



Date: Tuesday, 6 May 2014

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Shelley Davies, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 252726
Email: emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 4pm on 2 May 2014. Any items received after this will be reported verbally to the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 10

PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 6th May 2014		
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		
5	12/04209/FUL	Objection
The attached letter of objection has been received and circulated to all members		
6	13/05139/FUL	Objection English Heritage
CROSS KEYS PUBLIC HOUSE, KINNERLEY, SHROPSHIRE		
<p>Following our telephone conversation of today, I wonder if it might be possible to apply to the planning committee for a postponement of their decision on the building of houses on the land surrounding this public house.</p> <p>As you know, the building is the subject of an application for statutory designation as a listed building. I have not been able to visit the building yet (which is of course crucial to any proper judgement) but, on the basis of the photographic evidence and measured drawings submitted to us, I would consider it to have the appearance of a good candidate for listing.</p> <p>I should be grateful if you would let me know the outcome of the council meeting on Tuesday.</p>		
7	14/00831/OUT	Objection
<p>We note that this scheme offers to provide additional 'overflow' parking for the school surgery but that the recently validated application at Milford Road (ref: 14/01123/OUT) in accordance with the Parish Council wishes, is offering land for the provision of a <i>new</i> surgery.</p> <p>On the basis that these schemes are both offering the same community benefit, we feel that the Prescott Road application should perhaps be deferred in order that they may be considered together or revised accordingly. If it is the intention of the surgery to move further north, then overflow parking in this location would not be necessary.</p>		
8	14/01018/FUL	Parish Council
The attached letter has been received which seeks to clarify the Parish Council concerns		

Dear Sir/Madam

Ref No: 12/04209/FUL. Land off Pixley Lane, Hinstock, Shropshire. Change of use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes for 3 no. gypsy pitches together with the formation of additional hardstanding and utility/dayrooms ancillary to that use.

This letter has been written to provide a summary of the key points/themes of the **241 objections** given by the residents of the Parish of Hinstock to the above planning application. This letter has been passed to the Committee Clerk to ensure it is passed to all members of the Planning Committee (or Sub-Committee which is going to determine the application).

The objections are made based on **Shropshire Council's Core Strategy**, specifically CS5, CS6, CS12 and CS17 and Government Circulars National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (**NPPF**) and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 20212 (**PPTS**) and how the application is contrary to the requirement of these Policies.

CS5 Countryside and Greenbelt and CS6 Sustainable Design and Development

•The proposed development falls outside of the permitted development boundary for Hinstock and is not an identified site under SAMDev established through community/Parish consultations.

Applicant has not demonstrated a (i) need for and (ii) the benefit of the proposed development (CS5).

• The application is not targeted or well evaluated or it would detail in the design and access statement how it complies with Shropshire Council's Planning Policies through the development and **quantify** the need and benefit.

•Given that the LDF has not yet had an opportunity to plan for appropriate land supply suitable for traveller sites per PPTS Para. 4 and 9 it appears premature and no overriding need to apply for development of open countryside (which CS5 seeks to protect) when long term site supply has not been established which should look to use previously developed brownfield sites throughout Shropshire as recommended per Para. 24 of PPTS. Also the option to further develop existing established sites throughout Shropshire.

Failing to enhance countryside character contrary to CS5 and not in keeping with the overall character and context of the surroundings contrary to CS6 as follows.

•The proposed development is unacceptable because it is isolated and sporadic (see map of countryside on planning document, this is an agricultural field). It is completely separated from the existing village settlement and in an open countryside location.

•The development is badly designed and not soft landscaped. Utility blocks are basic and urban in design. Vast quantities of hardstanding (1476m² as per Surface Management Document) and high fences/hedging are proposed. Although the chances of hedges growing with so much hardstanding is questionable. This would be at odds with the current surroundings.

•The site will be visible to motorists on the A41 and highly visible to walkers/cyclists using Pixley Lane and the public footpath and would appear as a permanent residential feature. Visibility will be increased in the autumn and winter. Thus affecting visual and recreational amenity used by existing settled community.

CS12 Gypsy and Traveller Provision

Not appropriate for gypsy/traveller site even as an exception site.

- There is no information or evidence from the applicant or agent to show the future occupants have a strong local connection to the area contrary to CS12. In fact there are no details on the occupants or any housing need demonstrated.
- Site has not been well planned contrary to CS12 and PPTS in terms of location and design as discussed under CS5 and CS6.
- On the application (original and amended) it has been declared that no pre-application advice was sought from the Local Authority. However this would be best practice especially for exception sites. Also to ensure it is inclusive and integrated development with the existing community as per CS12.

CS17 Environmental Networks

Development does not protect and enhance the natural environment.

- Contrary to CS17 no Ecological Assessment had been undertaken before the application in order to establish if offence would be made under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010).
- Great Crested Newt European protected species possibly present at site. Has been recorded as present 150m from site.
- SC Ecologist currently recommends refusal.
- Adverse effect on residential amenity of neighbours and community with regard to
 - Noise disturbance in previous untouched area.
 - Lighting nuisance.
 - No details on plans for waste and recycling management.
 - Possible overdevelopment of site.
 - Recreational use of Pixley Lane – detrimental effect on health and wellbeing of settled community.

Other matters

Concern over possible business activity and use on the site. Policy F of the PPTS states that Council's should not permit mixed use on rural exception sites.

- Statement reference no. of vehicles, gives minimum of 2 but no maximum.
- .Details if any over 3.5 tonnes implies business use.

Concern over highway safety to for all who use Pixley Lane for walking, cycling, horse riding etc.

The above demonstrates that the application is contrary to all of the Shropshire Core Strategy Policies detailed above. However the only reason given for the application is that there is an 'identified need' which has not be quantified or explained and certainly does not justify the unnecessary development and adverse, detrimental effect on an area of open countryside.

Yours faithfully

Hinstock Parish Working Group

Submission by Knockin Parish Council

1. This submission concerns only the boundary treatment proposed, and relates only to the height of the proposed railings. No other objections are raised by the Parish Council.
2. The Parish Council were unanimously of the opinion that the proposed 2m height of railings would have an excessive impact upon the countryside setting of the village. In appreciation of the applicant's desire to enclose his garden, they were of the view that railings at a maximum height of 1.5m would be acceptable, and that if required for security purposes, there would be no objection to a ha-ha in front of the railings – a feature of many country houses. They considered it unlikely that screening would satisfactorily hide the railings without being incongruous in itself.
3. It should be noted that at the east end of the site earthworks have lifted ground levels, so that the high railings would appear more dominant in the countryside. The height can be judged on site – the railings would be 0.4m lower than the wall pillars.
4. The Conservation Officer shares the Council's objection to the height of the railings.
5. Despite this expert advice, and local opinion, the planning officer concludes that the railings are acceptable. Her reasons appear to be:
 - a) that the railings are better than the original proposal, dismissed on appeal;
 - b) that gardens are allowed fencing of this height under permitted development rules;and therefore, the proposal would maintain and enhance the character of the countryside, as required by policy.
6. These reasons are spurious – the judgement which is required is whether the proposal would meet the policy and be an enhancement to the countryside, not whether it's an improvement on the unacceptable proposals which have been partly implemented. The fact that gardens are normally permitted high fences or railings is irrelevant – this is a case where a new development is to be permitted to extend the developed area into the countryside, and the planning authority should take whatever reasoned decision is necessary to safeguard the character of the rural surroundings of the village and its Conservation Area.
7. The officer gives no reasoned argument as to why her judgement should be superior to that of the Conservation Officer or the representatives of local people, or why their views are wrong. Members are asked to either refuse, or condition approval, so that a lower, more acceptable railing is used.

29.4.14