



Date: Tuesday, 17 September 2019

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

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 17th September 2019		
<p>NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee.</p> <p>Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting</p>		
Item No.	Application No	Originator
Item 7.	19/02525/VAR	Parish Council
<p>In the report it states that 5 letters of complaint had been received by yourself, yet on checking the application information there are 8 letters from the general public of which 7 were against the application and one was deemed as neutral. I would hope that this error can be corrected and the members of the committee are informed of this mistake.</p> <p>Officer Comments</p> <p>A total of 6 letters of objection, 1 non-committal comment and 1 letter from local ward member have been received. The Public Comments section of the committee report in paragraph 4.2.1 is amended as follows:-</p> <p>Six letters of objection have been received raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No path on the Shotton Lane corner so crossing the main road is currently done on the highway. • Safety to pedestrians. • The path would be used by local residents. • Proposed footpath was offered by developer and would provide additional safety for pedestrians from Shotton Lane • Planning permission was only granted for the dwellings on the understanding that a footpath would be constructed. • All building work has been completed except the footpath. • Residents on corner of Shotton Lane would use proposed path. • There is no pavement on Shotton Lane corner to enable safe crossing of main road. • Improved visibility at Shotton Lane to cross main road than Bridgewater Place. • Pavement would aesthetically enhance the village. • The footpath will allow the pedestrians to make deliveries safer. • The footpath will not impact on the old milestone <p>One letter has been received from a local resident of Bridgewater Place raising the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments of neighbours living in vicinity of proposed path need to be taken into consideration. • The junction with Wem Road is restricted due to slight bend and existing is hazardous because of traffic speeds. 		

- A pavement along the roadside frontage would give speeding motorists travelling from the Wem direction a clearer concept of approaching a built up area.

Item No.	Application No	Originator
9	19/02633/FUL	Neighbour

Comment from neighbour asking the following:
 1: What, if any, assessment has been carried out by the Highways Dept.on the issue of increased traffic using Swanhill to travel to and from the proposed new facilities and what, if any, measures are planned to mitigate the effects of such an increase?
 2: What, if any, provision is planned for car parking for visitors to the new centre, assuming that they will attempt to access the facilities via Swanhill?

Officer Comments

In response to the neighbour questions above is it pointed out that the scheme does not propose any additional vehicle access or car parking. The café would only be accessible to those using the area on foot. There is an existing narrow access track which historically has been used by Council maintenance teams/ staff to access the depot buildings and the Countryside Wardens office in the adjacent bungalow; this situation is not proposed to change. It is not anticipated that the proposed café would give rise to increased traffic using the lane.

Item No.	Application No	Originator
9	19/02633/FUL	Case Officer

Section 3 of the report to Committee should indicate that the proposal is not part of its statutory functions. (The Council's).

Item No.	Application No	Originator
8	16/04620/VAR	Case Officer

The proposal is considered acceptable in relation to the historic environment as this application is to vary what is understood to be an extant consent and relates to the appearance of the dwelling which was previously given consent on this site. It is considered that whilst the shape of the proposed revised dwelling on site has not been amended to reflect the previous dwelling approved or officer comments made, the scale and massing has, following further discussions. In considering this application special regard to the desirability of preserving the designated heritage assets and their settings in line with Section 66 of the Planning Listed buildings and Conservation Area Act 1990 has been made.”

As such the Council's Conservation Manager raises no objections to this proposal following revisions to the overall design.

The proposal subject to this application has been subject to a reduction in the height of the building and minor tweaks to the design, i.e. position of roof lights, pitch of roof over garage etc.

Also to clarify it appears some local residents appear to be confusing the fact that the previous approval was for an eco-house. This was on the basis of its standard of construction and not its external appearance. The new design would still be built

to the same eco-standard as the previous approval.

This page is intentionally left blank