

**SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 8th May 2019

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:
2 (Minutes)	18/03172/FUL	Neighbour

I do not agree with the minutes as posted. As usual the minutes favour the applicant and are not a true reflection of how the deferred decision was reached.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	18/03091/FUL	CPRE Bridgnorth Division

Objection

It is considered that the proposed development is completely out of character in this country setting and CPRE fully supports the views of the Parish Council.
Received 29.04.2019

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	18/03091/FUL	Chetton Parish Council

Chetton Parish Council has no objections to the amended proposals as shown on the above application.
Received 07.05.2019

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	19/00218/FUL	Hopesay Parish Council

Parish Council comments on temporary caravan:

Hopesay Parish Council does not object to the temporary siting of a static caravan, provided that it is allowed for a limited time period only.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	19/00218/FUL	Case Officer

It has been brought to attention that condition 6 as currently recommended in the published committee report and which requires submission of foul and surface water drainage was included in error as the drainage detail has been submitted as part of the application documents.

It is therefore recommended that condition 6 is reworded to read as follows:

Prior to the first use or occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted the foul and surface drainage systems hereby approved shall be installed in full accordance with the approved plan drawing number M18-PO2 Rev B and drainage particulars and the systems shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with satisfactory means of drainage, avoid increasing the risk of flooding at the site or elsewhere, and safeguard the ecological interest of the River Clun Special Area of Conservation, in accordance with Policies CS6, CS17 and CS18 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy.

In addition to the end of condition 13 requiring the erection of a bird box the following sentence is added '*The bird box thereafter shall be permanently retained and maintained on the site*'

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	18/05149/FUL	Reade Buray Associates

The officer's report does not cover points raised in submitted comments to the portal, in particular those referred to in my email sent to you at 12:53 today (listed 1-4 below). For example, at paragraph 1.8 the planning officer simply accepts an unsubstantiated statement made about the site access driveway by the applicant which is contradicted by the Shropshire Fire & Rescue team in a response to a query by "Andrew" (posted on the planning portal on 2 April 2019) in which it clearly explains the reasons why the site access driveway does not (and cannot) comply with section B5 of the Building Regulations. The fire officer provides a link to a formal Determination to confirm non-compliance in a precisely similar earlier case.

The Determination is attached, the conclusion of which is in line with the recommendation of the report prepared by Mode Transport Planning (which was based on accurate measurements of the site access driveway) in the objection comment by Claverley Preservation Society (CPS). As such the application should, in my opinion be refused unless and until an alternative access compliant with the Building Regulations regarding fire access has been provided.

On behalf of the members of the CPS, I would be grateful if you will please ask the duty planning officer to clarify his properly considered reasons for setting aside both the Shropshire Fire & Rescue Service comments and the Mode Transport Planning report on this case with particular reference to:

1. The incorrectly drawn application plans which show the existing driveway access (which for some unexplained reason is excluded from the application site) 4m wide when it is actually 2.8m wide between the houses 7 Bullring and 1 Church Terrace including a 0.3m strip of unregistered land (i.e. just 2.5m width belonging to the applicant)
2. The advice of Shropshire Fire & Rescue that the site access driveway does not comply with section B5 of the Building Regulations and that compensatory measures proposed by the applicant are likely to be inadequate to properly protect occupiers from the consequences of a fire event
3. The advice of Shropshire Waste Management team regarding distances that residents will have to move bins along the access driveway (which is inexplicably excluded from the application site) despite the claims by the applicant's agent
4. The parish council decision not to support the application for affordable homes on this site which, under SC affordable housing policy should automatically result in a refusal

It is no defence, in my opinion to say that on this point, Building Regulations are not a planning matter: vehicular access is a material planning consideration in every planning application. Furthermore, the reference by the officer (in his report) that negotiations with

the applicant to facilitate the approval of the application have taken place in accordance with NPPF guidance should not, in my opinion, extend to acceptance by the planning team of grossly inaccurate drawings and avoidance (by whatever means) of compliance with fire safety regulations enshrined in the Building Regulations, an important consideration in the on-going context of the Grenfell Tower disaster.