

**SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 13th March 2018

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	17/03774/FUL	Planning Officer

An additional condition is recommended relating to the approval of facing materials:

Prior to the above ground works commencing samples and/or details of the roofing materials and the materials and colour finishes to be used in the construction of the external walls shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/03774/FUL	Neighbour

-Original concerns still stand that entrance/exit to the development is situated at a bottleneck; real and ongoing issue with children and other pedestrians; possibility of amalgamating access with the Smithy development has been ignored.
-Issue of adequate drainage has not been addressed, which would mean more flooding on their land.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/03774/FUL	Peter Woodman (Albrighton and District Civic Society)

Email submitted stating the following:

“I am still unconvinced that the applicant has done sufficient work to justify the treatment of the drainage issues by means of this condition.

It is known that the existing foul and surface water drainage position is already inadequate - with frequent flooding occurring as recently as last week - and Severn Trent operatives stating to Shaw Lane residents that the whole system is "shot"

I note that you (Planning Officer) state that it is normal procedure to treat the drainage issues by means of such a condition - but in this instance where there are already such serious problems I believe it is totally inappropriate to do so.

Jessups and Severn Trent should be obliged to convince you as planners and more importantly local residents that the existing drainage problems will be dealt with - and future ones predicted to be caused by the development - before any planning permission is granted.

I should inform you that we have obtained legal advice which justifies opponents of this development pursuing a judicial review of Shropshire Council's decision if the Planning Committee decides to grant permission at its meeting on Tuesday.”

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/03840/FUL	Neighbour
<p>In addition to the comments I have already made on the above application, I would be grateful if the Committee would also consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="151 342 1434 566">1. I note from the Committee Report that conditions would be imposed on this application if granted. Previous conditions placed on this developer had been flagrantly ignored, starting with the one which required that the site now under consideration should be returned to its original state. The re-greening of the site mentioned in the committee report consists of three trees and one shrub - hardly returning it to its original state. The Council is being made to look a fool! <li data-bbox="151 600 1434 745">2. There are 18 objections to this proposal with no supporters. Other proposals have produced similar results. Why does the Committee continue to ignore the wishes of the residents? I question where democracy is in this situation and wonder why this particular developer appears to flout conditions with alacrity and yet still receives approval. <p>I urge the Committee to take a stand and require the reinstatement of the plot to fit in with their own designated Conservation Area.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/03840/FUL	Neighbour (and also via Town Council)
<p>I would like to re-iterate my objection to the proposed erection of two flats adjoining Holmwood. I purchased my flat in Holmwood in May 2016 and was told that the land adjacent would be car parking and landscaped. After that, Mario Nicholas was refused permission for a small detached house, was subsequently refused permission for flats and now is applying again.</p> <p>I was told in no uncertain terms by Mrs Nicholas and by Mario on several occasions that this land was 'nothing whatsoever to do with the flat owners of Holmwood', so how an extension to Holmwood can be approved is questionable. This building, if it goes ahead, must be a totally separate entity to Holmwood.</p> <p>This building will be so intrusive to my flat that I would have to keep the blinds down permanently in bedroom 2 and to two windows in my living room.</p> <p>In the event of approval I would ask the Planning Department to include a recommended planning condition for some space (a walkway width, say 1.5-2m) between the two buildings as access for maintenance to gutters, windows etc on this side of Holmwood.</p> <p>The owners of flats 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 have been trying to form a management company and have been hindered in this by the length of time it is taking for the purchase of one of the flats to be registered on the Land Registry. Both Mario and the purchaser have told me that the flat has been sold. When the management company is transferred to the owners of Holmwood the freehold will be transferred as well. Again, this has been confirmed by Mario's solicitor. If I had the freehold of my flat, would my objection to having another building on the other side of my bedroom wall have carried more weight? This may be the reason why it is taking so long to finalise the legalities of the sale of the remaining flat.</p> <p>If permission is granted for the building, will there be checks as to whether changes to the plans are made as building progresses? Before I bought my flat I was told that there</p>		

would be steps up to the front door on one side and a ramp on the other. In the event, the ramp was never built. Also, on the plans I saw there was no designated area for the wheelie bins for flats 3-6. Flats 1 and 2 have their bins at the back of the building. Subsequently, the bin area has been put directly under my living room window, in front of the window to my basement room. I object very strongly to this.

If approval is granted, will the owners of Holmwood, especially flats 1, 3 and 5 be informed of details regarding party walls, shared drainage etc.? I am very concerned about noise from a party wall.

My pleasure in my flat has been blighted by the impossibility of contacting Mario, the view of his builder's yard outside, the inactivity of the management company under his ownership and the extreme difficulty of forming our own management company so that maintenance and finances can be properly looked after.

Hindsight is a wonderful thing, but had I known that this proposal could be considered, regardless of objections from our own Town Council and many neighbours, I would never have purchased my flat and regret bitterly having done so.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/03840/FUL	Neighbour
<p>We live next door to Holmwood at Burway View and have already objected to this application and earlier versions.</p> <p>All our previous objections still stand but we would like to make the following points arising from the Planning Officer's report recommending approval.</p> <p>In his Introduction,2.1,the Officer says,"in general Clive Ave,which is an unadopted road,is characterised by a feeling of spaciousness with further large houses set back behind grass verges and matures trees".</p> <p>This is very true,except that at the end of 2017 there were no trees left at all on the Holmwood site.We now have a token planting of three trees and one bush.</p> <p>We cannot therefore agree with the Officer's final assertion,7.0, "that ...the scheme maintains the verdant character of the Conservation Area".</p> <p>It does not!- it is cramped,stark,overdevelopment in a Conservation Area within the AONB. This is the major planning issue of the application.</p> <p>Nothing has changed since the previous application which was firmly rejected last year, apart from the token planting referred to above.</p> <p>The application has received no support from Church Stretton residents. There have been numerous objections from local residents and organisations.</p> <p>We urge the committee to reject this application.</p>		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/03840/FUL	Residents' association
<p>I am writing on behalf of Clive Avenue Residents Association. The Association objects to this application.</p> <p>I would be grateful if the following comments were made available to the committee considering the above application.</p>		

It is the view of the Association, which is responsible to residents for the maintenance and enhancement of Clive Avenue, that nothing has materially changed since the initial refusal of this application. The Association's recorded objections still stand. Construction on this site would detract from what is noted as "the generally spacious and verdant character of the Clive Avenue street scene" and represents an unwelcome and unwarranted intrusion in the Conservation Area. It beggars belief that the planting of three trees and a bush is considered sufficient to override the substantive objections to this development, which the Association has detailed in previous submissions, and which are echoed in the overwhelming majority of comments from other organisations and individuals.

The Association also considers that approval of this application would, in effect, be rewarding the developer, who has been using the site as a builders yard for another development, for unauthorised tree felling and for failure to comply with previous conditions. Approval would create an unwelcome precedent for the Conservation Area, demonstrating that if you wait for long enough and make minimum concessions, you can override both wider planning considerations and the wishes of local residents.

The Association urges the committee to reject the application.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9	17/05189/FUL	Ecology

Please can these two ecological conditions be added into the officer report:

Habitat management plan (post-construction) condition

No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works and vegetation clearance) until a habitat management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include:

- a) Description and evaluation of the features to be managed;
- b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that may influence management;
- c) Aims and objectives of management;
- d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
- e) Prescriptions for management actions;
- f) Preparation of a works schedule (including an annual work plan and the means by which the plan will be rolled forward annually);
- g) Personnel responsible for implementation of the plan;
- h) Detailed monitoring scheme with defined indicators to be used to demonstrate achievement of the appropriate habitat quality;
- i) Possible remedial/contingency measures triggered by monitoring';
- j) The financial and legal means through which the plan will be implemented.

The plan shall be carried out as approved, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and enhance features of recognised nature conservation importance, in accordance with MD12, CS17 and section 118 of the NPPF.

Update survey condition

If the development, or each phase of a phased development, hereby permitted does not commence (or having commenced is suspended for more than 12 months) within 3 years from the date of the ecological survey, then the approved ecological measures and mitigation secured through conditions shall be reviewed and, where necessary, updated and amended.

The review shall be informed by further ecological surveys (in line with recognised national good practice guidance) in order to i) establish if there have been any changes in the presence and/or abundance of species or habitats on the site and ii) identify any likely new ecological impacts and mitigation requirements that arise as a result.

Where update surveys show that conditions on the site have changed (and are not addressed through the originally agreed mitigation scheme) then a revised updated and amended mitigation scheme, and a timetable for implementation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development (or commencement of the next phase). Works will then be carried forward strictly in accordance with the proposed new approved ecological measures and timetable.

Reason: To ensure that development is informed by up to date ecological information and that ecological mitigation is appropriate to the state of the site at the time development/phases of development commence.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	17/05723/FUL	Applicant
<p>Letter from applicants to Members of the Shropshire Council South Committee dated 5th March 2018</p> <p><i>Dear committee members</i></p> <p><i>I write to request your support of our planning application (17/05723/FUL) to build a local need dwelling.</i></p> <p><i>Hayley Breakwell and I (Trevor Breakwell) are in need an affordable dwelling and as such we followed the process to seek permission for an affordable house just east of Much Wenlock.</i></p> <p><i>I have lived here all my life and have strong family connections, the farm buildings adjacent to our application are owned by my uncle Frank and the field by my father who has generously offered us a plot of land to build an affordable house. My uncle is considering retirement and therefore a real possibility of us taking on the running of the farm, so a house close by would be useful.</i></p> <p><i>Previously I have worked on the family farm in Much Wenlock where my family have farmed since 1954, but I now work for Severn Trent where Much Wenlock is my base and I cover the surrounding areas on my round.</i></p> <p><i>Our two daughters attend the local schools and Hayley work's at the primary school where she previously used to volunteer in Forest school, Hayley has lived in Much Wenlock for the past 15 years.</i></p> <p><i>My children and wife are happy at school and have no wishes to move schools/ jobs. Hayley's job fits perfectly with the children's education and school holidays.</i></p> <p><i>We need a new home as the cottage where we live now is on Willey estates, it is very small, has no heating and there is also a chance we have no security of tenure, plus the rent is rising.</i></p>		

We are at a stage of our lives where we need the security of our own home to protect our children's future. We feel very much part of the close-knit community of Much Wenlock and the councils local need housing policy alongside the availability of my fathers land will hopefully allow us to remain.

It is appreciated that the proposed site isn't immediately against the town boundary, however we don't have any other land available to us to build. Whilst my family is fortunate to own land near Much Wenlock, most of land surrounding the town is owned by one or two large estates.

We intend to keep the house as eco as possible and blend it in to the landscape. Hayley and I would be devastated to move from Much Wenlock, where I have grown up. We feel encouraged by the strong support received from the local community and fully agree with the town councils desire to help local people stay local despite the expense of houses.

We hope this application will be approved which will us to stay in Much Wenlock and watch our children grow up here. There are no houses that we could afford that are big enough for a family of four.

Many thanks

Trevor and Hayley Breakwell

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
11	18/00143/FUL	Neighbour

As non-designated heritage assets these buildings and sites are material considerations in the planning process and receive the full weight of both local and national planning policies during the decision making process. The following policies are relevant.

Relevant Sections of the NFFP
Section 12

Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Take into account opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

Consider the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible.

These points have in my opinion not been given full consideration or due weight by the planners. Perhaps they are unaware of the full extent of the existing ironworks or the documented historic significance of Lower Forge and Upper Forge. Such as having a 750 yard underground waterway tunnel connecting it to Upper Forge which has a waterfall and various existing waterworks. There is also an underground furnace and underground rooms still existing at Lower Forge. It is found in an area that is famous as the cradle of the Industrial Revolution and contemporary to Ironbridge. By definition heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification which is currently lacking.

There is no intention to keep Lower Forge in the past or impede restoration of the derelict cottages. Local opinion is that the proposed building plans be sympathetic to the historic

nature of the hamlet. We understand changes have to be made. Proposals to build have a large footprint contradict Policy CS 6 which states development should conserve and enhance the built environment and be appropriate in its scale and design. The present proposals do not conform to this policy.

The proposed extensions for 9, 10, 11 are 3.75m in length are inappropriate and mismatched to the existing cottages. They do not take account scale and proportion and are distorting and incongruous to the terrace as a whole.

The construction company who are the applicants contest they need to make the front extension a large size so the buildings are financially viable. Financial viability is not a planning issue.

The proposed extension wall has been lowered to 6 feet which is the height permitted for a fence. Is a wall the same as a fence? A fence currently exists between large parts of Mexico and Texas. A wall is now being demanded because a wall is clearly different to a fence.

Human rights.8:2 Allows for fairness and equalityThere is little respect for private life and peaceful enjoyment of the possession of the modest property next door. The proposed plans will create a significant loss of amenities from number 8.

The desires of the applicants must be balanced against the impact on the residents. Plans which have been submitted three times are still contrary to national guidelines. NFFP and Policy CS 6.