

Date: Tuesday, 9 December 2014

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Linda Jeavons, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 252738
Email: linda.jeavons@shropshire.gov.uk

SOUTH 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

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 9 th December 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		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6.	14/02127/FUL	Neighbour Objections/RDA Support
<p>Since this application was deferred at the 14th October 2014 South Planning Committee, seven public representations have been received from four different parties. These can be viewed in full online, however are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Nothing has been mentioned with regards to the potential structural and drainage issues associated with our property in recent design improvements and correspondence. ○ Stating that work will be done within the highway boundary does not address the matter of ground disturbance, vibrations can already be felt from the A4169. ○ There is currently a tree line which dissipates noise and pollution from the road junction. There will be an increase in noise pollution due to be the removal of this acoustic barrier and the increase in traffic. Our isolated property will also become more visible to potential intruders. ○ We are uncertain as to whether the junction work can be accessed on existing highway boundaries as we have current land registry entries and original deed plans that contradict each other. ○ The submitted highway layout is misleading, the carriageway would have to be widened much more. ○ The extra passing places do not cover all vehicle users ○ The developer has not taken into account the use of the road by horses, walkers, cyclists and motorcyclists. ○ The new plan does not take into account winter weather conditions. ○ The widening of the access point onto the A4169 will make the slope steeper, and exacerbated in adverse conditions. ○ I believe the law relating to Bradley Lane requires a derestricted sign. There are no traffic calming measures. ○ Vehicles travel faster than the restriction. Increased speeds justify increased visibility distances. ○ No objection in principle to the development, but serious concerns in relation to the design of the junction improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Double white lines on the road are in place because of the hill crests either side of the junction which reduces visibility for all movements - The width of the lane reduces from the junction directly in front of our property. This would lead to vehicles encroaching onto our land in order to pass each other. - Concerns over the health and safety of our family due to increased traffic and noise pollution. - Effect on buildings and foundations from the construction activities and increased levels of heavy vehicles. - Risk to road users and to large number of walker using the lane. ○ The archaeological information should have been presented to Councillors earlier and flagged up as of potentially great importance. ○ Concerned that major structures will be built on an archaeological site. 		

- At present the interpretation of these remains is that they are water management features.
- It is understood that archaeological investigation will be made a condition of Planning Permission, but if unusual elements are discovered, this would seriously compromise the scheme as well as costing considerable sums of money.
- This piece of land would be reduced to brownfield status should the project conclude or fail.
- The regime in place to remediate a flood leak of even modest proportions at the site is inadequate, hardly reassuring after 30 years of work firstly by Severn Trent and then the Environment Agency.
- I and several neighbours have spent a lot of money on flood proofing our properties and Shropshire Council have budgeted in excess of a million for flood containment for the Farley Brook catchment area. What sense does it make to negate this by allowing a development of this size in such a sensitive place.
- If this is granted, the derelict buildings at the site will also be developed. The increased domestic water out flow will be similar to building a small housing estate there and the projected road traffic volumes doubled or trebled.

One of the representations submitted takes the form of a letter to the Riding for the Disabled Association (RDA) and includes their response, one of strong support, and both of which are précised below:

Letter To RDA

- With considerable local knowledge residents believe that this chosen location is not suitable due to being located in the Much Wenlock Rapid Response Catchment, there being a medieval settlement on the site, the adjacent chemical/fertiliser factory and highways safety and logistics issues. This raises serious concerns as to the welfare and safety of RDA clients using the centre and also to the local population.
- Have the RDA completed a detailed Risk Assessment for this project which bears the associations backing or has an Insurance Company produce such as assessment.

RDA Response

- This application has been put together by the Perry Group and not the RDA.
- However, we absolutely support what they are trying to achieve in Shropshire which is an important part of our strategy to increase the access to this type of service for people with disabilities across the UK and to create facilities which are sustainable.
- As a relatively small charity, the RDA are not in a position to undertake complex site evaluation at this stage.
- When a decision is reached, assuming it is for approval, any implications for insurance will be a matter for the Perry Group to discuss with the insurers.
- It is understood that the process to get a planning decision has been delayed in order to allow the Council more time to consider some of the technical aspects, which suggests that they are taking this issue very seriously.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6.	14/02127/FUL	Alliance Planning Objection representing 12 local residents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerned about the absence of any wide ranging review of all the highways improvements options at this junction by the applicant, limiting it to land within the Highway Authority's control, not considering the 'best option' may include the 		

acquisition of 3rd party land.

- No technical assessment of the junction proposal has been undertaken, the absence of which or a request for it by the Council's Highway Advisor means that the Committee is being asked to make a decision without clarification that the proposed works are safe in highway terms and will address the concerns raised.
- Key conclusions of The Transportation Consultancy (TTC), the services of which have been retained to independently review the highway proposals, have been provided within a submitted Technical Note summarised as follows:
 - offer substandard visibility to the north on the A4169 junction which are below the safe Stopping Sight Distance;
 - offer possible risk of ground of longer vehicles across the proposed junction improvement cross section;
 - do not address the adverse gradients on the lane and on the A4169 junction which will restrict the speed of larger vehicles entering the A4169 and pulling away;
 - the proposed passing places on the Lane to the Site are presented in the absence of a highway boundary plan confirming that the land required is available and details that the ground conditions allow for the places to be delivered;
 - the forecast traffic level for the facility, set out in the Transport Statement, are not based on technical assessment using nationally recognised TRICS trip generation database; and
 - no information is provided regarding maximum accumulation of parked vehicles on-site in order to assess whether the proposed level of parking provision and its layout is sufficient for the proposed use. The applicant should provide more accurate information regarding parking accumulations of all vehicles on-site. The horse-box and trailer parking area should be shown as marked, and with sufficient capacity to accommodate the maximum accumulation identified, plus turning and circulating areas.
- A further deferment by the Planning Committee is recommended to review the findings. In the absence of this clarification the application should be refused on the basis that the proposal will result in an adverse effect on highway safety.

Members are directed to view the Technical Note document submitted by Alliance Planning which is available to view in full online.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	14/02184/FUL	Agent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site Plan drawing submitted showing location of SSSI; - Drainage details requested by Natural England are being prepared for submission, please note if the drainage scheme proposed would affect the SSSI, the applicant is prepared to install a sealed Cesspool instead. 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	14/02184/FUL	Third Party objection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please listen to the people who have made this place so special, if they don't support this business how can it possibly succeed? - Everyone objects, how can one business be more important than the local people, AONB and wildlife; 		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	14/02184/FUL	Third Party - further comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The "public " right of way that runs from the Wenlock Edge to the Wenlock Edge Inn, is not marked on the Map provided by the applicant; - This right of way is blocked by stone dumped at the entrance and there are signs clearly stating there is no public right of way, to stop walkers crossing the car park to Ippikins rock; - There are two public rights of way which come from Ippikins rock and lead to the car park. Is the path through the car park to the road a "public" or Permissive path? - There is no public footpath through the pub garden – it is the Parish Boundary dividing the pub, (in the Much Wenlock Parish) from Hill Top (in the Easthope Parish.) 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	14/02184/FUL	Shropshire Council Rights of Way Team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no recorded public right of way or formal permissive path (i.e. allowed under written agreement) across the Wenlock Edge Inn Car Park; - The green line shown as a public footpath on the agents block and site plan is not a public right of way but the Parish Boundary. 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	14/02184/FUL	Case Officer
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development would not obstruct either formal rights of way and permissive paths or the informal route which runs through the car park, the use of this path by the public is subject to the permission of the landowner; 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	14/02184/FUL	National Trust
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further representation received from National Trust – continued objection to scheme; - The buildings would be more visible than parked cars; - It would take years for any planting to take effect and would never fully hide the buildings or car park; 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	14/02184/FUL	Third party – Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is clear that the Wenlock Edge Inn cannot function economically in its current state, as demonstrated by its vacancy for the past several years; - The proposals will help to diversify the income of this rural business and will help this iconic and historic inn to reopen. 		

- Support the application subject to conditions requested by statutory bodies.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9.	14/03444/FUL	Resident – support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scale of Parish Council's rejection of this planning application is unreliable - 3 parish councillors objected online before the application was discussed at the September meeting, therefore they could not have gone into that meeting with an impartial point of view - Two of those parish councillors voted against the application and one abstained - One of the parish councillors is a next door neighbour to the southern side of the potential development and stated in the meeting that it would reduce the value of the barns being developed to residential properties; has a clear conflict of interest between being a parish councillor and being a neighbour and should not have been allowed to join in the debate never mind vote - Planning Committee should recognise the applicants huge compromise in agreeing to reduce the visual impact of the site and the overwhelming support of the local community 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9.	14/03444/FUL	Resident – support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parish Council's comments are not representative - the portal shows that there is approaching 90% support for the proposal - majority of objections are from Parish Councillors predictably repeating their views - it is clear from the last Parish Council meeting that one of the Parish Councillors has a clear pecuniary interest; this has been disregarded by the Chairman - concern over how vote was made - should be approved due to overwhelming positivity of the Sherifffhales community, which is in support of this proposal - mixed messages from Government over solar farms; Government paper of 2009 commits UK to a minimum 20% of all energy produced from clean/renewable sources by 2020; recent Government comments have sought to damp down the virtues of these schemes as they have overwhelmed the Government coffers - the most recent confirmation by scientists is that CO₂ damage to our climate is real and we must relent from our dependence on fossil fuels; no miracles in the offing, we have wind, solar, and bio-mass, though the latter robs the food chain, OR Nuclear, though no public (tax payer) investment program in the offing on any of these fronts - refusal would reflect putting short term political comforts before the good of future generations and an ignorance of the inevitable black outs from energy shortfalls 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9.	14/03444/FUL	CPRE
<p>Object to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - industrial scale of proposal will blight the countryside around - farmland will be out of production for a considerable length of time - will not bring any benefit to local people as any energy produced will go straight into the National Grid - when the National Grid cannot store any energy then it is switched off and we will compensate the landowner a second time 		

- energy bills will not be reduced
- firm will bring in its own workforce
- intermittent heat produced will not bring the benefits claimed
- if the solar panels were on a smaller scale like on farm buildings with the source going into the farm buildings there would be no problem
- CPRE support the objections raised by the Parish Council

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 9 th December 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		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9.	14/03444/FUL	SC Highways Development Control
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further to the updated Construction, Decommissioning and Traffic Management Method Statement, from a highways perspective all information with regard to the proposed construction traffic route is satisfactory and therefore there is no need for submission of additional information. The planning condition 3 can be amended as follows: - - No construction or decommissioning work shall take place other than in accordance with the traffic management measures set out in the submitted Construction, Decommissioning, and Traffic Management Method Statement. - - Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to protect the amenities of the local area. 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9.	14/03444/FUL	Resident – objector.
<p>Object to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rural vandalism on an industrial scale and has no place on good quality agricultural land. The land is a mix of Grade 2 and 3 - solar farms belong on brownfield sites and buildings not on beautiful Shropshire countryside - will benefit a few greedy farmers and developers who don't have to live with the consequences and will cost the consumer in subsidies - thought our coalition government had stopped supporting these developments; Liz Truss said that solar farms on this scale were a blight on the landscape, so why are Shropshire planners bringing this project forward - completely against Shropshire's own core strategy, CS5, CS16, CS17 		

This page is intentionally left blank