

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date of committee: 30 August 2018		
<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:
5	17/05234/FUL: Land Off Greenfields Recreation Ground	Neighbour Dr Peter Day (21.08.2018)
<p>I have managed to quickly read some parts of this before the meeting with residents and some of this is incorrect and these comments should not be committed to paper without checking the Land Registry titles:</p> <p>4. <i>The available documents submitted with the registration would have been those referred to on the title which have been considered by officers and do not add anything further to consideration of the land's status. The 2010 date relates to the entry in the register when the land comprising the site and the adjacent recreation land, together with other land in the town, was transferred to Shrewsbury Town Council. This section for example is incorrect the documents are different</i></p> <p>Can I ask that these documents form part of the planning revocation and that documents should have been requested from the Town Council in this consideration and NOT from documents sent to me. These documents have not been previously disclosed to either planning application.</p> <p>Can I also add this is untrue:</p> <p>8. <i>Minutes of various meetings over the years potentially indicate that the land was acquired for use as public open space or for recreational purposes as part of a larger piece of land but this evidence is not conclusive as there are no clear plans or maps to identify what land is being referred to.</i></p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/05234/FUL: Land Off Greenfields Recreation Ground	Neighbour Dr Peter Day (22.08.2018)
<p>I have had a chance to review your recent officer report. I can only re-iterate what I have stated in my previous email, below for your convenience.</p> <p>Since the Greenfields Community Group requested a revocation of the planning application 12/00620/OUT we have undertaken further research into the history of Greenfields Recreation Ground and as far as we can discern (apart from temp allotment use) there were no formal decisions in respect of this land from the time of acquisition in the 1920's until the recent sale. The sale of the land which is now fenced off is Open Space because it was held by the Council for recreation purposes until the sale and because it was actually used for recreation by locals. There is in our view a good argument that the sale process was unlawful because there are special processes required when selling Open Space and these were not followed.</p> <p>As a matter of fact that this land has been held as open space for almost 100 years and has been used as such and should have been recognised as such and that policy relating to green space should be applied to it: see the revised version of the NPPF.</p>		

Paragraph 97 provides:

Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

1. an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
2. the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
3. the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.

The Greenfields Community Organisation believe that the Land Registry documents 2005 and 2010 and map attached to these documents and deed have vital information not previously disclosed by Shrewsbury Town Council that clearly demonstrate that this and is Greenfields Recreation Ground and indeed Open Space. Furthermore Shrewsbury Town Council understood this by their voluntary registration of land with the Land Registry in 2005 and 2010.

The error in not defining this land as Open Space requires immediate attention as we believe the above documents authoritatively establish this land as Open Space.

I have to ask again in terms of the revocation of planning process and my complaint regarding the information and process of this original planning application by Shrewsbury Town Council is this your final response.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/05234/FUL: Land Off Greenfields Recreation Ground	Neighbour Matthew Banner (22.08.2018)

I have looked at the planning document recently uploaded regarding the land off Greenfields, noticing your wording below.

6.1.15 Shropshire Council Commons registration officer has advised that the application to register the Greenfields Recreational Area as a village green is still being determined. The Council as Commons Registration Authority is minded to reject the application as not "duly made" as there have been two trigger events (as set out in Section 15C - Schedule 1A of the Commons Act 2006) with no corresponding terminating event. These trigger events affect a small portion of the application land. The determination of this current planning application need not and should not be held up by this decision.

I would therefore like to question aspects of this comment which are conflicting in nature. Firstly, with regards to the application being duly made, you have previously insisted and highlighted that the application land and the park are already separate entities and have no relationship with one another other than a land boundary. It seems contradicting to then say that trigger events affect a small portion of the land. If that is so, that land in question is not separate or you are being negligent in allowing this planning proposal to be accepted.

Secondly, when referring to trigger events. Again, since the building application land is separate (confirmed by you) there is no implication for accepting the tvg proposal. Irrespective of any trigger event which could be refuted and will. As far as I am concerned I live next to the park and which to protect and also have greater say over the land. I can argue this has nothing to do with the application since the land is separate and I have not included it in the tvg application. By rejecting the application under your current comments you are once again confirming the two lands are not separate or share a relationship more than a boundary both of which need further investigation and should

halt the building application being accepted. It is alarming to read that irrespective of the progress of this application that building can start, again showing negligence. Should this application be rejected on these points, I will instruct my solicitor to both sue the council over damages and negligence unless you can provide clarity on my comments.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/05234/FUL: Land Off Greenfields Recreation Ground	Neighbour Dr Peter Day (25 August 2018)

I attach the email I sent to Jane Raymond below and my complaint is the Town Council were not asked to validate or produce any documents to the Revocation Planning Decision (or have their 'its not a park' position verified by this process), but apparently documents provided to me, an amateur, were used instead. This cannot be the method of interrogating a planning decision? I have absolutely no qualifications that make me an authority in planning or the law.

However the community has since day one steadfastly refuted the Town Councils position both in its documents and through local testimony. Jane knew we, the Community, were looking into Land Registry Documents to Validate Council Minutes of 1925 but did not wait or request an update – nor did she as the investigating/planning officer request these Land Registry Documents. Most significantly for us and as stated above Jane did not make it incumbent on the Council to prove the land is not part of our Park. It is significant as once this land is gone a 100 years of recreation is lost to this community and I believe it is in the interest of all parties to get this right.

The community has additionally tried to protect a footpath that runs through Greenfields Recreation Ground. This is the most contentious aspect of the planning proposal as this footpath is used for approximately 300 journeys by this communities most vulnerable, its Primary School children, on their way to Greenfields Primary School. The development will build a road across this footpath endangering our very young.

Two applications to try and offer some protection to this route via a Village Green and Definitive Map application are still lost in the Councils procedures. However both Officers undertaking these applications have made pre decision comments to the Planning Officer against the applications and undermining decisions which have yet to be decided. These prejudicial comments appear in the Officers Report Aug 2018 and this is not acceptable. The application to afford some protection to our children via the Definitive Map application has taken since April 2017 and it is still in the application stage. This is also not acceptable.

There is a real sense in my community that we are being patronised by both Town and County Councils in the sale and planning process. There is a palpable sense of disaffection with the democratic process. I tried to reflect this in my email to Jane by expressing the communities disappointment that we could not submit our research before her decision on the revocation application was hastily made below.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/05234/FUL: Land Off Greenfields Recreation Ground	Neighbour I Welsby and R Norton (27.08.2018)

The above Planning Application shows no respect for the Greenfields Victorian Area which has only one vehicle access. Unless you live within this area, as we have for many years, one does not get to grips with these growing concerns.

This application will necessitate granting access to much larger vehicles, which will put the already strained infrastructure under increased daily pressure.

To expect residents to find alternative parking is quite unacceptable these days.

The entrance to the Recreational Ground, will provide the only vehicle access to the proposed development, and caution has to be respected as the children's play area joins onto the car park.

The entrance is the: Public Right of way, Play area, School run, Bowling and Social Club activities, Allotment Area, Cyclists, and Church/social parking.

In addition, there is an issue connecting to all mains services. The antiquated drainage system, which is sited practically right in the middle at the thread end of Falstaff Street. These drains already have problems, including foul smells, and have been known to flood cellars.

When entering Greenfields Street from the main Ellesmere Road, you could immediately be confronted with oncoming vehicles, in the single line access. Someone has to reverse. Driving on down to Hotspur St and Percy St, reversing and manoeuvring around one another is the only options, then the nasty bend into Falstaff St, where many a car has lost its wing mirror.

Construction of this size will put the recreational activities out of action for months and would interfere with the registered safe cycling path. Even D-value houses.

As winter approaches the vehicles on Ellesmere Road will increase two-fold. This adds further pressure from the reversing vehicles, due to shops with limited parking.

This Park is central to all houses, Old and New has been OPEN Space for many years.

A comparatively small amount of money could enhance this important Park. With extra parking, a return of trees with a seated picnic area would enhance and give this land its rightful place, where green areas are just as important as in the country.