

Date: Thursday, 9 May 2019

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Contact: Shelley Davies, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257718
Email: shelley.davies@shropshire.gov.uk

CENTRAL 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

This page is intentionally left blank



Committee and Date

Central Planning Committee

INSERT NEXT MEETING DATE

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 11 April 2019

2.00 - 4.53 pm in the Shrewsbury/Oswestry Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Responsible Officer: Shelley Davies

Email: shelley.davies@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 257718

Present

Councillor Ted Clarke (Chairman)

Councillors Nat Green (Vice Chairman), Nick Hignett, Pamela Moseley, Tony Parsons, Alexander Phillips, Kevin Pardy, Keith Roberts and David Vasmer

116 Apologies for absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Ed Potter.

117 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Central Planning Committee held on 14th March 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

118 Public Question Time

There were no public questions or petitions received.

119 Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

Members were reminded that they must not participate in the discussion or voting on any matter in which they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and should leave the room prior to the commencement of the debate.

With reference to planning application 18/05584/FUL 41 Wood Street, Shrewsbury - Councillor Keith Roberts stated that the applicant was known to him and he would therefore leave the room, take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this item.

With reference to planning applications to be considered at this meeting, Councillors Nat Green, Alex Phillips and Keith Roberts stated that they were members of Shrewsbury Town Council. They indicated that their views on any proposals when considered by the Town Council had been based on the information presented at that time and they would now be considering all proposals afresh with an open mind and the information as it stood at this time.

With reference to planning application 18/05670/FUL Proposed Development Land off Mount Close, Pontesbury - Councillor Alex Phillips declared an interest during consideration of this item – see Minute 124.

120 Residential Development North of Leigh Road, Minsterley, Shrewsbury - 18/05802/OUT

Councillor Nick Hignett as local ward Councillor left the table during consideration of this item, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

The Area Planning Manager introduced the outline application (access off Leigh Road for consideration) for residential development (up to 28 dwellings) to include some demolition and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit to assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area that morning.

The Area Planning Manager advised Members that if they were minded to approve the application he suggested an amendment to Condition 2 to reduce the length of time for an application for reserved matters from three years to one year to ensure that the timings were as close as possible to the extant permission.

The Area Planning Manager referred to an additional representation from the Minsterley Flood Action Group that had been circulated to the Committee. He noted that a flood risk assessment had been submitted and considered by the SC Drainage Team and advised that a condition be added to any permission granted to ensure that the SC Drainage Team were consulted in relation to the submitted drainage scheme.

Douglas Jones, local resident spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Stuart Thomas, Agent on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Having considered the submitted plans for the proposal and noted the comments of all the speakers Members unanimously expressed their support for the Officer's recommendation subject to the amendment to Condition 2 and an additional drainage condition as outlined by the Area Planning Manager.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation subject to:

- A Section 106 legal agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution;
- The conditions set out in Appendix 1;
- The amendment of Condition 2 to reduce the length of time for an application for reserved matters from three years to one year; and

- An additional condition to ensure that SC Drainage Team be consulted in relation to the submitted drainage scheme.

121 Meeting Room, 17 Betton Street, Shrewsbury - 18/04386/FUL

The Technical Specialist Planning Officer introduced the application for mixed residential development of seven dwellings following demolition of all buildings on site; alterations to existing vehicular access; formation of driveway and parking areas and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit to assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area that morning.

The Technical Specialist Planning Officer noted that Condition 12 referred to the Town and Country General Development Order 1995 and explained that this should be amended to the 2015 Permitted Development Order and advised that if Members were minded to approve the application an additional condition in relation to the reinstatement of existing wall and fence should be added to any permission granted.

Phillip Benghiat, local resident spoke in objection to the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Steven Atkinson, Architect on behalf of the applicant spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In the ensuing debate, Members raised concern regarding the scale and design of the development and the impact on the Belle Vue conservation area.

Having considered the submitted plans for the proposal and noted the comments of all the speakers, Members unanimously agreed to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation for the following reason:

The proposal would constitute overdevelopment of the site which, due to its scale, layout and design, would result in a development which would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Belle Vue Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to national and Development Plan policies including CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Core Strategy, MD2 and MD13 of the SAMDev Plan, and Section 16 of the NPPF.

122 41 Wood Street, Shrewsbury - 18/05584/FUL

Councillor Keith Roberts left the room in line with his declaration at Minute 119.

The Technical Specialist Planning Officer introduced the application for change of use from A1 retail to A5 hot food takeaway restaurant and associated alterations to the building and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit to assess

the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area that morning.

The Technical Specialist Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the Schedule of Additional Letters which included representations from two local residents and the agent in response to Officer questions.

Victoria Pearson, local resident spoke in objection to the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1), Councillor Alex Phillips addressed the Committee as the local ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, a number of points were raised including the following:

- He did not object to takeaways in principle but considered this to be in the wrong location;
- He noted that on-street parking in this area was in high demand and the application should be deferred pending a highways assessment;
- The proposed use of the premises would generate additional vehicles for customers, staff and deliveries; and
- Dropped kerbs would be blocked by parked cars restricting access for wheelchair users.

Tayler Davies, Agent on behalf of the applicant spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In the ensuing debate, Members raised concern regarding the parking issues in this area and considered the proposed use to be significantly different and increase the demand for parking at times when minimal parking was available and would therefore encourage inappropriate parking and have a detrimental impact on the local highway network.

Having considered the submitted plans for the proposal and noted the comments of all the speakers, Members unanimously agreed to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation for the following reason:

Members considered that the proposed change of use provided in-sufficient off-street parking spaces for both staff and customers. It was acknowledged that the fall-back position was the use of the commercial premises as an A1 retail unit (including use as an off-licence) and that all customers travelling by vehicle would be required to find a space to park in the surrounding streets. However, it was considered that the

pattern of use and demand for on-street parking would be significantly different and increased for the proposed A5 use. This increased demand for parking would be generated at times when there was likely to be minimal parking available in the surrounding streets and as such would encourage inappropriate parking or waiting of vehicles and have a detrimental impact on the local highway network contrary to Shropshire Councils adopted policies CS6 and MD2.

123 School House Farm, Sheinton, Shrewsbury - 18/04266/FUL

The Consultant Planning Officer introduced the application for the change of use of farm yard and buildings to holiday complex to include: some demolition of buildings; siting of four glamping units and one log cabin; works to and change of use of two buildings to form office and store and leisure facilities, formation of parking areas; and installation of package treatment plant (Amended Description) and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit to assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area that morning.

The Consultant Planning Officer drew Members' attention to an additional representation from a local resident which had been circulated to the Committee. In reference to the representation, the Area Planning Manager stated that the site was able to accommodate additional units and therefore if Members were minded to approve the application he suggested that the scale of development be restricted to that included in the application.

Roger Thompson, local resident spoke in objection to the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Councillor Ian Lawrence, on behalf of Sheinton Parish Council spoke in objection to the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1), Councillor Claire Wild addressed the Committee as the local ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, a number of points were raised including the following:

- There were only 22 dwellings in Sheinton and the site was in the middle of the village;
- The site would not be supervised at all times and if Members were minded to approve the application a condition should be added to ensure that there was a manager on site at all times;
- At full occupation there would be 42 guests on site, doubling the size of Sheinton; and
- The application would not benefit the community and would have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area.

Helen Earley, the applicant, spoke in favour of the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In response to the speakers, the Consultant Planning Officer clarified that the figure given for the maximum number of guests was 38 and stated that a condition in regards to low level bollard lighting had been included.

Having considered the submitted plans for the proposal and noted the comments of all the speakers, Members unanimously agreed to defer consideration of the application to a future meeting of this Committee to allow the opportunity for the concerns raised by Members in relation to the use of the site 12 months of the year and the lack of on-site supervision to be addressed.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of the application be deferred to a future meeting of this Committee to allow the opportunity for the concerns raised by Members in relation to the use of the site 12 months of the year and the lack of on-site supervision to be addressed.

124 Proposed Development Land Off Mount Close, Pontesbury, Shrewsbury - 18/05670/FUL

The Planning and Enforcement Officer introduced the application for Erection of 18 affordable dwellings and associated works and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit this morning to assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

The Planning and Enforcement Officer drew Members' attention to the Schedule of Additional Letters which included a representation from the Coal Authority noting that Condition 7 may need amendment in light of this representation.

Councillor Duncan Fletcher, Pontesbury Parish Council spoke in objection to the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1), Councillor Nick Hignett addressed the Committee as the local ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, a number of points were raised including the following:

- Severn Trent Water and the SC Drainage Team comments were incorrect as flooding had occurred in this area last year;
- Properties further downhill will be vulnerable as a result of this development and culverts were required in this area; and
- Properties in Mary Webb Close had seen their insurance policy premiums increased following flooding last year.

Phil Oliver, Architect on behalf of the applicant spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In response to comments raised by the speakers, the Planning and Enforcement Officer explained that a drainage scheme had been submitted and Severn Trent Water had stated that the plans were acceptable and approval had been given by WSP.

At this point in the meeting, Councillor Alex Phillips noted that his Father was a director of the Housing Plus Group which was linked to Severnside Housing and therefore left table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

In response to a concern raised regarding the use of netting to prevent birds from nesting in trees and hedges, the Area Planning Manager suggested that Condition 8 could be amended to require that the Construction Management Plan provides for any intention to use netting on trees and hedges to prevent birds from nesting to be agreed by the Ecology Team.

Having considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all the speakers, Members unanimously expressed their support for the Officer's recommendation subject to an amendment to Condition 8 to require that the Construction Management Plan provides for any intention to use netting on trees and hedges to prevent birds from nesting to be agreed by the Ecology Team.

RESOLVED:

That authority to grant planning permission be delegated to the Head of Planning Services subject to:

- The conditions recommended in appendix 1 and any modifications to these conditions deemed necessary;
- The signing of a Section 106 agreement to secure the affordable housing in perpetuity; and
- An amendment to Condition 8 to require that the Construction Management Plan provides for any intention to use netting on trees and hedges to prevent birds from nesting to be agreed by the Ecology Team.

125 25 Abingdon Road, Shrewsbury - 19/00595/FUL

The Area Planning Manager introduced the application for the erection of single storey conservatory to side elevation and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit to assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area that morning.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1), Councillor Pam Moseley addressed the Committee as the local ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table,

took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, a number of points were raised including the following:

- She would not normally speak on this type of application but due to how the properties were set out the proposed conservatory would have an impact on the adjoining housing;
- The proposal would have a significant impact on the adjoining house resulting in a loss of light, especially in the winter months;
- Shrewsbury Town Council and other residents had objected to the application; and
- The application should be refused in regards to the impact on the neighbouring property.

Jeannie Bailey, the applicant, spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Having considered the submitted plans for the proposal and noted the comments of all the speakers, Members unanimously expressed their support for the Officer's recommendation.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1.

126 Hillside, Rowley, Shrewsbury - 19/00758/FUL - APPLICATION WITHDRAWN TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

RESOLVED:

Application withdrawn from the agenda for Central Planning Committee - for determination by the South Planning Committee.

127 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the Central area as at 11th April 2019 be noted.

128 Date of the Next Meeting

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that the next meeting of the Central Planning Committee be held at 2.00 p.m. on Thursday, 9th May 2019 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank

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
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?		
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?

This page is intentionally left blank

The Stew -Fitting out of New Flats

FLAT 1	length (m)	height (m)	area (msq)
New stud walls with sound insulation: (forming bathroom, ensuite, corridors and entrance.	21.20	3.30	69.96
Openings for doors in stud walls inc doors			
Kitchen units and fittings			
Bathroom fittings			
Ensuite fittings			
Electrical power and lighting			
Electrical heating			
Plumbing and domestic hot water			
Form opeinings in 326mm brick walls and insert new doors.			
Secondary double glazing to wndows.	1.10	2.10	
Fill opening with stud wall and allow for opening for one door.	3.00	3.00	
Skirtings	90.00		
FLAT 2			
New stud walls with sound insulation: (forming bathroom, ensuite, corridors and entrance.	56.00	3.30	184.8
Openings for doors in stud walls inc doors			
Kitchen units and fittings			
Bathroom fittings			
Ensuite fittings			
Electrical power and lighting			
Electrical heating			
Plumbing and domestic hot water			
Form openings in 326mm brick walls and insert new doors.			
Secondary double glazing to wndows.			
Skirtings	112.00		
New stairs			
FLAT 3			
Similar to Flat 1			
EO			
Fill openings with stud wall	7.00	2.40	16.8

FLAT 4	Similar to Flat 2 - no stairs and less floor area and walls.		
	New stud walls with sound insulation: (forming bathroom, ensuite, corridors and entrance.	38.00	3.30
			125.4
	Openings for doors in stud walls inc doors		
	Kitchen units and fittings		
	Bathroom fittings		
	Ensuite fittings		
	Electrical power and lighting		
	Electrical heating		
	Plumbing and domestic hot water		
	Secondary double glazing to wndows.		
	Skirtings	112.00	

no.	rate	cost	
	80.00	5,596.80	
5	268.00	1,340.00	
	item	10,000.00	
	item	3,000.00	
	item	3,000.00	
	item	4,000.00	
	item	4,000.00	
	item	4,000.00	
2	150.00	300.00	
5	800.00	4,000.00	
	800.00	800.00	
	12.00	1,080.00	
		41,116.80	437.4128

	80.00	14,784.00	
9	268.00	2,412.00	
	item	10,000.00	
	item	3,000.00	
2	3,000.00	6,000.00	
	item	5,000.00	
	item	5,000.00	
	item	5,000.00	
1	150.00	150.00	
6	800.00	4,800.00	
	12.00	1,344.00	
	800.00	800.00	
		58,290.00	123 620.1064
		41,116.80	
	50.00	840.00	
		41,956.80	98 446.3489

	80.00	10,032.00
7	268.00	1,876.00
	item	10,000.00
	item	3,000.00
2	3,000.00	6,000.00
	item	5,000.00
	item	5,000.00
	item	5,000.00
6	800.00	4,800.00
	12.00	1,344.00

52,052.00

97 **553.7447**

2057.613 /4 =

514.4032 average cost / sq m

The Stew, Frankwell Quay, Shrewsbury

SCHEDULE of Repairs, Reinstatments and
Other Works V.3 WITH REPOINTING

	Unit	Qty	Rate	Cost
Site Set Up				
Set up site, secure fencing, welfare facilities etc.				10,000.00
EXTERNALLY				
Scaffolding				
Scaffold entire building	msq	783.00	20	15,660.00
	m	82.60	135	
West Wall (House)				
Remove plaster from facing Brickwork	msq	12.00	18	216.00
Remove paintwork	msq	40.00	30	1,200.00
Reinstate facing brickwork	msq	10.00	110	1,100.00
Rake out and repoint brickwork	msq	50.00	110	5,500.00
Remove blockwork from opening	msq	5.00	20	100.00
New brickwork to match to part fill above opening	msq	2.00	135	270.00
Reinstate 5 no openings	msq	10.00	50	500.00
Take out and replace brick voussoirs labour and plant	no	8.00	52	416.00
Voussoirs supply only	no	8.00	328	2,624.00
New stone quoins	no	10.00	45	450.00
New stone string course	m	8.00	135	1,080.00
New stone face repairs to quoins	no	10.00	100	1,000.00

New sash windows including painting	no	7.00	1,000	7,000.00
New stone cills	m	7.00	200	1,400.00
	m	7.00	190	
New Door	no	1.00	1,000	1,000.00
New door surround	no	1.00	1,750	1,750.00
Apply limewash to address differences in shades of new and original brickwork	msq	50.00	23	1,150.00
Add for surround and hood				800.00
West Wall (Warehouse)				
Remove paint from facing Brickwork	msq	55.00	30	1,650.00
Rake out and repoint brickwork	msq	115.00	110	12,650.00
Reinstate openings	no	6.00	50	300.00
New windows including painting	no	6.00	900	5,400.00
Remove concrete blockwork	msq	4.40	10	44.00
Glazing to taking in door openings including panels over floor depth.	msq	15.00	200	3,000.00
Repair lucam	no	1.00	150	150.00
Apply limewash	msq	88.00	23	2,024.00
South Wall (Warehouse)				
Remove paint	msq	74.00	30	2,220.00
Remove metal bracketry to pedimented gable	no	1.00	25	25.00
Rake out and repoint brickwork	msq	115.00	110	12,650.00
Stich brickwork across vertical crack.	msq	3.00	80	240.00
Take out existing windows; Replace with new timber windows.	no	6.00	900	5,400.00
Apply limewash to retain present character.	msq	74.00	23	1,702.00
Small Extension (South Elevation)				
Remove paint	msq	6.75	30	202.50
Rake out a repoint brickwork	msq	21.50	110	2,365.00

Reopen ground floor window opening	msq	1.20	50	60.00
New windows	no	1.00	700	700.00
East Wall				
Remove plaster from facing brickwork.				
Remove internal doors. Remove large box and any gas/electric/water connections and meters within.	msq	37.00	18	666.00
Remove external render from brickwork and make good.	msq	10.00	18	180.00
Remove paintwork from facing brickwork.	msq	27.00	30	810.00
Remove blockwork from blocked up openings.	msq	4.00	135	540.00
Brick up openings previously formed for internal doors.	msq	4.00	25	100.00
Reform window openings.	msq	8.00	25	200.00
Rake out a repoint brickwork	msq	142.00	110	15,620.00
Reinstate facing brickwork to area of render	msq	37.00	80	2,960.00
New replacement casement windows including painting	no	19.00	700	13,300.00
New replacement external door	no	1.00	500	500.00
Small Extension (East Elevation)				
Remove paint	msq	6.75	30	202.50
Rake out a repoint brickwork	msq	1.00	110	110.00
Reopen ground floor window opening	no	2.00	25	50.00
New windows	no	2.00	700	1,400.00
North Wall				
Remove plaster from facing brickwork.	msq	10.00	18	180.00
Remove paintwork from facing brickwork.	msq	24.50	30	735.00
Rake out a repoint brickwork	msq	57.50	110	6,325.00

New replacement casement windows including painting	no	2.00	700	1,400.00
New replacement entrance doors including painting	no	1.00	500	500.00
Take out taking in doors and replace with glazing with panel to obscure depth of floors.	msq	12.00	200	2,400.00
Repair lucam.	no	1.00	150	150.00
Rainwater goods				
Half round cast iron	m	60.00	54	3,240.00
75mm dia cast iron rainwater pipes.	m	50.00	58	2,900.00
Roofs (slated Warehouse)				
Strip slates and lay 40% aside for reuse and relay allowing for replacement slates	msq	235.00	100	23,500.00
Repairs to rafter feet.	No	14.00	30	420.00
Repairs to wall plates	m	8.00	142	1,136.00
Repairs to purlin ends	No	8.00	250	2,000.00
Roofs (slated 2 storey Extension)				
Strip slates and lay 40% aside for reuse and relay allowing for replacement slates	msq	35.00	65	2,275.00
Repairs to rafter feet.	no	2.00	30	60.00
Repairs to wall plates	m	2.00	30	60.00
Repairs to purlin ends	no	5.00	250	1,250.00
Roofs (plain clay tiles)				
Strip tiles and lay 40% aside for reuse and relay allowing for replacement tiles	msq	50.00	85	4,250.00
Repairs to rafter feet.	No	20.00	30	600.00
Repairs to wall plates	m	6.00	30	180.00
Repairs to purlin ends	No	6.00	250	1,500.00

Valleys				
Strip lead valley between E and W ranges at N end of building.				
Repair valley linings and supports				
New Code 6 lead valley gutter.				
	m	13.00	325	4,225.00
Reinstatements				
Reinstate dormers:				
Stud work to cheeks				
Rafters to hipped roof	no	3.00	5,000	15,000.00
Plywood cheeks lined with lead				
Tiles to roof				
Casement window				
External works				
Services and connections				
Drainage and connection to sewers				50,000.00
Hard pavings around the building				
INTERNAL REPAIRS/UPGRADE				
Ground Floor				
Remove plaster from all walls.	msq	380.00	18	6,840.00
Line external walls with insulated Gyproc metal stud faced with insulated plasterboard and skim	msq	190.00	45	8,550.00
Line ceiling with fire resisting boarding and plaster. Case beams in 2 layers of plasterboard and skim.	msq	236.00	23	5,428.00
Take up concrete ground floor slab and replace with insulated concrete slab.	msq	236.00	60	14,160.00
Repair damaged brickwork.				5,000.00

First Floor				
Remove plaster from all walls.	msq	380.00	10	3,800.00
Line external walls with insulated Gyproc metal stud faced with insulated plasterboard and skim	msq	190.00	25	8,000.00
Take up floor boards; lay mineral wool quilt on chicken wire and replace floor boarding making an allowance for new boards to make up any shortfall.	msq	203.00	50	10,150.00
Second Floor				
Remove plaster from all walls.	msq	380.00	10	3,800.00
Line external walls with insulated Gyproc metal stud faced with insulated plasterboard and skim	msq	190.00	35	6,650.00
Take up floor boards; lay mineral wool quilt on chicken wire and replace floor boarding making an allowance for new boards to make up any shortfall.	msq	227.00	56	12,712.00
ENABLING WORKS TO FACILITATE NEW USES				
Form openings in existing floors for new stairs.				6,000.00
Provide new timber stairs	no	4.00	3,000	12,000.00
LANDLORD'S AREA FIT OUT (not including items above)				
Ground Floor		20.00	500	10,000.00
First Floor		18.00	500	9,000.00
Second		18.00	500	9,000.00
FLATS FIT OUT COSTS				
Assume these costs include all services connections				

Flat 1 94 sqm		94.00	514	48,316.00
Flat 2 123- sq m		123.00	514	63,222.00
Flat 3 98 sq m		98.00	514	50,372.00
Flat 4 97 sq m		97.00	514	49,858.00
Net Construction Costs				607,781.00
Contingencies @2% (DVS) (see also scaffolding and site set up costs above)	10%			60,778.10
Prelims @ 10%	12%			80,227.09
Gross Construction Costs				748,786.19
Value of Flats				
Flat 1 - 2 bed (rear)		210,000.00		
Flat 2 - 3 bed (front)		270,000.00		
Flat 3 - 2 bed (rear)		220,000.00		
Flat 4 - 3 bed (front)		230,000.00		
Value of Ground Floor				
Ground Floor (estimated - not including fit out costs) 220sqm		125,000.00		
Gross Development Value		1,055,000.00		

Development Costs				
Legal fees (2k per unit) (DVS)				8,000.00
Sales fees (DVS)	2%			19,000.00
Architects fees @10%	10%			74,878.62
Structural engineering advice (floors)				2,500.00
Severn Trent (DVS))				10,000.00
Planning application fees		462.00	4.00	1,848.00
Building Regulations		750.00	4.00	3,000.00
Financing costs 6.5% (DVS)				48,671.10
Buildings insurance (in prelims)				
Site investigation allowance				1,500.00
Gross Development Costs				918,183.91
Gross Profit before any Land Purchase				
		136,816.09		
% of construction costs		14.90		
Costs per square metre	Sq m	£/sqm		
including contingencies, prelims, fees etc				
All elements	700	1,311.69		
Repairs and reinstatements	700	657.52		
Flats including enabling works	422	715.98		
Total Cost of Flats (new + repairs etc)		1,373.51		

The Stew, Frankwell Quay, Shrewsbury

SCHEDULE of Repairs, Reinstatments and
Other Works V.3 WITHOUT REPOINTING

	Unit	Qty	Rate	Cost
Site Set Up				
Set up site, secure fencing, welfare facilities etc.				10,000.00
EXTERNALLY				
Scaffolding				
Scaffold entire building	msq	783.00	20	15,660.00
	m	82.60	135	
West Wall (House)				
Remove plaster from facing Brickwork	msq	12.00	18	216.00
Remove paintwork	msq	40.00	30	1,200.00
Reinstate facing brickwork	msq	10.00	110	1,100.00
Rake out and repoint brickwork	msq	50.00	110	
Remove blockwork from opening	msq	5.00	20	100.00
New brickwork to match to part fill above opening	msq	2.00	135	270.00
Reinstate 5 no openings	msq	10.00	50	500.00
Take out and replace brick voussoirs labour and plant	no	8.00	52	416.00
Voussoirs supply only	no	8.00	328	2,624.00
New stone quoins	no	10.00	45	450.00
New stone string course	m	8.00	135	1,080.00
New stone face repairs to quoins	no	10.00	100	1,000.00

New sash windows including painting	no	7.00	1,000	7,000.00
New stone cills	m	7.00	200	1,400.00
	m	7.00	190	
New Door	no	1.00	1,000	1,000.00
New door surround	no	1.00	1,750	1,750.00
Apply limewash to address differences in shades of new and original brickwork	msq	50.00	23	1,150.00
Add for surround and hood				800.00
West Wall (Warehouse)				
Remove paint from facing Brickwork	msq	55.00	30	1,650.00
Rake out and repoint brickwork	msq	115.00	110	
Reinstate openings	no	6.00	50	300.00
New windows including painting	no	6.00	900	5,400.00
Remove concrete blockwork	msq	4.40	10	44.00
Glazing to taking in door openings including panels over floor depth.	msq	15.00	200	3,000.00
Repair lucam	no	1.00	150	150.00
Apply limewash	msq	88.00	23	2,024.00
South Wall (Warehouse)				
Remove paint	msq	74.00	30	2,220.00
Remove metal bracketry to pedimented gable	no	1.00	25	25.00
Rake out and repoint brickwork	msq	115.00	110	
Stich brickwork across vertical crack.	msq	3.00	80	240.00
Take out existing windows; Replace with new timber windows.	no	6.00	900	5,400.00
Apply limewash to retain present character.	msq	74.00	23	1,702.00
Small Extension (South Elevation)				
Remove paint	msq	6.75	30	202.50
Rake out a repoint brickwork	msq	21.50	110	

Reopen ground floor window opening	msq	1.20	50	60.00
New windows	no	1.00	700	700.00
East Wall				
Remove plaster from facing brickwork.				
Remove internal doors. Remove large box and any gas/electric/water connections and meters within.	msq	37.00	18	666.00
Remove external render from brickwork and make good.	msq	10.00	18	180.00
Remove paintwork from facing brickwork.	msq	27.00	30	810.00
Remove blockwork from blocked up openings.	msq	4.00	135	540.00
Brick up openings previously formed for internal doors.	msq	4.00	25	100.00
Reform window openings.	msq	8.00	25	200.00
Rake out a repoint brickwork	msq	142.00	110	
Reinstate facing brickwork to area of render	msq	37.00	80	2,960.00
New replacement casement windows including painting	no	19.00	700	13,300.00
New replacement external door	no	1.00	500	500.00
Small Extension (East Elevation)				
Remove paint	msq	6.75	30	202.50
Rake out a repoint brickwork	msq	1.00	110	
Reopen ground floor window opening	no	2.00	25	50.00
New windows	no	2.00	700	1,400.00
North Wall				
Remove plaster from facing brickwork.	msq	10.00	18	180.00
Remove paintwork from facing brickwork.	msq	24.50	30	735.00
Rake out a repoint brickwork	msq	57.50	110	

New replacement casement windows including painting	no	2.00	700	1,400.00
New replacement entrance doors including painting	no	1.00	500	500.00
Take out taking in doors and replace with glazing with panel to obscure depth of floors.	msq	12.00	200	2,400.00
Repair lucam.	no	1.00	150	150.00
Rainwater goods				
Half round cast iron	m	60.00	54	3,240.00
75mm dia cast iron rainwater pipes.	m	50.00	58	2,900.00
Roofs (slated Warehouse)				
Strip slates and lay 40% aside for reuse and relay allowing for replacement slates	msq	235.00	100	23,500.00
Repairs to rafter feet.	No	14.00	30	420.00
Repairs to wall plates	m	8.00	142	1,136.00
Repairs to purlin ends	No	8.00	250	2,000.00
Roofs (slated 2 storey Extension)				
Strip slates and lay 40% aside for reuse and relay allowing for replacement slates	msq	35.00	65	2,275.00
Repairs to rafter feet.	no	2.00	30	60.00
Repairs to wall plates	m	2.00	30	60.00
Repairs to purlin ends	no	5.00	250	1,250.00
Roofs (plain clay tiles)				
Strip tiles and lay 40% aside for reuse and relay allowing for replacement tiles	msq	50.00	85	4,250.00
Repairs to rafter feet.	No	20.00	30	600.00
Repairs to wall plates	m	6.00	30	180.00
Repairs to purlin ends	No	6.00	250	1,500.00

Valleys				
Strip lead valley between E and W ranges at N end of building.				
Repair valley linings and supports				
New Code 6 lead valley gutter.				
	m	13.00	325	4,225.00
Reinstatements				
Reinstate dormers:				
Stud work to cheeks				
Rafters to hipped roof	no	3.00	5,000	15,000.00
Plywood cheeks lined with lead				
Tiles to roof				
Casement window				
External works				
Services and connections				
Drainage and connection to sewers				50,000.00
Hard pavings around the building				
INTERNAL REPAIRS/UPGRADE				
Ground Floor				
Remove plaster from all walls.	msq	380.00	18	6,840.00
Line external walls with insulated Gyproc metal stud faced with insulated plasterboard and skim	msq	190.00	45	8,550.00
Line ceiling with fire resisting boarding and plaster. Case beams in 2 layers of plasterboard and skim.	msq	236.00	23	5,428.00
Take up concrete ground floor slab and replace with insulated concrete slab.	msq	236.00	60	14,160.00
Repair damaged brickwork.				5,000.00

First Floor				
Remove plaster from all walls.	msq	380.00	10	3,800.00
Line external walls with insulated Gyproc metal stud faced with insulated plasterboard and skim	msq	190.00	25	8,000.00
Take up floor boards; lay mineral wool quilt on chicken wire and replace floor boarding making an allowance for new boards to make up any shortfall.	msq	203.00	50	10,150.00
Second Floor				
Remove plaster from all walls.	msq	380.00	10	3,800.00
Line external walls with insulated Gyproc metal stud faced with insulated plasterboard and skim	msq	190.00	35	6,650.00
Take up floor boards; lay mineral wool quilt on chicken wire and replace floor boarding making an allowance for new boards to make up any shortfall.	msq	227.00	56	12,712.00
ENABLING WORKS TO FACILITATE NEW USES				
Form openings in existing floors for new stairs.				6,000.00
Provide new timber stairs	no	4.00	3,000	12,000.00
LANDLORD'S AREA FIT OUT (not including items above)				
Ground Floor		20.00	500	10,000.00
First Floor		18.00	500	9,000.00
Second		18.00	500	9,000.00
FLATS FIT OUT COSTS				
Assume these costs include all services connections				

Flat 1 94 sqm		94.00	514	48,316.00
Flat 2 123- sq m		123.00	514	63,222.00
Flat 3 98 sq m		98.00	514	50,372.00
Flat 4 97 sq m		97.00	514	49,858.00
Net Construction Costs				552,561.00
Contingencies @2% (DVS) (see also scaffolding and site set up costs above)	10%			55,256.10
Prelims @ 10%	12%			72,938.05
Gross Construction Costs				680,755.15
Value of Flats				
Flat 1 - 2 bed (rear)		210,000.00		
Flat 2 - 3 bed (front)		270,000.00		
Flat 3 - 2 bed (rear)		220,000.00		
Flat 4 - 3 bed (front)		230,000.00		
Value of Ground Floor				
Ground Floor (estimated - not including fit out costs) 220sqm		125,000.00		
Gross Development Value		1,055,000.00		

Development Costs				
Legal fees (2k per unit) (DVS)				8,000.00
Sales fees (DVS)	2%			19,000.00
Architects fees @10%	10%			68,075.52
Structural engineering advice (floors)				2,500.00
Severn Trent (DVS))				10,000.00
Planning application fees		462.00	4.00	1,848.00
Building Regulations		750.00	4.00	3,000.00
Financing costs 6.5% (DVS)				44,249.08
Buildings insurance (in prelims)				
Site investigation allowance				1,500.00
Gross Development Costs				838,927.75
Gross Profit before any Land Purchase				
		216,072.25		
% of construction costs		25.76		
Costs per square metre	Sq m	£/sqm		
including contingencies, prelims, fees etc				
All elements	700	1,198.47		
Repairs and reinstatements	700	553.79		
Flats including enabling works	422	715.98		
Total Cost of Flats (new + repairs etc)		1,269.77		