

Date: Tuesday, 24 July 2018

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Shrewsbury/Oswestry Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury,

Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Contact: Emily Marshall, Committee Officer

Tel: 01743 257717

Email: emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

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





NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

Date: 24th July 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	Application No. 18/01269/FUL	Originator:
No.	The Council's Landscape Consultant has responded to this application and their conclusions to the application indicate: 'The LVIA concludes that, other than for walkers on the short (250m) section of footpath through the proposed development site in the short to medium-term, the proposed development would not result in any significant adverse additional or combined effects on landscape character or visual amenity during the construction and operational phases of the development and, in combination with the adjacent approved development, would provide some long-term beneficial effects to the character of the site and surrounding landscapes as a consequence of the permitted renovations of the farm buildings and the permitted and proposed biodiversity and landscape enhancement proposals. We consider that the landscape and visual impact assessment has been carried out in an appropriate manner, and, given the robustness of the methodology and the application of that methodology, its findings can be supported. Given the above, we make no recommendations as a result of this review'	Officer.
Item	Application No.	Originator:
No.		Originator.
7	18/00833/FUL	Agent

The applicants (via their agent), yesterday morning submitted an amended site plan which was later withdrawn. The email confirming withdrawal indicated:

Thank you for your email, please proceed without the amendment as per agenda.

However, our historic expert's views remain a material consideration. These were

sent to you on the 10th July, with plenty of time for you to consider them.

Our position is set out in their response, they disagree and question how the canal trust have come to their conclusions And believe the conclusions they have reached are incorrect as they or your ecologist have not followed the historic England guidelines. We will be relying upon our expert's opinion at any subsequent appeal and costs request.

Please see below the key comment.

The Canal & River Trust comments, from a heritage perspective, are subjective on the whole. There is no evidence in their submission that they have read our report, or undertaken any independent impact assessment based on the Historic England guidelines.

We look forward to this application being reported to the committee and them applying the correct balance that there is no harm coupled with the obvious farm diversification and tourism benefits.

Officer response.

It is understood the Canals and River Trust have no further comments to make to those as originally put forward in their response to the application.

The matter referred to above by the agent has been brought to the attention of the Council's Conservation Team who have responded indicating:

The Canals and Rivers Trust is the relevant statutory consultee and they provide comments as they see fit. The policy requirement set out in the NPPF (para 128) and the Local Plan (Policy MD13) is for the LPA to require the applicant to undertake an appropriate level of heritage assessment. The LPA and other consultees use this to form their own assessment of the merits of a case – there is no requirement for them to commission their own, independent assessment as the agent implies. The LPA will likewise be prepared to substantiate and defend it's position at appeal using its own expert heritage officers.'

As such your officer is not convinced by the comments as put forward by the agent and conclusions as set out in the report remain as Officer advice.

