



Date: Tuesday, 25 June 2024

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Tim Ward, Committee Officer  
Tel: 01743 257713  
Email: [tim.ward@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto:tim.ward@shropshire.gov.uk)

## **SOUTHERN 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

# Agenda Item 9

<b>SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS</b>		
<b>Date:</b>		
<b>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</b>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
6	24/01047/REM	Planning Officer
<p>On 17<sup>th</sup> June, the agent has supplied a further, amended Arboricultural Report, (date of revision 14<sup>th</sup> June 2024), which contains a method statement, at paragraph 7.0, giving specification of the construction proposed for the access drive. The Council's Tree team have subsequently been asked to provide an additional response to this and, if acceptable, it would ensure that the tree to be retained would suffer no damage from the development and alleviate the need for the recommended pre-commencement condition 2.</p> <p>On 21<sup>st</sup> June following a request from the development manager the agent amended the plans to demonstrate a 2-bedroom dwelling so that the reserved matter can be determined in accordance with the relevant outline planning permission</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
7	24/01556/FUL	Planning Officer
<p>Additional Information to support scheme from applicant:            Applicant continues to dispute that planning permission is required for the change of use of land that housed the cattery building.            Applicant argues that he can cover half in garden area in domestic buildings which could be substantially larger than the proposed new building.            All the existing buildings are going to be demolished and these are larger than the new building.            If the roof were to be lowered, then it would be permitted development.            The design is contemporary as it will then match the proposed replacement dwelling that the applicant will be applying for in the future.            It is not for a commercial development and applicant was not asked for a bat survey at the outset.            It does not overshadow the neighbour and would be constructed with a block and beam floor and block walls, so there would be no noise and the neighbour has not raised any concerns.</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
7	24/01556/FUL	Planning Officer
<p>Further information and plans from applicant to support scheme:            The proposed building has less floor area than the sum of all of the buildings that are to be demolished. With a building on the opposite side of the curtilage the total is excess of 177m<sup>2</sup> so a condition can be imposed. It is all within the domestic curtilage and so applicant considers that he can cover half my land with permitted development buildings.</p>		

It is only because the height of the building is higher than 0.75m that it needs planning permission.

The adjoining neighbour has now written into the Council to support the proposal and the applicant wants this letter of support read out at Committee. He does not object and prefers the design of the new building to the unsightly mess of the clutter of existing buildings.

The proposed building has been designed by an architect and the glazing only faces into applicant's garden.

The proposed building is a solid building more than 8m away from nearest neighbour and there is no prospect of any noise emanating from this building.

Applicant still disputing the requirement for a bat report or that BNG is required, as the cattery is within the garden area. Only applied for a change of use, because the Council would not progress my case unless this was included, but applicant still considers that the cattery was an ancillary use to the residence and not a separate use.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
7	24/01556/FUL	Ward Member

Unfortunately I will be unable to speak at the meeting due to diary . I support the application and believe the new building is an improvement to the site and suits the applicants life style for usage . I do not believe the building to be as detrimental t policy as the officer does and would welcome the committees opinion