

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 19 <sup>th</sup> May 2015		
<p><b>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></p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/01874/FUL	Neighbour
<p>Photographs have been submitted taken at 09:10a.m. (11.05.15), showing two articulated vehicles entering B4379 from Havenhills Road.</p> <p>Even with the suggested passing places no one else stands a chance (motor vehicles or horse riders) with these huge HGV's travelling in convoy (which I witness often from my house), down these single track lanes. The junction on to the B4379 is also hazardous as they take up both carriageways when entering the main road.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/01874/FUL	Neighbour
<p>There seems to be no reference made in the highways documents to the fact that 2 bridle ways join on to the preferred route for vehicles along Havenhills road together with access to a further Defra permitted access walking and riding route. These two bridleways join onto the Havenhills road and necessitate riding along its length which does not have sufficient width to safely pass these HGvs (this is also a problem when cycling). When meeting an HGV along this route there has been no alternative but to turn around and ride back which then means that the HGV is following closely behind putting riders in a very dangerous situation. I note the proposal is to allow 10 journeys along this lane between 9 - 3 and then 4 - 5 pm this number of journeys means that there would be no time in the day except between 3 and 4pm when horse riders could safely use this route between the bridleway said or to reach the Defra permitted access. I have been riding this route for over 20 years and now find that the use of one business new to the area and without the benefit of the proper planning permissions in place is being put above the safe use of all existing users. Purpose built industrial estates with the proper existing infrastructure and planning with vacant units are available in the surrounding area. From photographs put on this site it clearly shows that riders, cyclists, pedestrians and other vehicles are often meeting two of these vehicles in tandem. This poses a danger to other road users and makes the use of this lane now impossible for horse riders to use and is depriving them of the amenity use of the bridleways that adjoin it.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	14/05212/FUL	Neighbour
<p>We write regarding two further planning applications for Hazeck The Mines Benthall TF12 5QY. We have now received two further letters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Revisions to existing planning approval for side extension.</li> <li>2.Felling of Norway Spruce and Bramley Apple Trees</li> </ol> <p>This is in addition to two further outstanding applications.</p> <p>Having viewed the planning site today, they do not show the approved chimneys, the plans appear to show the roof height to be at the same height for all three sections of the main house. (without the "proposed side kitchen extension"). We were under the</p>		

impression this application was refused and that the new section (yet to be constructed) was at a lower roof height. This "revision" is a further increase in roof height to the enormous size of the already constructed building, the protruding triangular section also at an increased width and height now at the roof ridge, will bring the building closer to our boundary. There is also an increase in glazing which is a further intrusion of our privacy. Creating an overbearing and imposing effect, impinging on our home. This "revision" will require the removal of a large Bramley Apple tree and large Silver Birch tree. (This was previously refused). But is now subject to a separate planning application to fell the Bramley Apple tree, no mention is made of the mature and large Silver Birch which would suffer the same fate, should the approved or applied for extensions go ahead. These are mature, large and visible trees, poorly photographed in the tree report. We attach photo.

Having read the Shropshire Core Strategy. I would question the following points.

1. "Conversion of rural buildings which take account of and make a positive contribution to the character of the buildings and countryside." The proposed plan does none of the above it lacks integrity is totally out of keeping in the rural landscape. When viewed from the opposite side of the valley it is now the prominent feature in the landscape, particularly at night when illuminated by feature lighting. It is already in its unfinished state completely overbearing. No further "revisions" or extensions should be permitted.

2. "out of scale, badly designed or otherwise unacceptable development, or which may either individually or cumulatively erode the character of the countryside, will not be acceptable. Whilst these considerations will apply generally, there will be areas where development will need to pay particular regard to landscape character"

We are within a World Heritage Site. An area of significant historical merit, an area which I believe is of outstanding natural beauty. Whilst Hazeck was a small single story bungalow with a room in the roof accessed by a ladder, surrounded and screened by greenery, it was of a scale not to impact on its setting. We are of the opinion that no further building should take place on this site. This construction is completely inappropriate in the conservation area we are sited. It is very modern in design when surrounded by mainly cottage style properties. It is incongruous in a small rural hamlet. The original bungalow is now lost within the now enormous two storey house. It does not take account of the character of the original building or the wider landscape setting.

Whilst acknowledging that we cannot object on grounds of loss of view, we will no longer have a view over the Ironbridge valley. Prior to development we could sit in bed and watch birds in the trees outside and see a beautiful view across the valley. We had on a sunny day full morning sunlight flowing into the master bedroom, bathrooms and our main living room. This is no longer the case, we have partial sun in the morning. The planned extension will further block sunlight/natural light into rooms on this side of our home. We have now had to dress our master bedroom window as we now have a direct view into Hazeck's current living room. This is partially screened more recently by a Wendy house and large children's trampoline. We also have a direct view into the bedroom (shown as a bathroom on the drawings). This was not an issue when a single storey bungalow screened by mature trees and greenery. This overlooking issue we have repeatedly stated. This is massively invasive. The planned extension with excessive further floor to ceiling bifold glazing, I find particularly intrusive and a further invasion of our privacy. The round brick pattern feature is a minor improvement on glazing, but we note a large velux style window which will again look into our master bedroom and main living room. This is also intrusive and a further invasion of our privacy.

If further increases in size and footprint are permitted this will result in much smaller amenity space, there is very little recreational space in relation to the size of the property

as is. There will be a reduction in onsite parking space for visiting cars (plus vans and cars connected to the applicants business). There is an outstanding application for garage and retaining walls, which will if approved also reduce amenity space further still.

In regard to the Eden Arboriculture report we note in table A1 the guide lines for tree planting against driveways, walls and buildings. The enforced tree protection (because almost every tree shrub or living plant has been striped from the site) has resulted in nine large specimen trees being planted against our (owned not shared ownership) boundary wall, driveway and outbuilding. If the report is taken at face value then the newly planted trees need to be moved as they are far too close to our boundary wall, driveway and outbuilding. The trees will also need to be relocated should the retaining walls and garage be approved, which somewhat renders the tree protection policy as worthless. It also states in the report the apples falling will cause damage, the Bramley Apple tree to be felled seems as with all of the plans rather extreme. Surely hard pruning would be more sensible. Removal of both trees ultimately is to enable further extensions to the two storey house (notably referred to as a bungalow).

The amount of planning applications for this site is ludicrous. There are currently four outstanding planning applications for this tiny plot. We trust that these will be assessed as a collective rather than individual basis. As this is a blatant attempt to get round the planning process. The ongoing applications are only serving to clog up the system. I can only imagine it is as frustrating for the planning department as it is for the locality.

Photographs submitted with these comments.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	14/05212/FUL	Neighbour

Yet another planning application for this site that is already considerably overdeveloped. I commented in a prior response that the planning committee must give consideration to this ongoing tactic to incrementally develop this site via multiple applications. I object to this application on the grounds that the windows in the side elevation (north facing) would overlook my property and as such invade our privacy. I also object to the associated plan to remove the mature tree: should the planners care to review google earth then is evident that the trees at the site have already been decimated and no further removal should be allowed. I remind the committee again that this is a conservation area and this modern overdevelopment is totally out of character. We will appeal if this application is approved and is would then ask the planning committee to explain how this development aligns to the planning guidelines

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	14/05212/FUL	Neighbour

1. We did not oppose the original application for change from a bungalow to a two storey house, or the original application (approved) for extensions at each end.

2. We do oppose this further application because the increased roof height will make an already dominant building, severely impact upon our privacy and the overall appearance of this conservation area.

3. There is a separate application for a double garage which would mean an unbroken building line across the right hand end of the site facing us. The site is already over developed for its size. The property is significantly elevated compared to the houses it faces across the lane meaning the intrusive nature of the development is magnified.

4. Further separate applications refer to the removal of more trees from the site. In summer these trees provide some shielding of the new building but in winter the appearance is stark and dominant. We believe therefore that the current extension application should take into account the other outstanding applications for tree removal and double garage.

5. We recognise that Mr and Mrs Craven have made real attempts to soften the impact of the work facing the lane. Sadly however we believe their site cannot tolerate further development without real loss to the overall conservation area in which it is sited.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	14/05212/FUL	Parish Council

Although we realise that the size of the proposed extension has been reduced, we are still opposed to any increase in size or height from that which is permitted under 13/02940/FUL. Any extra buildings on the site will be over-development and impact on the Broseley Conservation Area. We therefore continue to object to this application.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	15/00089/REM	SC Highways Development Control

No Objection:

The issues raised in their highway comments have been addressed. It is acknowledged that the level of parking provision proposed for the dwellings would satisfy the parking standards of the former Bridgnorth District Council which are still in force in the south east Shropshire area.

The applicant advises:-

Block paving is to be removed from the area of carriageway adjacent to plot 117.

Footway to be provided on the northern side of road between plot 195 and plot 66 to encourage linkage within the site to the area of public open space to the north.

Provision to be made for secure cycle parking for dwellings without garages.

A rear access and a hard paved link to be provided for plots such as 1, 20, 58 and 63 through their gardens to encourage use of parking within the allocated space and discourage on-street parking.

Plots 10,11,14,15 have been provided with 1 space each plus the use of 4 visitor spaces.

Plots 91&92 have been provided with 150% parking i.e. 1 space each plus the use of a shared parking space.

Plots 174-179 have been provided with 8 spaces for 6 dwellings i.e. 2 visitors, 187/188 and 190/191 have been provided with 3 spaces for 2 houses.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9	15/00371/FUL	Bridgnorth Town Council

Extract from adopted minutes submitted to confirm the views of Bridgnorth Town Council on this application:

**‘It was PROPOSED and SECONDED: that Bridgnorth Town Council recommends approval in respect of planning application 15/00371/FUL subject to reservations about the height of the stack and an examination of the necessity of this. Approval is also subject to appropriate consultation with the Public Protection Specialist with a view to minimising the noise pollution and further consultation with residents.**

An amendment was then PROPOSED and SECONDED that the application is approved subject to the visual impact of the stack being minimised to the best of the company's ability. This included the painting of the stack in a colour agreeable with local residents. A vote was then taken.

**RESOLVED:** that the Planning Application is approved subject to the visual impact of the stack being minimised to the best of the company's ability. This included the painting of the stack in a colour agreeable with local residents. Concern regarding noise pollution would be emphasised within the comments passed to Shropshire Council.'

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	15/01054/REM (Watling Street, Craven Arms)	Agent
<p>Following discussion with officers the Agent has agreed to reverse the orientation of Plot no 3. This places the obscure glazed bathroom on the side nearest to the garden of the existing private property known as Castle View. Bedroom 1 now faces south and any views towards the garden of Castle View are at an angle of more than 45 degrees, which is considered to be an acceptable spatial relationship.</p> <p>The agent has noted that the officer report refers wrongly at 7.1 to 24 No. houses when it should be 25 No. houses.</p>		