



Date: Wednesday, 28 August 2019

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Linda Jeavons, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257716
Email: linda.jeavons@shropshire.gov.uk

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

TO FOLLOW REPORT (S)

12 Date of the Next Meeting (Pages 1 - 6)

To note that the next meeting of the South Planning Committee will be held at 2.00 pm on Tuesday, 24 September 2019, in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 28 th August 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:
3	18/03172/FUL	Public Representation
<p>We write with reference to the above Application and the additional information which the Applicant has recently submitted regarding proposed drainage for the site.</p> <p>We draw your attention to our previous letters of objection dated 8 February 2018, 6 August 2018, 18 October 2018, 4 February 2019, 27th July 2019 and 6th August 2019 - please note that these objections still apply.</p> <p>We quote from our letter of 27th July 2019, as follows: <i>‘The calculations provided by MSL and those submitted previously do not stand up to rigorous inspection. It appears highly likely that an attenuation volume of at least double that suggested by MSL will be required to protect the site and its environs.’</i> Lo and behold the revised information purports to show an attenuation volume of 246 cubic metres whereas previous information showed only 66 cubic metres – this represents an increase of 372%</p> <p>The Applicant has had several opportunities to get this information right but, on each occasion, has spectacularly failed to do so. This matter is sufficiently fundamental to the development of the site that any drainage details MUST be independently ratified by your Consultants in advance of any Planning Committee Meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The details of the attenuation tanks shown on Drawing 19-1169-D SK03 Revision B are STILL INCORRECT. The Applicant has shown that the attenuation tanks have a 100% void but has referred to the tank as being formed of ‘crates’. This type of tank typically has a 93% to 95% void to allow for structural support of the units. 2. The Applicant has ignored previous advice from WSP UK, dated 22nd July 2019, to use ‘<i>the Micro Drainage software to design the sizing of the attenuation storage tank</i>’. 3. In their comments of 6th August 2019 WSP UK state that the proposed flow control devices are ‘<i>too small and impractical as they are prone to blockage</i>’. We are VERY concerned that any blockage will lead to significant volumes of water being discharged from the site in an UNCONTROLLED MANNER. To prevent such an occurrence we believe that the Applicant should provide revised drainage details and proposed maintenance proposals to prevent such an occurrence, well in advance of any Committee Meeting to consider the Planning Application. 4. The size of the proposed surface water attenuation tanks is so large as to not permit any space within the Planning Application boundary for the proposed sewage treatment plant and its associated drainage fields etc. 5. This Application MUST be REFUSED until the Applicant has provided satisfactory 		

information to show how the site can be properly drained

Accordingly, we conclude **once again** that this Application in its several iterations continues to be a catalogue of mismatched assertions, and calculations which appear to be based more on hope than fact, and trust you will take our comments into account when considering this wholly ill-conceived and inappropriate Application in a process that will lead to its **REFUSAL**.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
3	18/03172/FUL	Public Representation

We are writing to further OBJECT to the above Planning Application based upon the lack of information supplied.

We trust that our comments will form part of your consideration that lead to a REFUSAL of the submitted Planning Application. Please note that our previous objections still apply.

There are SIGNIFICANT OMISSIONS in the Report provided to Councillors, as follows:

1. Paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 'Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified'. The report omits to point out that the information relating to need has not been FULLY EVIDENCED – indeed no written evidence has been provided on Planning Portal for interested parties to comment on. The information provided should rightfully be regarded as HEARSAY, in that the only information relates to what one Council Officer has said to another Council Officer. This does in no way represent FULLY EVIDENCED information.

2. Paragraph 137 of the NPPF states the following; 'Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development'. Evidence to this effect has simply NOT been provided by Shropshire Council.

Lack of the above information represents a major procedural oversight as Members of the Planning Committee (who are not Planning Experts) must have guidance from Officers relating to such fundamentally important issues when considering this Application.

In conclusion we are firmly of the view that the information provided by the Applicant and Shropshire Council is insufficient to secure a satisfactory Planning Consent. We trust that our comments will lead you to REFUSE the Planning Application.

Officer Comment: This planning application does not alter the Green Belt boundary around Alveley Village. Paragraph 6.1.4 of the Committee advises:

*"While this site is situated in the Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate development, the National Planning Policy Framework lists a number of exceptions at paragraph 145. These exceptions include *f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exceptions sites);"*

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
3	18/03172/FUL	Public Representation
<p>Numerous material planning reasons have been presented against this application.</p> <p>There are just as many other reasons, not least the future of the village in terms of built environment. In the light of the Local Plan for Alveley being at an advanced stage, this application is premature.</p> <p>The Applicant has repeatedly asserted that he is doing this for the village, yet not one person has put their support on record. On the other hand, many people have objected from the outset and to each successive representation of the proposed development.</p> <p>Section 4, paragraph 40 of the National Planning Framework states: “Local planning authorities [...] should also, where they think this is beneficial, encourage any applicants who are not required to do so by law to engage with the local community and, where relevant, with the statutory and non-statutory consultees before submitting their applications.” It would seem the Case Officer did not consider “engaging with the local community” beneficial. The Applicant did not consult with local residents, or the Alveley Green Belt Preservation Group (AGBPG) at the outset. AGBPG sought a meeting, at which the Officer (Richard Fortune) gave the clear impression that the development was a done deal and objecting would be a wasted effort.</p> <p>This is reflected in the Applicant’s approach. From day one he has behaved as if consent was a mere formality and he was all set to bulldoze ahead.</p> <p>And he did indeed attempt to bulldoze ahead. In 2018 residents of Meadowbrook Close were disturbed by the sound of heavy machinery and exited their homes to find a digger at work uprooting hedgerow. It was only their intervention that prevented the oak tree (NOW SUBJECT TO A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER) being torn from the ground.</p> <p>It was only after the South Planning Meeting of 9 April 2019 when he failed to achieve consent that he attempted to consult with AGBPG and residents.</p> <p>At the South Planning Meeting on 9 April the Applicant stated that he only intends to build SIX dwellings, although “people” are saying that he will build more - the inference being that “people” are wrong.</p> <p>He suggests that he is doing the village a favour by putting a limited development on this GREEN BELT SITE, as a large developer would blanket the entire area with a far greater number of properties. This attitude indicates the Applicant’s total lack of understanding of The Green Belt, and policy which requires robust evidence of SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES to build on The Green Belt.</p> <p>Since the Applicant himself has said that he intends to build more houses after the initial SIX, his assertion is shown up for what it is – a gambit to mitigate objections and achieve planning consent, as well as sidestepping the very real material planning issues (sewage; water management/flood risk; traffic flow/parking etc., etc., etc.) that exist and would increase incrementally with a greater number of dwellings. Then there is the thought that by building certain types of dwellings, in stages, in small numbers, towards a final target amount a developer might obviate Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).</p> <p>The Case Officer is recommending approval subject to the Applicant satisfying a LARGE number of conditions. Should consent be given on this basis, the situation would be</p>		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:

This page is intentionally left blank