

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL**PLANNING COMMITTEE**
12TH JULY 2011**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
11/0249/FULL	17	<p data-bbox="576 674 1426 1003"><u>Neighbour</u> (Additional letter received) – Paragraph 4.4 of the Committee Report states ‘It is not considered that there has been any significant change in the levels of privacy enjoyed by the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling as a result of the erection of the greenhouse’. “This assumption is incorrect. The close proximity of the greenhouse has impacted greatly on the privacy of West Wing, as anyone can observe on entering the garden, sitting room and bedroom of West Wing”.</p> <p data-bbox="576 1043 1426 1406">Paragraph 4.5 states ‘The extension would not be visible from the road and would have no significant impact on the character, appearance or openness of the Green Belt or the surrounding countryside’. “The extension is not readily visible from the road. It appears that more consideration and importance has been given to the visibility impact from the road than the impact the greenhouse has on its immediate neighbour – West Wing. The visibility impact of the greenhouse is, unfortunately, in front of the owners of West Wing all the time”.</p> <p data-bbox="576 1447 1426 1697">Paragraph 5.1 states ‘the structure would have no significant adverse impact on the amenity enjoyed by the occupants of any neighbouring properties’. “This again is an entirely incorrect assumption. The siting of the greenhouse has had a significant impact on the privacy of West Wing – the only dwelling to be affected by this structure”.</p> <p data-bbox="576 1738 1426 1944">Paragraph 5.1 states ‘The greenhouse offers no detriment to the character, appearance and openness of the Green Belt’. “The erection of the greenhouse has been sited directly in front of the sitting room and bedroom windows of West Wing which is within the Green Belt Conservation Area of Wolverley”.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>On the day the greenhouse was erected, West Wing, concerned by the close proximity of the greenhouse and believing it contravened green belt byelaws, approached the owner of Sinkers Cottage. The owner was not prepared to discuss or consider anything, stating no matter what was said he had no intention of moving it and he also stated he had received planning permission. Since there was no likelihood of any co-operation from Sinkers Cottage, West Wing took the matter to the Parish Council</p> <p>What is very confusing is that Sinkers Cottage enjoys a very large garden and with the recent removal of a large number of trees there is light and space for the greenhouse to be sited elsewhere within the grounds, so we fail to understand why the owners chose to erect a greenhouse just a few feet away from the sitting room and bedroom windows of a neighbour's property.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> - Paragraph 5.1 should read:</p> <p>It is recommended that the application be APPROVED with the following note:</p> <p>Note - Identification of approved plans.</p>
11/0343/FULL	21	<p><u>Neighbour</u> : three letters of objection received –</p> <p>Letter 1 - Strong objection; one of original housing stock of village and formed nucleus of the village in early 1920's. Full fronted house forms an important part of the character of the village and Belbroughton Rd. The new owner should realise his responsibility to the village through the Parish Council and Parish Plan. Should modernisation take place to the interior and rear of the building the frontage should be retained. Owner should not be allowed to let building fall into disrepair with same fate as 'Little Champson'. Structural Engineer should be engaged. I was a Parish Cllr for 30yrs and father was Parish Cllr for 37 yrs.</p> <p>Letter 2 - Recent local experience of disruption of building works at No 24. Object as building doesn't take account of high volumes of traffic on Belbroughton Rd, disruption to local traffic and inconvenience to residents. Would withdraw objection if alternative access via Parish Rooms, building work restricted to 10:00 to 16:00 in week and building was required to be completed in 18months - don't want to live near an eyesore building site.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Letter 3 - Objection in personal capacity (Parish Cllr); Parish Plan champions retention of built heritage and resists demolition of notable buildings, No. 22 is a typical ribbon development structure of 1930's - proposed is modern building not in keeping with character/heritage of area. Page 8 of Parish Plan refers to hopes of community through Parish Plan. Although applicant is a 'self builder' same approach as developer - he states building is too far gone to preserve and refurbish but no justification of this - simply more cost effective to demolish. The Parish Plan and the Core Strategy complement each other and should be used together in terms of heritage and new build. Ask for refusal on basis rebuild not necessary and contrary to Parish Plan and Policy CP11 of Core Strategy - 'new development should take account of heritage assets and where possible utilise historic streets, buildings, spaces and infrastructure' - doesn't give full licence to demolish. Parish Plan doesn't recognise this building individually but sufficient in Plan to recognise its intentions. Work on Blakedown Local Listing cannot go forward without a Conservation Officer in the meantime this building is fair game.</p> <p><u>Applicant's Agent</u> : In response to the Parish Council comments the following information has been submitted:</p> <p>We understand that the property has been empty for approximately 18 years and in that time has been used for various unpermitted uses, which have been the cause of complaint. It was marketed by the then owners over five years ago and failed to achieve a completed sale in this time. Its condition being a factor in the difficulties with a sale. The applicant finally negotiated its purchase last autumn.</p> <p>Prior to purchase a Surveyors Report was obtained, prepared by Andrew Grant dated 10.9.2008. The report indicates considerable defects and advises an estimated reinstatement cost of £300,000.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>A timber and damp proof report was also obtained at a similar time, from Mercian Preservation Ltd dated 22.9.2008. This report indicates that longstanding water penetration through the roof and valley had caused dampness to the wall fabric and timbers with the likelihood of timber degradation and decay and also rising damp, all requiring considerable rectification and treatment.</p> <p>Although some 'first aid' was carried out the condition of the building has deteriorated. From inspection the current condition and faults are as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cellar – low headroom, damp ingress, quarry tile floor direct on earth, although currently no standing water there was evidence of such. • Kitchen floor – quarry tiles direct on earth, no damp proof membrane or concrete slab. • LHS Bay – several structural cracks are visible in the brickwork to the plinth below string course where the bay sits over the cellar. • Bays – widespread rot and deterioration is evident in the timber of the bay windows, particularly the cills, where filler and paint has been applied to the defective areas and is spalling away. The bay windows are an integral part of the structure of the bays giving support to the mid-height spandrel panels, floor and roof, their poor condition compromises the structural stability of the bay. • Glazing – the curved window glass of the bay windows has been replaced in part by acrylic sheet. The curved glass has to be bespoke and is obviously difficult to obtain and replace. • Floor joists – the floor joists to the front LH bedroom are overspanned and have deflected, making it necessary in the past to pack the tops of the joists in the centre to provide a level bearing for the floor boards.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rear Extension – the single story ground floor rear extension is poorly planned and inconvenient. It has been shoddily built, possibly without the necessary approvals. The top of the mono-pitch tiled roof meets the wall of the main house directly under the cills of the first floor windows with very little depth for flashing with the likelihood of damp ingress. • Mortar pointing of brickwork – the mortar to the brickwork of the plinth up to the string course is friable, eroded and porous. Some messy re-pointing in patches has been done in the past. This is of the incorrect type, has little depth and has also become loose. • Stone lintels –some of the stone lintels are showing signs of distress and weather erosion. • Render – the render above the string course up to the roof , which forms the greatest area of outer wall surface and weather protection, is generally drummy, loose and shelling off its backing. There are various indications of damp ingress on the inner faces of the external walls. • Roof valley – during a time when the building was unoccupied, the lead was stripped and stolen from the valley gutter between the twin rear gable roofs, allowing water penetration and flooding of the building for a considerable period, as has been described in Mercian Timber Preservation Ltd's report, causing damage to the fabric and structure. Poor rectification was carried out using an inappropriate material, bitumenous felt, consequently a problem remains. • Roof generally – the roof is not weather tight and requires fully re-roofing. Some structural timbers within the roof structure are inadequate and some are showing signs of deterioration, particularly the wall plate and rafter ends. • Underground drainage – the underground foul drainage system has been badly altered and extended and in places on the south side of the building is exposed and runs for part of its length above ground.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>As is evident from the foregoing and from the photographs, which are also provided, the faults are considerable and the condition of the building is generally poor. With deterioration, the cost of rectification, refurbishment and bringing up to a standard, indicated as £300,000 in the surveyor's report of 2008 is likely to have increased and in case with VAT added at the current rate of 20% will be £360,000. It is estimated that the cost of the new build replacement dwelling, with the applicant as a self-builder, is considerably less at £255,000 and VAT is reclaimable on new build. A new building would also incorporate sustainable and green features. Therefore the economics are considerably in favour of the demolition of the existing house and the provision of new build replacement dwelling.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> - The first sentence of paragraph 3.1 should read "The Parish Council objects to this application."</p>
<p>PART B</p> <p>11/0111/FULL</p>	<p>27</p>	<p><u>Bewdley Town Council</u> – No objection to revised plans</p> <p><u>Natural England</u> – No objection to revised plans subject to a condition to secure delivery of the stock proof fencing along the SSSI boundary</p> <p><u>Countryside and Conservation Officer</u> – No objections to revised plans</p> <p><u>Worcestershire Regulatory Services</u> (Environmental Health) : REVISED PLANS – No adverse comments regarding the erection of the concrete based manure storage bund, but condition required to ensure that water contaminated with manure, for instance from within the stables, will not be discharged into field drains directly</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> – one email of support received</p> <p><u>Change to recommendation</u> at paragraph 5.1 - it is recommended that delegated APPROVAL be granted subject to the completion of the reconsultation exercise on the revised plans, no new material planning objections and the conditions listed at the end of the report and added to on the Addenda and Corrections sheet.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Add Conditions</u> -</p> <p>6. Approved stock proof fencing to be erected between points A and B on approved location plan</p> <p>7. Details of area subject to levels changes to be shown on a site plan, to be submitted and approved in writing</p> <p>8. No discharge of waste water into any field drain</p> <p>Note The applicant is advised that the approved manure storage facility should be emptied regularly, bearing in mind the proximity of residential neighbouring properties</p>
11/0261/FULL	31	<p><u>Change to recommendation</u> at paragraph 5.2 - it is recommended that delegated APPROVAL be granted subject to the completion of the reconsultation exercise on the revised plans, no new material planning objections and the conditions listed at the end of the report.</p>
11/0317/FULL	34	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> - No objection and recommend approval.</p> <p><u>Planning Policy Section</u> - No comments received.</p>
11/0332/FULL	37	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> - No objection and recommend approval.</p>