

**SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 5 April 2022

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:
6	21/05411/FUL	H B Vaughan

OVERLOOKING AND LOSS OF PRIVACY

This Development is very close to mine and neighbouring properties, due to the land slopping down toward the proposed development from my property and the House been built with suspended floors making it high views we lose direct privacy to our house and window as the accommodation will have Vision straight into my home as we do it .

VISUAL AMENITY

This proposal will have a visual effect in our AONB day and night due to it been seen from local landmarks such as the steeperstones etc.

The accommodation/parking plus extra noise will all have a huge impact to Gravels Bank as a whole with car headlights flashing into neighbouring properties at night plus noise will be a big problem.

HIGHWAY SAFETY & TRAFFIC GENERATION

The entrance to the property is on a very busy junction were their have been many accidents over the years , their is also 5 neighbouring entrance that all lead out on to this junction and directly on to the proposed entrance which will make it extremely dangerous .

The generation of extra traffic is a huge concern the roads at Gravels Bank are already collapse the lane is only single track and extra traffic is going to make it very dangerous . I submitted my concerns to the committee's consideration and hope the application is rejected as their are NO benefits to this area for this planning proposal

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	21/05411/FUL	A Scott

Having read the report prepared for this committee by the Case Office, I still have a number of concerns regarding this application in addition to those set out in my original objection submission with the attached photographs.

Whilst I feel that the Officer Appraisal reflects the spirit of the Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy (March 2011) and other quoted guidance, all of which is in my opinion open to interpretation and much subjective bias and it is these areas I wish to address:

Overlooking and loss of privacy

Ref: Para 6.4.2 - what is deemed acceptable overlooking? This development is extremely close to neighbours, in some cases just feet away. The concern is not just the overlooking from the windows but from proposed carpark arrangements, which will result in significant loss of privacy and enjoyment of my property (house and garden).

Visual amenity

This proposal will significantly change nature of the site: there will be greatly increased vehicle movements; the building character will be changed from an open sided transport shed to a large slab-sided accommodation block; will require outside lighting, which will inevitably cause light pollution - there is no bright lighting here at night. It is not just the bats that will be affected.

Adequacy of parking/loading/turning

This facility will be at its closest point, feet away from neighbouring boundaries and having no screening (hedging is very sparse at this time of year) will allow for car headlights to shine into neighbouring gardens and houses. I do question the need for the parking to be located on this side of the development as there is an existing large parking area just beyond the proposed development. Perhaps the parking of cars there would be an unacceptable nuisance to the applicant? Also, the need for any parking is questionable as is the need for car charging points when the stated target audience for this facility is bikers and walkers!

Highway safety and traffic generation

This issue has not been given adequate consideration or study. Anyone visiting the area could not fail to notice the poor state of the roads, which will not be helped by an increase in vehicles. The junction directly opposite the entrance to this development is particularly dangerous and busy, as evidenced during a recent traffic diversion put in place by Severn Trent Water, necessitating all traffic to Bentlawnt and beyond being routed through the settlement.

I also would like to draw the committee's attention to the fact that there is already a holiday property being operated from this site which also generates traffic.

Noise and disturbance

The recognition of the need for a Noise Management Plan document highlights that it is anticipated that this development will generate noise. Is this an acceptable situation given the location and the proximity of other residential properties close to the proposed development?

I submit this for the committee's consideration in the vain hope that this application be rejected as it would appear that in advance of any determination, preparations are already underway in anticipation of permission being granted.

Notwithstanding the above, the recommendation to grant permission comes as a great disappointment to the many local residents who objected to this scheme and whose views and objections appear to have been totally disregarded, indeed had any of the residents been consulted during the site visits undertaken, a different conclusion may have been drawn by this report. There is no evidence offered in either the application or the appraisal that there is a further need for additional bed space/self-catering accommodation in the area; which is already well provided for and raises the question whether there will be any restrictive caveats placed on the use of these units, should the "staycation" trend become less popular as Covid 19 recedes. Contrary to the case put forward, there are no anticipated benefits to be derived from this development for the community, indeed if granted will diminish the standing of the area within the AONB.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	21/05411/FUL	Worthen With Shelve Parish Council

WSPC objects to this application on the grounds of over-development within the parish and this settlement, impact on the AONB, unsustainability, pressure on local highways, over-looking and the inconsistent and prejudicial application of planning policy.

This parish lies largely within the AONB and in recent years has been subjected to significant over-development as a consequence of the misapplication of SAMDev policies.

In the current Local Plan period (2012-26) 116 open market consents have been granted in this parish against a target of 60 consents. In Hope Ward 48 open market consents have been granted against a target of 15 consents. Additionally 15 holiday let consents have already been granted to date across this parish.

The level of development in this parish has been too great. Much of this development has been of an inappropriate size, appearance and siting. Little regard has been paid to meeting local housing need.

Gravels Bank has almost doubled in size as a result of recent development. This formerly authentic small South Shropshire settlement used to comprise properties in keeping with their surroundings. In recent years it has been subjected to a shameful level of inappropriate over-development of properties of a size and appearance more suited to urban Essex than rural Shropshire. This settlement has been desecrated by recent development more than any other such settlement within the AONB.

This over-development has done dreadful damage to the aesthetic and tranquillity of this part of the AONB and put intolerable pressure on local highways, all of which are single track and in very poor condition with damaged verges. This pressure is not apparent to Planning and Highway officers making occasional site visits but is well known to residents and suffered daily by them.

Gravels Bank has no local facilities or public transport. This proposal is unsustainable, relying as it would on car borne traffic which would add to the pressure on local highways and damage further the tranquillity and integrity of the AONB. Already the lane through Gravels Bank is known to be difficult to traverse due to its narrowness, dreadful condition and level of use. This application would only add to this.

The nearby recent application 20/01719/FUL for the replacement of a timber cabin with a new cabin to create a single bed small holiday let was withdrawn when the case officer cited sustainability concerns due to lack of local facilities, public transport or street lighting. Those factors all apply to this application. Furthermore that earlier application was located on a part of the public highway under less pressure than this one. The delegated decisions made appear to be inconsistent.

Harvesting the fruits of the AONB in a sensitive sustainable fashion to support the local economy is acceptable but exploiting the AONB to its long term detriment and damaging the lives of residents and visitors alike is not.

Just as over-population and climate change cannot be attributed to one more birth or one more car journey, so one more unnecessary development can be passed if one chooses to do so. At some point though we have to say enough is enough and restrict developments to more sustainable locations. We believe this is that time.