

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 9 May 2019		
<p>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</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/05538/FUL - The Stew	Planning Officer
<p>Officer Comment</p> <p>of a S106 agreement for the Environment Agency contributions. The current recommendation in the officer report is to grant approval subject to conditions attached to Appendix 1. The recommendation omitted to include the requirement for the completion</p> <p>The correct recommendation is:</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION IS TO GRANT APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE COMPLETION OF A S106 AGREEMENT AND WITH CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO APPENDIX I.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/05538/FUL - The Stew	Ward Member
<p>Cllr Dean – Ward Member</p> <p>I am somewhat it of line with the town council as I have less concerns. Contact with me on the issue has come solely from the civic society rather than from residents. I am content that the town council has expressed an informed view on this so don't have anything else to add. I will try to attend but will probably not require speaking rights.</p>		
Item No	Application No.	Originator
5	17/05538/FUL - The Stew	Valuation Office Agency and Planning Officer
<p>Letter published on the Council's website from the Valuation Office Agency dated 3rd May 2019 in response to a query raised by an interested third party.</p> <p>Officer Response</p> <p>In response to the interested third party's concerns that the earlier analysis undertaken by the VOA and published on 23rd January 2019 was inaccurate because the criteria that was used to assess the applicant's Financial Viability Assessment may have been incorrect, it has been concluded by the VOA in their letter dated 3rd May 2019, that the original Final Report had been accurately compiled in accordance with the correct criteria.</p> <p>In addition the Gross Development Values (GDV) submitted by the applicant had been found to be "<i>fair and reasonable</i>". As a result, it is the opinion of the Planning Officer that because no changes have been made to the final calculations nor the original outcome of the earlier Viability Assessment, that the conclusions as set out in the VOA's opinion on all three schemes, dated 23rd January 2019 still stand.</p>		

Item No	Application No.	Originator
5	17/05538/FUL - The Stew	Peter Napier
Alternative Viability appraisal options for The Stew Conversion.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	18/03206/FU - Car Park, Dana	Planning Officer
There are errors in the first part of the report regarding numbers. The proposal is for nine apartments and has been reduced from the originally submitted proposal for ten.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	19/01500/FUL - Adj. Chronicle House	Shrewsbury Town Council
The Town Council raises no objections to this application.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	19/01500/FUL - Adj. Chronicle House	Neighbour: Objects
<p>We have received many letters asking for our opinion many times since the extra floors were noticed by the council, it seems clear as they are not on the original plan they should be removed. I am surprised to read the report that makes out the light on our premises is not affected which is not credible as is the rest of the paperwork listed on this application which dresses up this challenge to the planning department as positive. The structure is overpowering from the back of The Albion. Our approved plans to reinvigorate the Pub/Hotel are blighted to a degree as we renovate the rooms on the rear for visitors to the Town staying there as they will have to look straight into this unauthorised penthouse flat.</p> <p>This is to say nothing of the view from the staff accommodation agreed above. No study has included any site visits to us we know too. They seem to be a white wash to confuse the council no consultation has been attempted of any kind.</p> <p>To make a point it will be costly for the council if the developer makes further appeals as one of the supporters have, needs to be addressed. This should never have been built and this is at least the fourth time it has been presented. This should be given a removal order rather than any leave to further appeals and no public cost should be born for a challenge to the planning department of the town like this. It seems the Developer believes the we have no choice but to except the extra floor and it's just a matter of time before the council is forced to agree We hope this is not the case.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	19/01500/FUL - Adj. Chronicle House	Neighbour: Objects
<p>This erection is an abuse of the Neighbourhood it dominates snuffing out light contrary to the study obtained by the developer. Either way it obscures the natural view and scars the skyline in a way that has no place in a market town like Shrewsbury. from the Castle walk the Danna bridge or down the town it takes away any view of anything else and has no place being there. Olive trees in pot plants from a garden centre are no replacement for the genuine Shropshire flora and fauna the extra floors take away. When will it stop being represented and be removed?</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	19/01500/FUL - Adj. Chronicle House	Planning Officer
Paragraphs 6.2.4 and 6.2.5 of the officer's report refer to the impact of the proposal on amenity and that the additional increase in height of the building would have some		

impact on the outlook from the existing rear facing second floor windows of the Albion but also on the rear facing bedrooms and living room of the managers apartment and the hotel rooms approved under a recent application at the Albion Vaults.

This section of the report is incomplete and does not go on to consider this as a reason for refusal. Officers therefore recommend that the following reason for refusal is included on the decision notice if members are minded to refuse the application:

The proposed increase in the height of the building would reduce the amount of sky visible from both the existing rear windows and the rear windows of the proposed hotel and apartment currently under construction at the rear of the Albion Vaults and would therefore have some impact in terms of shading and loss of light and would increase the sense of enclosure and have an overbearing and obtrusive impact and would also result in overlooking and a loss of privacy. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Core Strategy CS6 and SAMDev MD2.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	19/01303/OUT - Cruckton	Neighbour: Support

We have known the Harrison family for many years and found them to be an integral part of the Cruckton Community and the family have lived at Woodfield for over 60 years. Her parents ran the Hare and Hounds, next door to the proposed site which has always been known as the village pub or the Hare and Hounds, Cruckton, which I believe dates back as far as 1860.

Woodfield has always been part of Cruckton village, as are all of the houses further along the B4386 towards Shrewsbury and the other way towards Nox. Cruckton is not just the part around the church and Cruckton Hall. On your own planning site, you are classing this whole area as Cruckton.

We live on one of the small holdings on the land from the Cruckton Estate which covered an area up to where the proposed planning site is. These were built for ex servicemen after the 1st world war, which was a similar scheme to the modern local needs planning. All of the residents of Cruckton consider themselves to live in the village whether they live on the main road or not. Along the main road, you have Cruckton House, Cruckton Farm Shop and Cruckton caravan site.

The Cruckton ploughing match that has been going for 86 years and started along this road, not in the boundaries of what the planners are saying is Cruckton.

The family that are submitting the application are also part of the Cruckton community. Tricia runs her business from there and this is essential that she is able to be on site at all times due to the horses and the care they need.

In all too many cases, children who have grown up in communities have to move away from there as property is either too scarce or too expensive. Surely in a time where there are huge developments arising all over Shrewsbury, allowing a local family to live near to their relatives, where they grew up and want to bring up their own family and run their business should go through straight through the planning process. Rather than the debating of something that people of the village have known for decades – we are all Cruckton.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	19/01303/OUT - Cruckton	Neighbour: Support
<p>I have known the family at Woodfield in Cruckton since I was a child, where I have seen it handed down through the generations of family.</p> <p>It is currently owned and lived in by Don and Pat Harrison, who along with their daughter Trish, who also ran and lived at the Hare and Hounds in Cruckton for many years, which was a successful public house and a strong local hub in the community of Cruckton.</p> <p>I live at Woodlands Farm, which is situated between Woodfield (proposed site) and the Hare and Hounds.</p> <p>I have always strongly considered that I live within the Cruckton settlement especially as all the neighbouring properties along the main road (B4386) all have Cruckton with in there addresses and on early maps showing that I also reside between two significant landmarks being Cruckton Station, situated near Horton Lodge and Crucktons Public House, The Hare and Hounds. I therefore believe the officers are wrong to assume that the settlement is only focused around the school/ hall.</p> <p>It is widely talked about through the media that there is a demand for local affordable housing, which is greatly supported by the government. Therefore I'm in full support of Trish and her family being able to stay within the community and to be able to further her equine business with the support of her parents who provide crucial childcare.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	19/01303/OUT - Cruckton	Neighbour: Support
<p>We have known Trish and Dan and her immediate family, who reside at Woodfield Cruckton for many years.</p> <p>I have also worked alongside Trish on many occasions within the local community, instructing and examing local pony club members and teaching individuals in the area. In our opinion the proposed site which will enable them to build within the affordable housing scheme for them and there two young children is ideal, as it will allow Trish to continue to work and support the local community as facilities that already exist at Woodfield enable her to continue her equine business, especially as being on site provides essential support from her parents providing necessary childcare.</p> <p>Another point I'd like to raise is their contribution to Shropshire as a county, not only in her equine business, but that of her son Jacob, who plays national Tennis and represents Shropshire and is proud to do so.</p> <p>We hear constantly from the media that the government advocates a serious lack of affordable housing in the UK at present, therefore in instance, where the candidates are solid, reliable and well respected members of the local community, in our opinion there should be no doubt to them being granted the permission to build. They will be laying solid foundations within the community of Cruckton for future generations to come.</p> <p>We truly hope you give this matter your sympathetic consideration for a very genuine young family to lay down solid roots in an area where they and their family can continue to give back to the community.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	19/01303/OUT - Cruckton	Agent
<p>Having reviewed your committee report and had several discussions with the parish council, applicant and neighbouring residents over the last few days, we have more evidence to present to you in relation to the location of the site being within the settlement of Cruckton and the evolution of the village. The parish council consider the report to be factually misleading in parts in relation previous applications and how they have been dealt with in Cruckton, and we would appreciate a little bit of time to come</p>		

back to you on this please? We are all extremely conscious of the tight deadline within which to get this to you and do not consider there will be enough time or opportunity to convey this to you/planning committee in enough detail at the meeting tomorrow.

I am therefore asking if you would please grant us an extension of time or deferment from this committee to the next one, to allow us time to correlate the information?