

**SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 27th May 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: |
|----------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 7 | 13/01633/OUT | SC Historic Environment |

Confirming no archaeological objections subject to a condition requiring further evaluation at the reserved matters stage. Clarifying that the requirements of Condition 9 in Appendix 1 of the report have already been completed and what is not required is a further pre-determination evaluation. I have agreed that this could (at risk to the developer) be conducted under condition on the outline application. In view of the above and in accordance with NPPF Section 128 I would recommend that targeted evaluation trenching of the site should be undertaken in conjunction with a systematic walkover survey of the arable field to the east and metric survey of the upstanding archaeological remains prior to work commencing on the site. This would enable an informed decision to be made regarding the archaeological implications of the proposed development and any appropriate archaeological action or mitigation. The trial trenching and walkover survey may conclude that further evaluation may be necessary to assess the extent, survival and significance of any archaeological remains. The condition needs to be altered to the following before the committee meeting. Suggested Conditions:

No development approved by this permission shall commence until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, have secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) that makes provision for targeted trial trenching, additional systematic walk over survey and metric survey of the upstanding archaeological remains all of which may lead to additional archaeological mitigation being required. This written scheme shall be approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works.

Reason: To allow a considered assessment of the archaeological potential of the site and to determine the appropriate level of mitigation.

Mick Krupa
Senior Archaeological Advisor
Historic Environment Team

| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
|----------|-----------------|-------------|
| 8 | 13/03834/out | Agent |

Further to our conversation this morning I have spoken to my Clients.

They are still aggrieved that the Parish Council did not accept their offer to lease the second application site for 25 years & renewable, for a peppercorn rent of £1. per annum, if the Council did not object to the application for four dwellings. This the Parish Council refused.

I am now instructed by my Clients that if the Planning Committee are minded to approve the application for 4 No. dwellings they will stand by item 2 in my email to Julie Preston of 27th November 2013 in reply to hers, which would provide a car park & play area for the Village Hall. They will either withdraw the second application or not appeal a refusal & lease the site for 25 years as stated.

My Clients reserve the right should the 4 No. dwellings be refused to resubmit the second application for one dwelling to comply with the Planning Officers suggestions in her Report, & if this is refused, appeal both applications.

I hope this will not be necessary & common sense will prevail.

My Clients have already given the Parish Council the name of their Solicitor. Julie Preston & I agreed the lease could be conditioned & subject to a Section 106 Agreement. The permission would not be released until the 106 Agreement was in place. My Clients accept this.

| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 10 | 14/00062/OUT | Highways Agency |

The Highways Agency has reviewed the application and has no objections to the proposals.

AMEND RECOMMENDATION TO:

Grant Permission as a departure and subject to satisfactory agreement being reached on a Section 106 Agreement relating to affordable housing provision; contributions to the Travel and Movement Strategy for Shifnal and off site drainage works; and maintenance of Town Park/open space by an appropriate body and to the conditions set out in Appendix 1.

| | Application No. | Originator: |
|----|-----------------|-------------|
| 10 | 14/00062/OUT | Neighbours |

Five additional letters have been received objecting to the application until surface water drainage issues have been resolved satisfactorily. The comments made are summarised below:

- Were told by Taylor Wimpey that attenuation pool on phase one would not hold water on a regular basis and was for a once in 200 year storm, but has been 75% full for the past 6 months.
- Water from balancing pond causing problems.
- Pool is unlined and water graduates naturally from the attenuation pool to the mere uncontrolled.
- Lowering outfall will not significantly alter water level; in dry spell left with large body of water which stagnates, algae forms and mosquitoes are in abundance.
- Garden has been ruined by water.
- Soakaway drainage from their and neighbouring properties ineffective due to water level in the mere.
- Problems due to the Council's negligence in the way it is dealing with the flow of water from Silvermere Stream to Wesley Brook; no consideration given to human rights.
- Stream cannot cope with three balancing pools.
- Should reject application until the original outlet from the mere is re-instated or re-routed.
- Stream to rear of Silvermere Park properties is the only water course on the east side of Shifnal.
- New pipe installed was to help drainage from the A464 and not for water from the Mere.
- All the housing developments would be adding water to the stream and it would seem reasonable that the cost of the work to repair the damaged pipe should be borne by the Developers based on the number of properties they are each building.
- Concerned pumped arrangement would increase likelihood of floods at rear of

Silvermere Park homes.

- Should be a drainage capacity model taking all developments into account.
- Public footpath along the edge of the development has never been completed and attenuation ponds would be where the path should be; should complete phase 1 before starting another.
- Local residents cannot be expected to meet the costs of pump maintenance/replacement over time as they are not the riparian owners for the part of the water course in which the problem exists.
- Question how fish or other wetland creatures move freely when the only connection is via a pump; contrary to the developers Great Crested Newt Strategy.
- Request a public enquiry regarding the Mere at Silvermere Park, the release of water into the drainage ditch at the rear of Brooklands Avenue and the sluice gate at the junction of the drainage ditch and the Wesley Brook; Mere not fit for purpose to serve first phase of development; Aston Street development will contribute to use of the Mere.
- The flooding experienced in Brooklands Avenue in 2007 should not be repeated by the Mere not operating effectively.

| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
|----------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| 11 | 14/00885/OUT | Bishops Castle Town Council |

Objection. The SAMDev consultation is current, and therefore very relevant. A site to the north/east of the town is the preferred site, applications to the south west were all rejected. Within the SAMDev policy Bishop?s Castle is expected to supply 150 houses, 85 houses are already committed and the remaining will be windfall. The town does not need open market houses over and above the 40 already within the SAMDev proposal. The application site is an unsuitable piece of land. The flooding issue needs more investigation as it is understood there is an existing problem with surface water flooding through a property, this has been resolved partially by the digging of a trench but a development will exacerbate the problem. Excess water from this area finds its way into the open stream on Kerry Lane which in turn can overflow into the junction of Kerry Lane and Church Street. The proposed access to the site appears to remove part of a garden belonging to a private resident and it is understood permission from the resident would not be given to use the garden for access.

| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
|----------|-----------------|-------------|
| 11 | 14/00885/OUT | SC Highways |

Principle of Development: Shropshire Council as Highway Authority has no objection in principle to the residential development at the proposed location.

Access: The submitted Illustrative Layout Plan Rev B submitted indicates that the proposed access will provide an opportunity for carriageway widening, which is acceptable in principle, subject to further details being received.

Restricted carriageway width – Woodbatch Road/Kerry Lane: Concerns have been raised with regard to the restricted carriageway along Woodbatch Road and Kerry Lane. Site observations have noted that the carriageway width along Kerry Lane is restricted and that there is possible scope to introduce a priority system to improve highway safety between the junction with Church Street along this section. Whilst it is not anticipated that the proposed development will generate a significant number of additional traffic movements along Kerry Green and Woodbatch Road in the peak hour compared to the number of vehicles already using this route. The applicant has agreed to make a highway contribution towards regularising traffic flow along Kerry Lane and Woodbatch Road, and this can be used to mitigate the impact of any additional trips generated by the new development.

Conditions: It is recommended that the following planning condition is attached to any Planning Permission, subject to a Section 106 Agreement being signed.

New Access: No development shall take place until details of the means of access, including the layout, construction and sightlines have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed details shall be fully implemented before the use hereby approved is commenced.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory means of access to the highway.

| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| 11 | 14/00885/OUT | Local resident, The Novers |

My property lies next to the highest section of the proposed development site (i.e. the southern end). I note that the officer report contains a section on "Public Comments" which have been summarised under a number of headings. I submitted a letter of objection dated 22 March 2014 in which I listed a number of examples of major problems with water runoff from the proposed site (caused primarily by runoff from the area just above the proposed site itself) and then onto mine and my neighbours properties, these included -

Flooding underneath our property causing subsoil erosion

A stream running through our garage

Soil erosion in our garden

Examples of problems at five other properties

Every winter the proposed site suffers from major runoff problems which stem from the area immediately to the south of the site - none of the developer's plans appear to take this into consideration. In my letter I also stated that in order to alleviate the runoff problems, every winter for the past seven or eight years, I have had to dig trenches across the field just above the development site to divert water away from the proposed site and from my property. No portions of my letter of objection, nor references to the problems I have experienced have been included in the "Public Comments" section of the report.

Officer response to resident:

The officer report refers to drainage issues in the residents' comments section although it does not specifically restate the detailed wording of your letter. I have however included the text of your email in an update report which will be circulated to the planning committee when they consider the application. I would add that if planning permission is approved then the applicant has confirmed that an interceptor drain would be installed along the southern boundary of the proposed site. This, together with other proposed drainage measures should address your concerns. You will note that the officer report in Appendix 1 recommends a drainage condition to cover this matter.