

**CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE  
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

**Date: 29 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**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
10.	14/00518/OUT Land adjacent Oaklands, Montford Bridge	Agent

Phone call received from applicants agent to state confirmation that the amended layout plan (drawing Number 13065-03 rev G) referred to within the Planning Officers Committee Report does amend the red site boundary, moving it further away from the existing field boundary with Oaklands the adjacent property. The agent will be submitting a revised site location plan confirming the intended site boundary prior to the committee meeting.

An additional condition is recommended by officers to be added if planning approval is granted in order to confirm the amended plans submitted:

“The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the deposited plans and drawings as amended by the revised plan Number 13065-03Rev G received on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2014 and plan Numbers 13065-01Rev A & 13065-05Rev A received on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2014.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details.”

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
11.	14/00899/FUL Anchor Inn, Gloucester Rd, Harlescott, Shrewsbury.	Objection from Pubs Preservation Officer of the Shrewsbury and West Shropshire Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA).

This Branch represents nearly 714 members in the western portion of the County. We wish to object to the proposal which will lead to the total loss of this public house and trust that the Council will follow their policy of having a general presumption against the loss of public houses. Our reasons are set out below. In general terms we share the deep national concern that now exists about the loss of public houses and, indeed, about the survival of the British Pub as an institution and a social asset. Retention of pubs allows them to: o meet the demands of differing communities by maintaining a healthy and varied choice for the consumer; o provide a place of informal social meeting, eating and drinking; o provide a place of employment for the Landlord and family and in many cases full and part time members of staff; o enliven the local economy by bringing visitors to the local area an example of which is members of opposing pub games/sports teams. In particular as regards this Public House: o It is of interest to note that in this case a CAMRA Public House Viability Test has been carried out by consultants who appear either to have not visited the pub or have been inadequately instructed and though it is long and fulsome and as expected its conclusion is negative it ignores totally the fact that the pub does have active darts, pool, dominoes and football teams (the latter being the oldest pub team in Shrewsbury) all of which lead to local social well-being and clearly indicate that it is part of the community contrary to the test claims. It is noted that

a number of objections support this view. o the application itself admits that that it has not been managed or run in way which could optimise its potential which some might suggest was a deliberate policy of the pub co in this case so as to justify the application. Indeed it is known that the pub co concerned has a massive debt to service and seems to have a policy of targeting certain pubs to achieve this by raising capital from their development potential rather than their function as a pub; o the reference to the CAMRA WhatPub web site has been deliberately misconstrued to suit their own ends – this objection underlines that fact; o the proposed development if granted will result in the permanent loss of a local amenity to a community where this facility would be considered important to social and economic vitality, and to a high quality of life, and therefore contrary to Local Policies RR4 and Central Government Guidance PPS4. CAMRA is an interested party within the scope of PPG 1 and we trust that the Officers and Elected Members will take our comments and submissions into consideration when determining this application.

*Officer Note: RR4: Rural Renaissance of the WMRSS was revoked on the 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010 whilst PPS4 was replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework on the 27<sup>th</sup> March 2012; as such neither policies are material considerations.*

Item No.	Application No.	Originator
11.	14/00899/FUL Anchor Inn, Gloucester Rd, Harlescott, Shrewsbury.	Objectors:

Two additional letter of received objecting to the proposal on the following material planning grounds:

- Principle of loss of pub which has detrimental community impacts.
- The evidence submitted in respect of lack of viability and condition of building is contested.
- Demolition of The Anchor Inn when three pubs have been allowed in Ditherington.
- The Anchor Inn is a meeting place and community facility which if demolished would lead t anti-social behaviour.
- There are a number of existing homes in the area which are empty and as such there is no requirement for additional housing.
- A more acceptable solution would be to retain but make the pub smaller and build flats on the remaining land.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator
11.	14/00899/FUL Anchor Inn, Gloucester Rd, Harlescott, Shrewsbury.	Objectors:

Additional Condition 17 –

All dwellings hereby approved shall be occupied strictly in accordance with a Local Lettings Policy, which has been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure compliance with Shropshire Core Strategy Policy CS11 with regard to local needs and prioritisation for local people.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
12.	14/01014/FUL Ingleby Way, Shrewsbury	AGENT

We have reviewed your report for Ingleby Way and would just like to make a couple of minor points:

1. Paragraph 4.1.7 makes reference to a 70/30 split for the affordable tenure. This

needs to be updated to reflect the agreed split of 3no. shared ownership and 2no. affordable rent, as referred to elsewhere in the report.

2. Condition 4 asks for a 10m buffer to the stream. Is this necessary, as works will be taking place to the stream bed as detailed in our application? In addition, the reason for the condition is to protect water voles, however the ecologists report found no indication of them.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
13.	14/01147/FUL Holdgate Drive, Shrewsbury	
A copy of 2 online petitions have been received with the heading 'Stop Galliers Homes from building next to Holgate Drive and Whittington Close in Shrewsbury' with a total of 122 signatures from locations in Shropshire and other locations in the UK and one from the USA.		