

**CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: Thursday 13th November 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	14/01704/OUT - Proposed Development Land South of Plealey Lane, Longden	Public Comment - Tichford (Objection)

I wish to object to the planning application on the basis that it is contrary to policy, of inappropriate scale, is not supportable by the local infrastructure, will damage the environment and be detrimental to the amenity of the village, including the school.

The proposal does not conform with planning policy as stated in the SAMDEV which identifies a maximum of 25-30 homes to be supported through the securing of a number of smaller development sites in Longden up to the end of the plan period, 2026. The addition of 35 dwellings on a single development site, located on a green site outside any recognised settlement boundary would be contrary to policy and would likely form a separate 'enclave' that never fully integrates with the village physically or socially. There are numerous examples of housing estates being 'tacked on' to small villages which have never truly integrated and are of contrasting design and layout to the rest of the settlement. Many of these around Shrewsbury serve simply as dormitory suburbs for Shrewsbury to the detriment of rural locations, increasing traffic flows as well as eroding the identity and character of villages and their communities.

I am concerned about the impact of the development on the school which currently enjoys an open aspect to the South Shropshire Hills. I believe that this is not simply a matter of a maintaining a pleasant view but of preserving the character and learning environment the school provides. The proposed development, on rising ground immediately adjacent to the school, would be of significant detriment to the amenity and learning environment the school provides to its pupils.

The school is a rural school in the rural environment on the edge of a small village. The scale of development would be urban in nature, particularly with the introduction of a large car park, merely to serve the needs of parents twice a day to pick up and drop off children. Whilst safe parking is required the scale and position of the car parking will be an additional significant detrimental factor to the eroding of the school environment and that of the neighbours, most particularly the Rectory.

Plealey Lane is of very restricted width and visibility, in many places only able to accommodate a single vehicle. The Lane is used quite inappropriately by large coaches wishing to reduce their journey times. The access for the development onto Plealey Lane does not have good visibility and will introduce significantly more traffic onto a road that is not designed for it.

The proposed car parking arrangements have the benefit of taking school parking off Plealey Lane but are a disproportionately complex and intrusive response to this relatively minor matter. The location of the car park will produce significant detriment to the amenity of the residents of the Rectory and will be difficult to manage in terms of the estates residents using the one way for quicker access to the village and beyond to Shrewsbury.

The proposal requires the removal of a number of significant trees that will impact negatively on the local environment. Others, such as the mature oak on the border of the Rectory will require protection during construction of the car park and may well be damaged by the works. The removal of the mature trees on the western boundary of the school playing field will be a particular loss.

The diversion of the footpath and the addition of gates are unwelcome and should be resisted. There have been no issues from the existing route which require its diversion.

If the development should go ahead it should contain a significant number of affordable housing units of which there is a great need to ensure homes for lower income families and to help retain young people in the village, maintaining balance in the community.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/01704/OUT - Proposed Development Land South of Plealey Lane, Longden	Public Comment - Sinclair (Objection)

Longden is a small compact village. To add the proposed number of properties would increase the size of the village by approximately half and cause considerable environmental degradation. There can be no economic advantage as there are few, if any, opportunities for industry. Taking into account planning permission already granted for Longden, our SAMdev commitment until 2026 has already been almost fulfilled, making this proposal unnecessary. This application does not reflect spirit of the Parish Plan (2010) and the subsequent Housing Statement (2012) where it is stated that the acceptable maximum number of dwellings in any one scheme is 10.

I understand that the total area of the proposed development is 8 acres although, in reality, the properties could be accommodated on half this amount of land. This would be a very profligate use of good agricultural land and, in addition, would give the developer the opportunity to add more dwellings at some time in the future.

The suggestion that there should be a one way system through the school grounds is totally unacceptable and would place young, lively children at risk.

Plealey Lane already suffers from traffic congestion at certain times, as necessitated by the school day. This development would worsen the problem. In addition, it is becoming apparent that motorists are taking a short cut from the A49, using these narrow lanes in competition with large, locally employed agricultural vehicles and an increasing number of HGVs wishing to access Mid Wales.

This proposed development is totally inappropriate for the village of Longden and I urge the Planning Committee to turn down the application in its entirety.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/01704/OUT – Proposed Development Land South of Plealey Lane, Longden	Public Comment (Objection) - Lloyd

I recently attended a meeting in the local village hall chaired by Councillor Roger Evans to discuss the implications of several planning applications outlined for Longden village. The meeting was conducted before an audience of 80-100 locals so you can gauge the feelings of residents, the vast majority being against the outline plans.

My major concerns and objections are as follows:-

- 1) Access to the site of proposed 35 house development along Plealey Lane from both directions is far too narrow to accommodate 2 way traffic bearing in mind that

children in secondary education may go to Mary Webb school in Pontesbury increasing hazards along very narrow lanes and the visibility issue at the junction of Plealey Lane and Rantipole Lane.

- 2) 62 extra houses would double the size of the village, where are jobs coming from to support increase in population, there is no industry so this would increase traffic into Shrewsbury and with the proposed development of the site at Sweet Lake, traffic would be even more congested around the schools at Meole not to mention additional problems for ambulances at "The Hub".
- 3) Original plans were for 10 houses on this site and would not be objected to but to saturate the field with up to 35 houses is not on.
- 4) In filling of 2/3 houses in other parts of the village is appropriate but to build another 16 houses on the bank coming into the village would add to the problems.
- 5) Issues of the village school would need to be addressed with regard to pupil and vehicular numbers, road and utility issues etc.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/01704/OUT – Proposed Development Land South of Plealey Lane, Longden	Public Comment (Objection) - Whittock

I have read with dismay your report to Councillors on this planning application. My main concern is that little or no weight has been given to local objections. Every one seems to have been trumped by reference to the Government's current policy(NPPF). This is a bad policy for many reasons and could be changed at any time. But meanwhile much damage will be done.

Longden Parish Council was asked to formulate a Plan for Longden. The view taken therein was that new housing should be done in small in-fill sites. This view was confirmed at a public meeting which I attended nearly 2 years ago. These important declarations have been ignored and people feel let down by the system and wonder why they bothered.

If this application fails as I hope it will, there is the Smithgore proposal waiting in the wings which would accommodate far fewer houses and to which a school car park proposal could be added.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/01704/OUT – Proposed Development Land South of Plealey Lane, Longden	Public Comment (Objection) - Stevens

Letter available in full on file but summarised as follows: -

- New dwellings occupied by outsiders with no interest in village
- Not good that school to support scheme
- Houses should be built on other side of Plealey Road.
- Development is not needed

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/01704/OUT – Proposed Development Land South of Plealey Lane, Longden	Highways comment

Received 12th November 2014

Further to A.F. Macdonald & Partners letter dated 29/10/14 we hope the following local highway authority responses to the relevant points raised will be of use to the committee in their consideration of this application:

Junction with Plealey Lane:

Mr Macdonald seems to ignore that applicant has shown visibility splays on the revised site layout plan which are indicated to be 2.4m x 76.5m in the Plealey direction and 2.4m x 79m in the Longden direction. As vehicles are expected to be travelling at speeds between 35-40mph along this length of the lane (even considering some improvement to forward visibility brought about by the proposed access changes), so the splays are considered to be appropriate in accordance with the Manual for Streets 2 guidance.

Admittedly it is not clear from the plan whether the tree in the Longden direction is to be removed, so we agree that a condition should be considered to protect the visibility splays. However we make the point that the technical approval condition is used to ensure that the developer meets highway requirements and complies with the outline application; I.E. if a developer agrees to provide a length of visibility splay as part of a planning permission, the pre-commencement technical approval condition won't be discharged until they have demonstrated on the detailed designs that the required splays have been included. The condition also states that the layout must be fully implemented in accordance with the approved layout. However a specific condition regarding visibility splays will afford us additional protection to secure the safety of users of the adjacent public highway:

"E11. Visibility Splays

Visibility Splays of a depth of 2.4 metres and length of 76.5 metres in the Plealey direction and of a depth of 2.4 metres and length of 79 metres in the Longden direction from the centre point of the junction of the access road with the public highway shall be provided before the commencement of the development, and these splays shall thereafter be kept free of any obstacles or obstructions.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate visibility in the interests of highway safety."

Standard of Existing School Access:

The residents of Plealey Lane will be well aware of the issues that exist outside the school during the dropping off and picking up times, due to the parking of vehicles on the lane. This problem is not exclusive to Longden and is an issue that occurs outside many of our schools, particularly in rural locations where the roads are generally narrower and more parents need to use a car to access the school. Over the years the council has received many concerns over highway safety due to vehicles parked on the road at this location, but this is an inherent issue related to the rural schools and is an issue that the highway authority are not able to feasibly solve.

The layout proposed by the developer provides a dedicated dropping off facility within the grounds of the school, so this should remove many of the existing problems along Plealey Lane associated with the dropping off and collection of children. Whilst the access to the school does not meet the current guidance, we consider that the net result in the safety of users on Plealey Lane should be positive, a point that Mr Macdonald does not refer to in his letter. Also, the adjacent boundary hedges could be trimmed to significantly enhance visibility and it would be in the schools best interests to carry this work out irrespective of whether the application is approved or not. Therefore we have taken a view that on balance we have decided not to object to the intensified use of the access, however the committee may take an alternative view on this.

With regards to the access being used by coaches, we are of the opinion that some alteration to the access may be required to accommodate the turning movements but this would involve minor alterations to existing kerb lines which can be dealt with at the reserved matters stage should the application be approved. Therefore if the proposal is to be advanced, we recommend a trial run with a coach on site is carried out on site to

determine the work required, which should be funded by the applicant (this would could be carried out under permitted development rights under licence).

Need for TA and Highway Improvements:

One of the original reasons for us objecting to this application (prior to amendment) was on the basis that it would meet the threshold of 50 units and would therefore require the applicant to provide a Transport Statement. However as the applicant has now amended the description to up to 35 units, which in our opinion takes the development below the threshold for requiring a transport statement under the Department for Transport (DfT) 'Guidance on Transport Assessment'. Notwithstanding this, the transport assessment guidance document has now been withdrawn by the DfT and has been superseded by the Planning Practice Guidance document 'Transport evidence bases in plan making'. The replacement guidance document no longer requires the developer to provide a transport assessment/statement with an application (the thresholds quoted have been withdrawn) and it places the onus on the LPA to assess the suitability of the highway network to accommodate additional development during the local plan period and to make plans for improvement where deemed necessary. This means that even if the thresholds Mr Macdonald quotes were applicable, the document under which they require action by the developer is no longer valid.

Whilst by its nature the width of Plealey Lane is variable, we are of the opinion that there are sufficient existing opportunities for vehicles to pass each other considering the scale of development proposed.

Layout Predicating Development Further West:

We can only consider what is placed up for consideration at this time, however in the event of any future development coming forwards we would again consider the suitability of Plealey Lane to accommodate the proposal at that time. The current application does not prejudice this and if highway improvements are required, they will be required before a development could proceed.

Proposed Car Park for School:

Discussions on the provision of the car park have been a matter for discussion between the school and the applicant as this would not form part of the adoptable highway. However as we understand it, the ownership these facilities would be transferred to the local education authority upon completion.

To comment on the design points Mr Macdonald raises, the coaches would be dropping off within a controlled area in the school grounds and not in a public place so any health and safety considerations raised could be managed, but this should be considered by the school managers and we would expect them to have raised this as an issue with the LPA should they have concerns.

The point raised that "streets on bus routes should generally be less than 6.0m wide" within the context of the school site is a red herring; as this point of guidance refers to the design of a new street; I.E. a new 2-way public highway. The school would not have a public 'bus route' running through it, but would be used by a relatively small number of coaches travelling in a single direction only. Given that the width of a coach is approximately 2.6m we are of the opinion that the approximate 5.0m width shown on the supplied layout is appropriate to accommodate coaches.

Public Footpath:

We understand our colleagues in the Countryside Access team have been consulted on the application, but you may wish to pass on the letter so they can consider the points raised in the letter.

I hope the above provides you with some useful information in response to the points raised by Mr Macdonald, but should you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact me.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	14/03338/OUT - Land West Of Mulberry House, Great Ryton	Officer update

1. The recommendation in the report is incorrect and should read.....

“Grant Permission subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 and a Section 106 legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards the provision of local needs affordable housing”.

2. Para 2.3 states that the site is part of a working dairy farm. In reality, farming activity at the site has now all but ceased and the building to be demolished to make way for the proposed development is now used for storage.

3. Para 6.4.1 states that an existing tarmaced driveway serves the existing property at Mulberry House and farm complex. This is not quite correct as a new, self-contained, stone driveway has been provided which provides vehicular access to Mulberry House. The proposed development will be accessed via the existing farm access and not the newly formed access to Mulberry House. No objections have been raised by Highways officers in relation to this aspect of the scheme.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	14/03338/OUT - Land West Of Mulberry House, Great Ryton	Public Comment (Objection – Mackay and Warhurst

Having read the Development Management Report, we wish to raise the following points:

1) SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

- The Application Form (Section 17, Residential Units) clearly states that this application is for two 4(+) bed dwellings. With regard to this, we raised the issue of Social Sustainability in our letter dated 17/08/14 (ref. Sustainability (f)), which we consider to be key, as it has relevance to the NPPF, yet was omitted from your report in Section 4.2.1.
- In 2.2 of the report, you have described Ryton as containing a mixture of "housing types and sizes". This does not accurately reflect the reality as 75% of all housing in Ryton consists of detached dwellings, about half of which are 4+ bed properties. (The 3 previous officer's reports more accurately described the balance of housing in Ryton.)
- In 6.1.9 re. "a social role", this application does NOT meet the needs of present or future generations as Ryton already has a plethora of large detached properties, as detailed above. In addition, it does not reflect the community's needs or wishes identified in the VDS, the 2010 and 2013 extensive consultations or the Parish Plan, all of which have consistently emphasised the need for small affordable market housing in Ryton to provide starter homes and for downsizing within the community.

Therefore in such a small community we do not accept that this application demonstrates Social Sustainability. The financial contribution to the supply of affordable housing will not benefit the shortfall in Ryton. In fact, it is likely to have an adverse effect by setting a

precedent whereby affordable housing will never be achieved in Ryton if, by paying a relatively small levy, it allows local developers to make greater profits on large market houses. Incidentally, over the past 12 months there have been 4 large houses for sale in Ryton, all of which, so far, have failed to secure a sale, resulting in one of these now being rented.

2) SITE HISTORY AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Re. 4.2.1, we consider significant information has been omitted from that raised in our letter of objection re. Site History. In addition to the insufficient range of services and facilities, previous applications were equally refused on grounds of "dispersed pattern of development" and the impact it would have on "the character and setting of the settlement of Ryton" thus making it environmentally unsustainable. This site is NOT infill but encroaches significantly into the countryside and the "likely visual impact upon the surrounding area" (6.1.13) is far too important in terms of environmental sustainability to be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

3) NPPF re. PREVIOUS REFUSAL (13/02591/FUL)

When the previous application above was made, the NPPF had already been published and adopted some time earlier and was used to inform that decision for refusal. In the Decision Notice, signed by Ian Kilby, dated 18/10/13, the Reasons for Refusal stated that the application was "contrary to LDF and the National Planning Policy Framework". It further stated that "In arriving at the decision the Council has used its best endeavours to secure an appropriate outcome as required in the NPPF para. 187."

Since then, SamDev has reached its final stage enabling more weight to be given to it and there is now a (considered) 5 year land supply. The previous application was for holiday lets of only one and a half storeys high, which could have been argued to have an economic benefit and, being in the same location as the current application, would impact far less significantly than these proposed larger dwellings.

Incidentally, the Applicant wrote to Mr Kilby and Mr Rogers requesting a meeting, having already expressed his intention to pursue an Appeal, should the application be refused. therefore we can only assume that Mr Rogers and Mr Kilby looked at this application carefully and felt secure in their decision.

If the site was not considered sustainable then on grounds of lack of services and dispersed pattern of development, nothing has altered in Ryton to change that. In addition, these houses are not socially sustainable due to the plethora of large houses already existing in Ryton.

We note in 6.1 14 the Core Strategies you have considered and would like to understand why you have ignored CS5. Ryton has always been designated Open Countryside and has democratically elected to remain so in our SamDev submission. A reason we did not wish to become a cluster, (and we realise it is difficult for you to appreciate without living in Ryton) is that the facilities and services in Dorrington are not practical to access due to the lack of parking on the A49. Also, it is out of the way for most routine car journeys which take the majority of residents through Condover in the direction of Shrewsbury.

We apologise for the need to make further representations so late in the day but request that these concerns are fully addressed to the Planning Committee in advance of the meeting on Thursday.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	14/03451/FUL – Two Dwellings NW of Ford	Objector
<p>Representations have been received from the family of the owner of the adjacent property to the site, Clifton Coach House. Concerns have been raised as to the proposed development and the impact on a family member who has significant health issues and visits the property regularly for respite care rather utilising a hospice. The owners are very concerned that this would affect the ability of the family to visit and stay at the site both throughout the building works and afterwards. Their concerns relate to the potential impact of both dust and noise (including ongoing traffic movements) on the wellbeing of the family member in question who uses a ground floor bedroom immediately adjacent to the bridleway. Concerns are also raised regarding the bridleway becoming blocked in the case of medical emergency. It is commented that whilst the unique nature of the situation is appreciated, the approval would amount to human rights violation.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	14/03451/FUL – Two Dwellings NW of Ford	Officer
<p>Following a request to increase the red line to incorporate all of the bridleway up to the highway, an amended plan has been received which includes the additional section of bridleway required. Due to the landowner of the bridleway not being established, the appropriate reasonable steps will be taken to contact the owner, which includes a publication in the Shropshire Star with regards to the amended plan (this has previously been undertaken on the previous plan which incorporated only part of the bridleway). Subject to no contact being made following this publication which raises material considerations that are not addressed within the report, the application would proceed as per the Officer recommendation if agreed by the Planning Committee.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	14/03451/FUL – Two Dwellings NW of Ford	Objector
<p>Further comments from Nesscliffe Hills and District Bridleway Association regarding the</p> <p>I ask that Councillors note the cut wire and ripped back fencing where the newly created access to the field to the south was cut through the hedge and wire fencing from Bridleway 7 to the field in May this year.</p> <p>I ask that Councillors are shown the old metal gate hinged on the south side of the bridleway, which has often been partly closed across the bridleway, and is marked as a solid line across the bridleway on the 'Location Plan and Proposed Block Plan'. submitted by Berrys.</p> <p>I ask that Councillors are shown the position of the proposed 'New gated field access' to be created, which is marked on the application plans beyond the two proposed properties and to the west of this old metal gate.</p> <p>I ask that the narrowness of the green lane, especially by the proposed new field entrance to be used by agricultural vehicles is noted, and that they are informed that the west end of the bridleway route is accessed through a 5ft bridleway gate.</p>		