

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

Date: 22 June 2021

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	20/03508/FUL	Neighbour
<p>Publication on the [Council's] website in respect of the planning application is at a late date therefore allowing residents very little time to respond, is this normal practice? The report was published on the 14th June and the meeting is to be held on the 22nd June taking out 2 days for the weekend, this leaves 5 days.</p> <p>I wish to raise the question on the drives of the houses from numbers 12 to 20. It appears there will be no separation from the ends of our drives and the beginning of the road. Is this correct? As residents we are still fearful of the traffic situation which is an accident waiting to happen, whilst important to residents, the Council do not seem to recognise this or the potential dangers.</p> <p>How will the speed of the traffic be controlled, with the number of on-line shopping deliveries and vans currently driving at speed, with a more open road this is likely to become more of a safety issue.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	20/03508/FUL	Albrighton Parish Council
<p>As discussed, on behalf of the Parish Council, we would request for this application to be deferred for decision to the next Southern Planning Committee. The reason for this is due to the Clerk leaving and a full council only being in place since last Thursday 10th June 2021. The Parish Council has not been in a position to discuss this planning application and Councillors elected at the 6th May 2021 election have not been provided up to date information.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	20/03751/FUL	Objector
<p>The neighbour objecting to the development has sent several emails to Council representatives which have in summary emphasised concerns about contamination of the private water supply to Ragdon Manor, as a result of flooding of the watercourse, combining with effluent from the applicant's septic tank. A short video clip showing water flowing down the road between Ragdon Bungalow and Ragdon Manor during heavy rain has also been submitted. This flood water is believed to contribute to contamination. Concerns also raised about herbicides sprayed near the watercourse. The neighbour has advised she and her family are now drinking bottled water and has requested a meeting with the Drainage and Flood Risk Manager. Further concerns have been raised about harm to the Shropshire Hills AONB and landscape character.</p>		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	20/03751/FUL	Drainage agent for applicant
<p>The drainage agent for the applicant has submitted a more detailed topographical survey with supporting calculations intended to clarify possible outstanding concerns about flooding and risk of neighbour's borehole contamination. This new information is currently being assessed by the Drainage and Flood Risk Manager, with a view to providing more feedback to the case officer.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	21/00671/FUL	SC Ecology consultees
<p>This application site meets the trigger point for requiring a bat survey since it involves modification, conversion, demolition or removal of buildings and structures (especially roof voids) involving the following: Pre-1914 buildings within 400m of woodland and/or water In the absence of this additional information refusal is recommended since it is not possible to conclude that the proposal will not cause an offence under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	21/00671/FUL	Planning Officer
<p>As highlighted by ecology consultees, further information is required with regard to bats and officers consider that this constitutes an additional reason for refusal where we do not have sufficient information to determine whether the proposed works will have a significant adverse impact on Shropshire's natural environment in accordance with policies CS17 and MD12 and where the proposed works may otherwise cause an offence.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	21/00671/FUL	Applicant
<p>Thanks for the latest information re 'bats in the attic'. Given the late admission of this report/request, way beyond the normal consultation period, made only at the last minute prior to the Planning Committee meeting , I can only assume that it is a last minute attempt to prevent Trustees from proceeding with their plans for the Integrated Heating System the Hall and the installation of solar panels in particular, should permission be granted by the Planning Committee. I am sure that the Planning Committee will see this for what it is.</p> <p>I have personally been in the roof space, as has the Structural Engineer, and we have seen no evidence of bat 'occupation', but then, we are not experts and we were not specifically looking for evidence of bats. I have also spoken to some of the elderly Trustees, some have had an association with the Village Hall for 80 years or more, they also have no recollection that the Village Hall has had any association with bats. Given the continual dialogue we have had since February no mention has ever been made of the need for such a survey. I understand that such reports are often required for specifically listed buildings, but of course the Village Hall is not specifically listed, so there would have been no presumption that we would have undertaken such a survey.</p> <p>As you know, we have taken a lot of time and trouble to reassure you the Planners, (and the public at large), that the installation of the heating system would have only a minimal effect on the fabric and aesthetics of the building, and have produced copious notes and</p>		

photographs to support our view. If we were fortunate enough to be granted Planning Permission for our scheme I am sure Trustees would agree to authorise a survey as outlined in your E-mail before undertaking the installation of solar panels.

However, I would suggest that this late intervention should not affect the Planners decision with regard to the Village Hall's because:

- (a) It was not made during the normal period of consultation or even the extended period thereafter,
- (b) It was not requested during the extended period of dialogue between the applicant and the Planning Officers,
- (c) The installation of Solar Panels would not be intrusive to the fabric of the building and would therefore have no effect of potential use by bats,
- (d) The purpose of the 'Integrated Heating System' is to reduce the use of hydrocarbon fuels, to reduce the carbon footprint of the Hall, ensure the Hall is a Near Zero-Energy Building (or as near as it can be) and as such is a positive response to the Climate Emergency.

If schemes like this cannot be swiftly introduced throughout the Country, then I suspect things will look bleak for both the bats and humankind.

I will continue to review your E-mail re - Bats to see if we can provide reassurance of no disruption for Bats because of the possible installation of Solar Panels on the Hall.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	21/00671/FUL	Planning Officer

The application indicated that minimal disruption of the roof or roofspace would occur but in fact the installation of solar panels will likely require the lifting of tiles, the installation of supports to the roof, the installation of wiring connecting the solar panels to the air source heat pump within the roof space, and potentially the strengthening of the roof structure- the full extent of works required will not be assessed until grant funding acquired.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	21/01171/FUL	Local Member (Cllr Butler)

I write in relation to the above application which is due to go to committee next week.

The resubmission to which I and the Parish Council only received notification of yesterday the 14th June has been investigated further and appears to be the resubmission of material alterations that were refused on a previous application as they were not just material considerations relating to the opposite end of the building compared to the original application to which I had asked it to come to committee as there was great concern from both the Neighbour being overlooked and the style design of the development of the historic cattle shed/barn.

I took the opportunity to visit the site yesterday and talked to the neighbour. Both He and I have no problem with the resubmission as it is on part of the building that does not overlook or impact his property.

Furthermore, I was Kinlet Parish Council last night and although the resubmission was received too late to be an agenda item for an official response, we debated the situation at length during my report and I can advise that they concur with my updated recommendations below and are copied into this email for their records.

Therefore, I write to advise I no longer want this resubmission to be looked at by committee as it is totally different to the original and my reasons for a committee process have been dealt with on the original refusal. I am happy for this to be dealt with by delegated matters to save committee time and money.

I have copied in relevant officers for information

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	21/01171/FUL	Parish Council

I write to confirm that the Parish Council have no objections to the above planning application no longer going to Committee and are happy for it to be decided under delegated powers.

Regards
Janette Burgess

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	21/01171/FUL	Officer

Given the above representations from the local member and PC there is no longer an appropriate trigger for determination by Committee and the application should now be determined under delegated powers.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	21/01539/FUL	Neighbour

Please be aware that photographic evidence provided in support of this application is very misleading. Photo taken from existing conservatory does not show where hedge finishes and there is a direct view to west of my garden below.

Also, street plan included in Development Management Report includes neither the most recent extension on east side of 11 Foldgate View which adjoins boundary, nor the conservatory.

Site visit would be very helpful.

Report contains inaccuracies, does not address objections raised and is unfair in its conclusions.

The street plan included in report appears to be incorrect/obsolete. Does not appear to show most recent extension on east side which adjoins boundary or existing conservatory.

1.2 Proposed building would not occupy "footprint of existing conservatory", it would be considerably larger and taller.

1.3 Emphasis on materials matching original house is irrelevant since they would not match flat-roofed extension which runs length of west side.

2.1 Number 11 sits further back than my property and, therefore, rear extension impacts my garden more than if houses were parallel. Field at rear (adjacent to Foldgate Lane) is scheduled for development.

6.3.1 Development area not screened by hedge. Photos provided are very misleading. There is a direct view west overlooking my lawn below. It seems inappropriate to accept and publish photographic evidence from agent paid by applicant. Single-storey status does not prevent overbearing impact because of gradient of site. It would tower around 4.5m above level of my lawn and be in full view. Furthermore, a substantial brick construction with an elevated roof is very different from UPVC conservatory. A flat roof would, at least, be lower and less obtrusive.

6.3.2 Windows to west overlooking my garden are unnecessary and intrusive. Site is south-facing and so extension does not need to be glazed on all sides. Windows on side close to my boundary could be eliminated or frosted/fixed light to avoid further loss of privacy.

6.4 Drainage issue dismissed despite having been a valid topic in recent Foldgate Lane planning debate.

Over-development concern ignored. Almost no garden space will remain. Young children already have to play at front of property which is also hard-landscaped.

Impact on residential amenity of both properties matters for current inhabitants and future ones. Space will become even more important when housing development is built in field at rear.

Sustainability point is not addressed. The demolition of a modern plastic/glass structure only to replace it with a more impactful one with a similar purpose is wasteful and pointless.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	21/01539/FUL	Planning Officer

It should be noted that housing development has been approved to the land at the rear of the property, although the siting of the building would, additionally have no residential amenity or other impacts on this development site.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
11	21/01799/FUL	Agent

Confirmation that MWNP policies have been considered. The application is not for new housing therefore Housing Policies H1-H6 do not apply. Policies RF1 – RF6 relate largely to new development and for this application the remains within the existing hardstanding with little additional surface water loading. The current garage is not fit for purpose being too narrow to take a vehicle and free on street parking remains available to properties on Barrow Street (Objective 4: traffic management and accessibility). Careful consideration has been given to make efficient use of the land whilst respecting the density, character, landscape and biodiversity of the streetscape. No important landscape and natural features have been changed, the works have been suitably designed for the context within which 42 Barrow Street is set. The scale and massing of extension relate sympathetically to the adjacent properties using traditional and vernacular building materials in respect of the streetscene (Objective 6: good quality design). The property is currently connected to the existing mains system with 1 no. bathroom on the first floor. The proposal seeks to meet the needs of modern family

living, including elderly visitors and people with disabilities with access to a ground floor WC – at present there is none. The proposal includes 2 no. WCs and 1 no. Shower, none of which will significantly increase the loading on the current system.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
11	21/01799/FUL	David Turner
Reference our earlier conversation (David Turner to applicant) and having skimmed through the officer's report, I feel that I would probably have withdrawn my request for committee determination before this reached the Southern Planning Committee Agenda.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
11	21/01799/FUL	Officer
Notwithstanding the comment above from Mr Turner (the local member at the time of the application), and the fact that the PC have no objection to the application, there is no facility for removal of the trigger for determination by Committee by a former member and the application should be considered by Committee accordingly.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
11	21/01799/FUL	Agent
Ecology Report – Version 3 by Biome Consulting dated 17 th June 2021 submitted. Updated version to include nocturnal bat surveys. No bats roosted within the site activity was low.		