

**CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE****SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS****Date: 07 June 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**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
7.	18/00268/FUL Land off Washford Road, Shrewsbury	Highways consultant for applicant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Emphasises that Council Highways has not objected</li><li>• Increase in traffic will have little impact on highway network</li><li>• Agrees with Highways Officer that secondary access should be two way</li><li>• Spaces on highway are not marked out or allocated for neighbouring properties. Parking rights are not given to individuals to park on the highway.</li><li>• The suggested visibility splay accords with national guidance</li><li>• Swift collection by refuse lorries</li><li>• Only one additional property over and above what has been approved before (at outline)</li><li>• Existing permitted use allows for large vehicles</li><li>• Low additional traffic movements will not have significant impact and accords with NPPF para 32</li></ul>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
7.	18/00268/FUL Land off Washford Road, Shrewsbury	Neighbour
<p>I wish to make some observations on the amended proposed highway arrangements contained in the letter from Mr Gough of Woodsyde Developments Ltd and the revised access drawing.</p> <p>I do not accept the need for a secondary access for the following reasons :-</p> <p>1. In his written statement of 8 May to the committee the current owner, Mr Alan Corfield, described the vehicle movements at the site thus. "We operate 4 large vans, sometimes with trailers and add to this regularly with 2-4 hire vans as and when demand requires. The workforce, numbering up to 20 in the busy periods all arrive by car on a daily basis." If the current entrance is managing such volumes then why is a second one needed when the expert guidance from Mr Gough states that there may be 7 vehicle movements from the development during peak hours, a sizeable reduction on the present traffic flow?</p> <p>2. The hedge alongside Washford Road is a valuable feature of the conservation area. The new access would mean the desecration of the long established hedge or would require the need to "set the existing hedge back" as Mr Gough euphemistically prefers to describe his plan for it to be removed and a new one planted.</p> <p>3. If the proposed new access is to be two way there is potential for dangerous vehicle</p>		

conflict at its junction with Washford Road. Vehicles exiting the site can only turn right as Washford Road is one-way and so will almost certainly stray onto the right hand side of the entrance to do so, which is the left hand and correct lane for traffic entering the site.

4. In his email to the Highways Officer on 19 March the architect emphasised he wanted to see a second access beyond the garages purely to provide an attractive entrance onto the site for residents. This cosmetic motive is insufficient justification for the excessive proposals now being put forward for two entrances for such a small site, when a small modification to the existing entrance would suffice.

5. The Shropshire Council Highway Officer stated on 28 February, in response to the original proposals :-

"It is considered therefore that the existing access into the site should remain as the sole access into and out of the site. The width and alignment of the access should be improved to enable a more efficient entry and exit of vehicles. The Site Plan is rather schematic and lacks clarity, the edge of carriageway has not been detailed, and the position of a light column and road name plate has been omitted. The improvement to the width of the access could require the relocation of the light column, which can be more easily determined on the submission of a more detailed/surveyed site plan."

Nothing has changed since this judgement was made and this response should now be adopted as the most suitable means of access and egress.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	18/00268/FUL Land off Washford Road, Shrewsbury	Neighbour

John Makin

Objection Comment

The garages termed (existing garages) are not owned by the proposed developer. I should point out all thirteen garages are privately owned and all have rights of way at all times relating to access and egress and no obstruction to the forecourt, stated in the deeds. At the moment only three vans belonging to the existing business need access. The proposed development would allow for 21 vehicles using the forecourt. I am also concerned about the proposed splay for the new entrance off Washford Road which would impede manoeuvre ability when using garages at the northern end of the block. I own number 4 and 5 garages and need to reverse tight to the existing hedge to gain access to my garage.

Yours Faithfully

John Makin

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	18/00268/FUL Land off Washford Road, Shrewsbury	Developing Highways Area Manager – South and Central

Further to Central Planning Committee held 10<sup>th</sup> May 2018, and members concerns with regard to the Highway implications of the above mentioned proposed development. In order to provide further clarification with regard to the Highways position, in support of previous comments submitted on Shropshire Councils behalf by Consultants WSP, I would make the following observations.

When considering the submitted application from a Highways perspective, there are a number of considerations to determine when the application. As outlined within Andrew Gough's correspondence dated 31<sup>st</sup> May 2018 then the first consideration is the existing use of the site and the trips that are generated by the existing use, both actual and potential based on the permitted use. In this particular case it is my understanding that the existing use is B8 Classification – Storage and Distribution, which could potentially generate a number of trips from the site. It is considered that whilst the application does not remove the existing garages, the proposed removal of the B8 use to residential will potentially reduce the number of vehicles movements associated with the site, and change the type of vehicles using the site on a regular basis. Residential development will still attach deliveries however will not attached as many LGV as the B8 – Storage and Distribution. It is therefore considered from a Highways perspective the proposed residential development could potentially provide betterment.

Another key consideration is extant planning permissions on the site, and if the submitted application varies significantly from the extant permission and if this will have a detrimental impact on Highway safety. In this particular case Outline planning permission has been granted for this site. Outline Permission included access, which provided two access points. Therefore consideration needs to be given to if the application under consideration significantly changes from the extant permission and would compromise Highway safety as a result.

Concerns have been raised with regard to the proposed secondary access to the site. Consideration needs to be given to if vehicles can enter and exit the site in a satisfactory manner the applicant has provided sufficient visibility for vehicles emerging, based on the surrounding Highway conditions. It is considered from a Highways perspective that proposed access to the site is acceptable in highway terms and there is no reason for objection.

The National Planning Policy Framework advises in paragraph 32 that '**Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe**'. Whilst it is acknowledged that the surrounding Highway network is restricted, in terms of parked vehicles, consideration needs to be given to the above, In relation to the existing use of the site and extant permission and if the movements generated by the proposed residential development will have a significant and severe impact on the Highway network in relation to the existing conditions. It is not considered that based on the information submitted a Highway objection could be sustained.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	18/00268/FUL Land off Washford Road, Shrewsbury	Case Officer
Case Officer notes that further details have been submitted by agent and placed on the public file. This includes a short report and plans, intended to illustrate that access arrangements will be acceptable.		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8.	18/02032/HHE 4 Weir Road, Hanwood, Shrewsbury	Case officer
<p>Addition to officer report.</p> <p>Paragraph 3: The applicant works within the planning department of Shropshire Council and to accord with the Scheme of Delegation it is a requirement that this application be determined by Planning Committee.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2.2: Neighbouring properties were notified of the development and no representations have been received objecting the proposal. It is not considered that the proposal will have an adverse impact on residential amenity.</p> <p>Paragraph 7: In view of the above, it is confirmed that the details submitted with the application demonstrate that the extension will be exempt from requiring express planning permission. This is because the proposed works comply with the requirements of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended). In addition, since no representations objecting the proposal have been received from any owners or occupiers of neighbouring properties, prior approval from the local authority is not required for this application.</p>		