NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS Date: 9th June 2015

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

SAMDev update

The SAMDev main modifications have been received from the Inspector and are currently out for consultation for 6 weeks. Following this, assuming no fundamental issues arising, the Inspector will issue her report and the Council can move towards adoption, which is likely to be in September at full Council.

Ahead of adoption, following the publication of the Schedule of Main Modifications it may be considered that those parts of the plan <u>not</u> subject to modification are 'sound' in principle. Therefore, the officer view is from the date of the publication of the Schedule of Main Modifications on 1st June, <u>significant weight</u> can be given to those SAMDev policies not subject to main modifications in planning decisions, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 216.

For those policies that are subject to main modifications, including Development Management policies such as MD3, it continues to be considered that <u>some limited weight</u> can be given as at present.

This will affect agenda items 5, 6, 8 and 9 as detailed below.

Item No.	Application No:	Originator:
5	14/03403/OUT – Drayton Rd, Hodnet	Case Officer

Greater weight can be given to the SAMDev Plan in regards to the Community Hub of Hodnet as there are no changes proposed to the development boundary or the number of allocated sites being proposed. Having regard that the proposed development site is outside of the development boundary for Hodnet the change in weight to the SAMDev is considered to be significant to alter the balance in the officer's recommendation.

Item No.	Application No:	Originator:
6	14/05739/FUL – Long Lane, Marchamely	Case Officer

Greater weight can be given to the SAMDev Plan in regards to the Community Cluster of Marchamley, Peplow and Wollerton as there are no changes proposed to the development boundary or the number of allocated sites being proposed. Having regard that the proposed development site is outside of the development boundary for Marchamley the change in weight to the SAMDev is considered to add additional weight to the recommendation of officers to refuse this application.

Item No.	Application No:	Originator:
6	14/05739/FUL – Long Lane, Marchamely	Applicant
See attached letter		

Item No.	Application No:	Originator:
7	14/05767/VAR – Spar Convenience Store	Case Officer

There appears to have been some misunderstanding as to when the noise survey was undertaken in relation to the Noise Impact Assessment which was submitted with the application. I would confirm that that the noise assessment was carried out on Sunday 30th November 2014 as confirmed in Part 4.2 of the report. Monitoring took place between 10:00 and 11:00 and 15:00 and 16:00 whilst the store was open and 08:00 and 09:00 and 21:00 and 22:00 when the store was closed. Five locations were monitored – the entrance to Newton

Farm House, on the opposite side of Shrewsbury Road form the car park, western boundary of the adjacent garage, along the service road and to the rear of the plant equipment. **Application No:** Item No. **Originator:** 14/05767/VAR – Spar Convenience Store Agent 7 A petition has been received and signed by 391 people supporting the extending opening hours on Sunday for the Spar store at Baschurch. Item No. **Application No: Originator:** 14/05685/FUL – Bridgewater St, Whitchurch 8 **Case Officer** Greater weight can be given to the SAMDev in regards to Whitchurch as there are no changes proposed to the development boundary or the number of allocated sites. However, as a site which is within the development boundary the change in weight to the SAMDev is not considered to alter the recommendation of officers. Item No. Application No: **Originator:** 14/05685/FUL – Bridgewater St, Whitchurch **Conservation Officer** 8 I refer to the amended drawings submitted. It is considered that they have provided better detailing in line with the previous comments made. It is therefore considered acceptable and no objection is made as the proposal would appear to accord with above policies. Item No. **Application No: Originator:** 9 14/04168/OUT – Ruyton XI Towns **Case Officer** Greater weight can be given to the SAMDev in respect of Ruyton XI Towns as there are no changes proposed with respect to this settlement. As noted within the report the site is within the development boundary within the SAMDev and as such the principle of housing development on the site is considered to be acceptable. Two additional conditions proposed as follows: No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for: the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors i. ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development iii. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and iv. facilities for public viewing, where appropriate wheel washing facilities ۷. vi. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction vii. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works Reason: To avoid congestion in the surrounding area and to protect the amenities of the area. Demolition or construction works shall not take place outside 0730 hours to 1600 hours Mondays to Fridays and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Reason: In order to maintain the amenities of the area.

	Item No.	Application No:	Originator:
9 14/04168/OUT – Ruyton XI Towns Objector	9	14/04168/OUT – Ruyton XI Towns	Objector

A further objection has been received from a local resident responding to the published officer report raising the following matters:

- Weight that can be given to affordable housing is questioned due to ministerial statement and recent appeal decision
- There is no statistics to show that the new housing would help local economy and the village does not have sufficient infrastructure
- The holiday accommodation could not be accessed if the development proceeded
- The ecology report is not public
- It may not be possible to achieve the development without affecting stability of the site and the adjacent road
- There are no dormer bungalows in this area and this dwelling would not fit in with those either side
- The applicant does not own sufficient land for the visibility splays
- The traffic speeds should be recorded for the location of the access
- Increase in vehicles using this access would be detrimental to highway safety
- Simultaneous vehicle entry and exit is not possible
- The dwelling will not be suitable for a person in a wheelchair or with walking difficulties and therefore is not a dwelling suitable for whole life occupation
- Engineering implications have not been considered sufficiently
- Garages are too small
- There are inconsistencies in the plan