

**CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 24th June 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. 9	Application No. 13/03862/OUT	Originator: Andy Williams (agent)
	<p>The agent has submitted the following statement:</p> <p>With only three minutes available to present a summary of the case on behalf of the applicant, we thought that it might be helpful to provide a copy of the 'message' we would hope to convey in advance of the meeting, so that it can be considered and reflected upon before the debate and any decision is made on the application.</p> <p>The key points we would ask you to note are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application is in outline with only the principle of development and access for consideration at this time. • The original proposal to construct a new access road under the A49 adjacent to the River has been superseded, in favour of a more simple roundabout arrangement directly into the site. • The Highways Agency is notoriously difficult to satisfy, but it is has confirmed that the proposed new roundabout off the A49 is acceptable. The site is therefore accessible and is no less sustainable in terms of its location than the SAMDev allocations which are situated on the far side of the A49.. • Pedestrian access can be provided by the two proposed footbridges. Access to Bromfield Road to the west will connect to the primary and secondary schools and leisure centre, and there is a bus route into the Town. Furthermore the proposals include scope for a neighbourhood store. • The footbridge over the River into Fishmore View to the east will enhance connectivity not only for future occupants but also existing residents wishing to access the proposed riverside open space and the community facilities on Bromfield Road, to the west. Please note, however, that whilst this link may be considered desirable (hence why it was proposed), it is not absolutely essential to the scheme. So, if in the light of objections, Members wish it to be deleted, the applicant is agreeable to this and a revised red edged site plan is available for substitution, if necessary. • The Council's Noise Specialist has confirmed that the potential impact of noise from the A49 is not a significant issue and it should be noted that 	

the layout and orientation of properties and also noise insulation measures are matters of detail for the reserved matters stage.

- The Council's ecologist is satisfied that the development will have no significant impact and there will be the opportunity to enhance ecological interests.
 - There appears to be some misconception about how the proposals might affect flood risk in other parts of the Town. Put quite simply, the Environment Agency and your own drainage officers have scrutinised and approved the Flood Risk Assessment which demonstrates that the proposed housing area will not be in the flood plain. Moreover, surface water run-off has to be attenuated to the green-field rate so the development will have no direct or indirect impact elsewhere downstream.
 - The Council's SHLAA acknowledges the merits of this site and perhaps if the access off the A49 had been confirmed earlier, the site might well have been identified in the SAMDev. We say this because it is located within the physical and visual confines of the Town as defined by the A49 on embankment and unlike other options development in this location will not be intrusive, nor lead to further sprawl into the countryside.
 - The SAMDev allocations for Ludlow lie beyond the A49 and have attracted strong objections that will have to be considered by the Inspector at the Examination. Therefore, contrary to the assertion in the report, these proposed allocations cannot be afforded significant weight at this time.
 - In any event, the application does not seek to compete with the SAMDev allocations, but instead, the proposal will help improve the five year housing land supply, which is at best marginal and at worst deficient.
 - We suggest that in numerical terms, this site has attracted relatively few objections for a major scheme of this type, not least because it is a logical housing opportunity that will have very little impact upon the environment or wider setting of the Town.
- In summary**, the officer report is well-written and thorough and it addresses and all of the key considerations that are material to the determination of this application, based upon an objective assessment of the issues, leading to a reasoned judgement on the Planning Balance.
- At Section 7.0, the report reaches a clear and unequivocal conclusion that the proposal is acceptable and it should benefit from the presumption in

	<p>favour of sustainable development provided by the NPPF.</p> <p>It will come as no surprise to learn that we would urge you to accept the recommendation to Approve.</p>	
Item No. 10	Application No. 13/04840/FUL	Originator: Cllr Turley
<p>Wishes that the Committee be advised that Shifnal does not support the Redrow development at The Uplands. After greater consultation with Shifnal, the Town Council removed (changed) their decision of July 2013 to one of rejection.</p>		
Item No. 11	Application No. 13/04956/FUL	Originator:
	<p>1 Additional representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong objection to severe loss of entitlement to light/daylight to properties on Castle Terrace. • Report does not adequately deal with issue of impact on overshadowing of neighbouring properties. • A right to light has been established by occupation of the neighbouring properties. • Application should be deferred and a light/daylight impact assessment should be requested before a decision is taken 	Mrs Fitzpatrick (neighbour)
	<p>1 additional representation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal and specific objection is that the building will deprive main bedroom of most vital light by blocking the only window to the bedroom. • The plans show that the wall of the house will be directly in front of the window albeit with a few feet between the 2. • If you could look at the plans and the east elevation you will see my property at the back of the drawing, there are 3 gable ends and mine is the final one. The dormer window of the proposed property completely blocks my window. • The sun shines from the back of my property and never from the front. The proposed building would prevent any light coming from the back and the only possible light would come from the front, which in turn would now be significantly darkened by the proposed property. The position of the sun needs by law to be taken into consideration. • The law, as I have been advised, states that I am entitled to ancient rights of 	Mrs Scruton (neighbour)

	<p>light providing it has existed for more than 20 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building infringes on 45degree rule for development in front of windows. • Issues is loss of light, not loss of view. • The right to light is important and it is not only myself who will be affected. The properties immediately in front of me in Bank Street will lose huge amounts of light, as will those on Castle Terrace. • there are the other objection of a practical nature, which the residents have raised; parking, drainage, overdevelopment etc., making the application extremely contentious. 	
Item No. 14	Application No. 14/01016/OUT	Originator: Mr Pugh (neighbour)
Additional comment from objector requesting a deferral so that they can seek professional advice on the Officer recommendation.		
Item No. 14	Application No. 14/01016/OUT	Originator: Agent
Letter submitted with land registry documents as proof of ownership of the whole application site by the applicants. The agent comments that all the land in their client's ownership can accommodate all of the development proposals including visibility splays as required by the Shropshire Council Highways department.		
Item No. 14	Application No. 14/01016/OUT	Originator:
14	<p>The issue here, taking account of the undue weight given to sections of the NPPF by the Planning Officer, is whether the site for which access is applied is a sustainable location. In our previous comment I have clearly set out the reasons why this is demonstrably not so, looking at the three sustainability dimensions for sustainability included in the NPPF. We consider the applicants flimsy arguments in favour of sustainability should count for little. The application would remove a long stretch of hedgerow, including mature trees and seriously damage the character and setting of the Conservation area. Approval would undermine the Policy whereby Oldbury has not been considered a suitable location for development since the Conservation Area was established. It is not a sustainable application and we urge the Planning Committee to turn it down.</p>	Dr Christopher Jephcott President Bridgnorth Civic society