

**CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 3rd April 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:
5.	13/02776/OUT Falklands Road, Dorrington	Public comments

One further letter received objecting on the following grounds:

- The re-proposed footpath on the fold is not a public highway (it is a private road) has no footpath in place and no room for one to be put in. It has no street lighting and as there are 2 blind bends this would be dangerous for both pedestrians and car drivers alike.
- The existing footpath along the A49 is unsuitably narrow and dangerous and would still be used by residents of proposed site as most village amenities are on the opposite side of the road, new residents would disregard the proposed new footpath eg to go to Sadd the butchers or the Horseshoes public house.
- The A49 is an extremely busy main thoroughfare through the village which already has considerable waiting times during peak traffic flows to enter or exit onto the A49. The proposal would increase traffic wait times at already busy periods.
- The Falklands road junction is only just within the 30mph boundary and would make it dangerous to pull out of and into Falklands road.
- The Falklands road itself is too narrow to deal with the increased amount of traffic.
- The proposed development is not within the village boundary, was not identified as a suitable location for development and does not comply with the VDS.
- There are very little employment prospects in the village contrary to the developers comments, residents would still need to commute to either Shrewsbury/Telford.
- Due to the poor amount of footpaths residents of the proposed development would opt to drive to village amenities, eg village shop, school (where parking is extremely limited) doctors, which would increase the amount of traffic already in the village. We strongly object to this proposed development and believe it will bring no benefit to the village, will increase the risk of accidents on the A49. The proposed new footpath is completely inadequate to deal with the new development.

Item No.	Application No.	
6.	13/03920/OUT Land Between Mousecroft Lane And Longden Road Shrewsbury Shropshire	Shrewsbury Town Council / Officer comment

“Members raised concerns about the impact of the additional traffic, generated from these 175 dwellings, on Longden Road and surrounding roads which during the rush hours become heavily congested. They would like to see the access positioned opposite to the depot therefore requiring just one traffic island and requested to know how the surface water will be dealt with on the site.”

- Officer comment:
 - A four-arm mini roundabout wouldn't provide the speed reducing qualities that the three-arm would provide due to a lack of deflection.

- Inappropriate to combine residential and industrial traffic.
- The application form states that surface water drainage will be disposed of by a sustainable drainage system and to the main sewer. The application has been referred to the Council's Flood and Water Management Team who have commented that the drainage details, plan and calculations could be conditioned and submitted for approval at the reserved matters stage if outline planning permission is granted. The Drainage Officer has advised that the use of soakaways should be investigated in the first instance. If soakaways aren't feasible then drainage calculations limiting the discharge rate from the site equivalent to a greenfield runoff rate should be submitted for approval. Accordingly it will a requirement of the Reserved Matters application that the development will integrate measures for sustainable water management to reduce floor risk.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	13/04757/OUT – Development land opposite The Crescent, Nesscliffe.	Agent

This is a late item of information to update Members seeking to address the Highway Officer's comments made in PARA 4.1.3 of the Committee Report concerning the following matters:

1. The Highway Officer has assumed there would be a loss of the bus-stop. It can be confirmed that this is not the case, as is illustrated by the "marked-up" revised highway access plan which shows that the extended footpath will facilitate and allow the retention.
2. The Highway Officer made comment on the "internal highway design layout" which state that if it came forward, in support of a Reserved Matters application, would be objected to, and the Highways Officer advocates an amendment. The illustrative master-plan has been slightly amended and is illustrated on the PowerPoint. The streets are fairly short and traffic numbers are low - streets are 4.8m wide, so allow for some on street parking also – it would work well as it has a rural edge feel and there are no (urban-esque) home zones in the village, where the character is more straight lanes with straight/angular changes in direction.

Officer comment – due to the timing of the submission of the additional information the Highways Officer has not been able to provide a response.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
12.	14/00254/FUL - Development land adjacent to Leylands – Pulley Lane, Bayston Hill.	Public comments / Officer comments

3 comments have been received which raised the following issues:

- 33 affordable dwellings have recently been approved in the Bayston Hill Parish. In the committee report it says that the SAMDev target is 39 to 49 dwellings after taking account of existing site commitments, but this is without these 33 dwellings.
- The dwellings are of a standard design seen nationwide with little street scene value.
- The development does not address the real housing need in the area.
- The reason the site has been left undeveloped should be looked into.
- The presence of Spring Cottage suggests potential underground water which could be polluted and contaminated and lead to ground stability issues.

- The development proposes to remove a boundary hedge which I am against.
- Officer comment - Please note that in respect of the 33 dwellings, this is an affordable housing exception site.