sites, there remains the need to find a location elsewhere in the development. This would overcome the above objections and the £60,000 could be used in its provision rather than in improving the two off-site play areas .

A site suggested earlier was ruled out because of objections by existing neighbours. If necessary, this could be looked at again, to include screening to mitigate possible nuisance. Why should the concerns of a few people (who may well have had children of their own) leave future residents without provision on site or the need to go off-site on dangerous roads?

The above objections justify a refusal of the application. However, a further deferral might be preferable.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/00823/COU	Officer response

The provision of public open space (POS) across all three sites is fully compliant with local plan policy MD2. Using the MD2 guideline the area of open space provision should be 11,370 m2 and the proposed area of POS totals 11,946 m2. The proposed area of POS exceeds that required by this policy as outlined in the July report

MD2 also requires that for larger sites the POS '*should comprise an area of functional recreational space for play, recreation, formal or informal uses including semi-natural open space*'. These combined proposals provide three large and functional areas of open space (two separate areas of informal and semi-natural areas and a formal area in front of the college building) in addition to other landscaped areas and woodland walk. The policy does not dictate that it should include a formal equipped play area.

The proposed informal and formal areas indicated on the proposed plans will provide opportunity for informal recreation and imaginative play and the opportunity to explore the natural environment close to home whilst more formal equipped play areas and a playing field are within walking distance of the site. Children will be accompanied by parents or guardians on their visit to these nearby play areas and the walk to the play area is considered to be all part of the experience of going to the park and provides additional exercise. Even if an equipped play area was provided within 100 metres of the proposed homes it would not be expected that children should be allowed to play unaccompanied.

The provision of a financial contribution of £60,000 in lieu of on-site provision is proposed to be used by the Town Council at neighbouring infant and junior play areas. The play areas labelled A (Torrin Drive) and C (Rad Valley Road) are in the Radbrook ward and play area B (Bank Farm Road) is just into the Meole ward. The Town Council have

confirmed that they wish the funds to go towards the improvements to A and B as they are within easy and accessible walking distance of the development site. It is recommended that the S106 is amended accordingly.

In addition the provision of on-site play equipment is usually funded by CIL so if the plans were amended to include an equipped play area on site this valuable contribution of benefit to both new residents and the existing community would be lost. It is considered that larger better equipped and maintained play areas within five minutes walk is preferable to smaller less equipped play area closer to home.

With regards to the larger contribution being sought for the Copthorne Barracks application this is to compensate for the loss of a playing field/sports pitch at that site. There is not a sports pitch at the Radbrook site and this is recognised by Sports England and there is no statutory requirement to consult Sports England as outlined in the previous reports to committee. There is therefore no requirement to retain an area for use as a playing field or sports pitch at this site or to seek a financial contribution for off-site provision in lieu of this.

7	17/02809/OUT: Former HMP Prison	Mrs Karen Morris (Neighbour)
<p>The plans for the Lancasterian School as outlined will have a significant impact on the natural light in our property which is next door to the school. Given the proximity of the planned development it is apparent that such a building would substantially overshadow our own property and lead to an unacceptable loss of natural light. We have great concerns which we were unable to express at the meeting with the developer in August. Our concerns were voiced by neighbours but we would like to reiterate these before the planning committee hearing.</p>		
8	16/04228/OUT: Former Copthorne Barracks	Norman Mcguigan (Light Infantry Veteran)
<p>Has submitted a copy of the text of the speech intended to be made at the central committee meeting and additional documents referred to including copies of press articles, the 'Shropshire Affordable Housing Allocation Policy and Scheme' and a copy of the statement on behalf of 'Bring Sir John Moore's Barracks Back to Life'. These have been circulated to members and are available in full on the public file.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
12	17/02233/FUL	Parish Council
<p>As requested via the clerk I am providing the following information.</p> <p>Coppice, Terrace, Mount, Horton, Greenfield, Hollybank and New Nouse Farms have all had permission for additional dwellings whether annexe, holiday home or separate permanent dwelling.</p> <p>Please note that in relation to the Planning Officer's partly misleading report I respectfully wish to point out the following facts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Before the Church Close development the number of dwellings outside your "core" outnumbered the number of "core" dwellings. 2. The 3 smallholdings along the bridleway (once the main road between Cruckton and Hanwood) predate the development in the "core". 3. 5 of the 6 smallholdings which contribute much to Cruckton's character have each had permission for additional dwellings of one sort or another. 4. When asked at the central committee meeting in February why there had been a 		

change of mind regarding whether Coppice Farm was part of Cruckton the Planning Officer replied "because it is within easy walking distance". A clear precedent?

I hope this information will be useful in resolving the planning application.