

**6CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: Thursday 21st August 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:
6	14/01036/OUT South of Brook Cottages, Ford	Case Officer

Correction to wording of officer recommendation to committee, correct wording is:

Recommendation:- Grant Permission subject to a section 106 legal agreement to secure **on-site** affordable housing with any remainder provided in an off-site contribution, and the conditions set out in Appendix 2.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9	14/02385/EIA Foxholes Farm, Little Ness	Consultee Comment

SC Archaeology (14/08/2014): I have no comments to make on this application with respect to archaeological matters.

SC Ecology: (20/08/2014): I have read the above application and the supporting documents including the Environmental Statement conducted by Arbor Vitae Environment Ltd (2014). Include the conditions and informative(s) below on the decision notice. Planning Officer to include the Habitat Regulation Assessment matrix within their site report.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	14/02425/VAR 1Red Barn Lane	Applicant

The applicant has requested that it be made clear to members that some of the points raised in the comments/objection of Shrewsbury Town Council are incorrect. The comments as received from Shrewsbury Town Council are set out below:

Shrewsbury Town Council - OBJECTS

Comment -Shrewsbury Town Council objects to the lifting of this condition; Members are of the view that this application was originally presented on the basis that an annex was needed for the original dwelling and whilst the application was refused, the Planning Inspectorate on upholding the appeal was most insistent that this dwelling should remain as an annex. We would continue to concur with the Planning Inspectors comments that any creation of a stand-alone property will create an unacceptable fragmentation of the site. It should also be noted that this property is situated in an area that has high amenity value providing a natural green lung in the heart of the town and that this aspect should be protected and preserved. Members have been saddened that there has been a history of development down this lane which is spoiling what is one of the few green spaces within the urban area of Shrewsbury.

The applicant has requested that it be made clear that the no planning applications that

directly apply to this building on site have ever been subject to a planning appeal, or have ever been refused. The correct planning history is set out in paragraph 1.2 of the committee report. The three planning applications that directly relate to the construction of the annexe and its subsequent use are set out below for clarity:

12/04261/VAR – Variation of condition 5 attached to planning permission 11/01898/FUL to allow the ancillary annex accommodation to be used as holiday let accommodation – granted 10/1/13 – Approved by Planning Committee

11/01898/FUL – Erection of a single storey extension to existing garage to provide 1 bedroomed accommodation (amendment to previous application reference 11/00482/FUL) – granted 28/6/11- Officer delegated decision

11/00482/FUL – Erection of a single storey extension to existing garage to provide one bedroomed annexe – granted 8/4/11- Officer delegated decision

The concerns raised by Shrewsbury Town Council regarding the potential fragmentation of the site and the resulting visual impact on the surrounding high amenity value of the area has been considered as part of the officer consideration of this application, see section 6.0 of the committee report.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	14/01037/OUT Station Road Dorrington	Condover Parish Council

Condover Parish Council considered the Sustainability Report relating to the above application and found it to be both inaccurate and misleading. It also does not address the terms of reference given by the SC Planning Committee which were to establish whether the local services deemed to make the application sustainable were sufficient given the cumulative demands of recent housing applications which have been submitted. It is hoped that this would not only include the ward of Dorrington but also neighbouring villages which also rely on Dorrington's services and quote them supporting their applications on grounds of sustainability.

- Inaccuracies relate to the actual planning permissions the report quotes as passed since 2011 within the parish. Whilst it was noted that the report has a tendency to swap between "parish" figures and "Dorrington" figures in its attempts to produce statistics to influence the reader.
- The report takes no account of planning permissions already passed and the influence they will have on increasing the population size and demands on local services.
- The report does not consider sustainable issues such as parking, access on to the A49, the lack of frequency of the current bus service and issues associated with social integration.
- The report contains pages of planning policy quotes which are unnecessary as they do not address the brief given by the Planning Committee.

As a result the Parish Council believe that as the report is not in their opinion valid it should not be considered by the SC Planning Committee as it does not assist the Committee in the decision making progress.

The Parish Council continues to oppose the planning application; which contravenes its SAMDev submission and is unsustainable. It is evident that the limited village services of Dorrington will be overwhelmed from the cumulative affect of the additional demands from its substantially increased and dependent population should this application be

granted permission.

I would be most grateful if you could keep the Parish Council informed as to when the application is to return to the Committee as a Parish Council representative wishes to speak at the meeting.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/01036/OUT Brook Cottages Ford	Agent

The agent has submitted a draft S106 legal agreement signed by the landowners in order to confirm that the development is deliverable and to demonstrate their client's commitment to delivering the scheme subject to the submission and approval of the reserved matters, which will be within the next 5 year period.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	14/00823/OUT Rear of Hanley Lane, Bayston Hill	Objector

One letter from an objector to the application has been received as follows:

"In your report to the planning committee you state at 6.1.2 that "the Council's position is that it has identified sufficient land that will address the NPPF 5 year housing land supply requirement".

But then, at 6.5.1, you say "In view of the significant weight which must be given to the lack of a 5 years housing land supply in Shropshire.....it is considered that a refusal on the grounds of loss of high quality agricultural land could not be sustained".

Paragraph 6.5.1 would seem to contradict paragraph 6.1.2. Also, the land in question is Grade 3 rather than high quality. Could you clarify, please?

Thanks

PS The grain crop in the field has just been harvested leaving stubble so the site is best viewed from the grassed area between 19 and 21 Hanley Lane."

The Officer report was originally written prior to submission of the SAMDev Final Plan to the Planning Inspectorate and was then subsequently amended before publication. Paragraph 6.5.1 should have also been amended to reflect the altered status of SAMDev and should have noted that the latest calculation of the 5 year housing supply does not alter the consideration relating to the potential loss of grade 3 agricultural land.