

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE**12TH AUGUST 2014****ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
14/0343/FULL	18	<p><u>Neighbour</u> : An additional letter from the same objector has been received raising the following additional concerns -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The materials and design of the extension are not as the applicant intends to build, the upper elevations will be of reclaimed brick with a mix of uPVC and oak framed windows of a mock Tudor post truss design dominating the southern elevation. Reclaimed brick will provide an ugly contrast with the untreated concrete blockwork and stretcher infills which form the ground floor extension (<i>Officer Comment - Revised plans show that the rear and side elevation facing No.42 would be rendered to match the existing property, whilst the elevation facing the objector at No.38 would be constructed of another material, reclaimed brick has been suggested by the agent. This is because there is insufficient space to render and maintain this side elevation facing the objector</i>). 2. The brickwork will be up to mid level of the window panes either side of the opening doors (<i>Officer Comment - This is shown on the most recently received amended plans, see below</i>). 3. We were verbally advised that the Juliet balcony will be of wrought iron but the plans are ambiguous and may show glazing in front of the doors with bars either side (<i>Officer Comment – The latest submitted plans show that a Juliet balcony would be positioned in front of the central full height panes of glass, see below</i>). 4. We were advised that the doors shown on the plan are to "too wide" and were to be re-drawn (<i>Officer Comment - The latest submitted plans show the doors are the same width, see below</i>)

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>5. The extension is to be built adjacent to our boundary and only 54cms from our existing kitchen wall</p> <p>6. The extension will clearly be dominant over our patio.</p> <p>7. In the absence of definitive plans and design details for the proposed extension we continue to object. However if amendments can be incorporated to reduce the scale and extent of the glazing in the doors and balcony and its visually overbearing effect then some of our concerns would be allayed. We therefore request that amendments to the plans are provided, otherwise we request that conditions are imposed to limit our loss of amenity.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> – The plans have been updated to show;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • additional glazing to the rear elevation within the roof truss to the gable end; • alterations to the fenestration at balcony level; and • matching render to the rear elevation and side elevation facing No.42 (not the side elevation facing the objectors property at No.38). <p>Taking these latest amendments into account it is considered that the alterations would not have an impact upon the design of the extension or upon the amenity of the neighbours so as to change the recommendation of approval as set out in the report. However as the consultation period for the latest submitted plans are yet to expire the recommendation has been changed.</p> <p><u>Change of Recommendation</u> - DELEGATED Authority to APPROVE subject to no new objections being received prior to the expiry of the consultation period.</p>
14/0419/FULL	23	<u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> – No objection and recommend approval.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Neighbour</u> : Objection -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed extension would be uncharacteristic within the context of the area and would create the appearance of a terrace. • The extension would increase the volume of the property by around 55% which is considered overdevelopment. • The internal dimensions of the extension would result in poor quality accommodation due to the width of the extension. • The supporting pillar required in the garage would make this area unsuitable for parking a vehicle whilst the property would provide additional accommodation. • The extension would reduce the between the properties creating an gap which does not permit maintenance and making the gutters inaccessible. <p><u>Officer Comment</u> - The observation that the garage would not provide a parking space as a result of the development is noted. Sufficient parking (two spaces) can be accommodated within the front drive of the property to meet the requirements of Worcestershire County Council's Local Transport Plan 3. The guidance provided within Manual for Streets acknowledge that garages are often not used to provide parking and as such the garage would not be considered to provide a parking space.</p>
<p>PART B</p> <p>14/0301/FULL</p>	<p>26</p>	<p><u>Health and Safety Executive</u> - Does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.</p>
<p>14/0355/FULL</p>	<p>32</p>	<p><u>Officer Comment</u> - For the avoidance of any doubt, at paragraph 4.1 of the report the reference to "chemicals" under the third bullet point relates to such items usually stored in a domestic shed which may include petrol (for a petrol lawnmower); creosote/fence treatment; paint, etc ...</p> <p>In order to clarify the drawings and to provide comfort to the adjoining occupier, an additional condition is recommended in respect of obscure glazing.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<u>Add additional conditions</u> - Obscure glazing Cycle Parking
14/0356/LIST	32	<u>Officer Comment</u> - For the avoidance of any doubt, at paragraph 4.1 of the report the reference to “chemicals” under the third bullet point relates to such items usually stored in a domestic shed which may include petrol (for a petrol lawnmower); creosote/fence treatment; paint, etc
14/0366/FULL	40	<u>Bewdley Town Council</u> - No objection and recommend approval
14/0367/ADVE	44	<u>Bewdley Town Council</u> - No objection and recommend approval <u>Bewdley Civic Society</u> – No indication is given on the plans as to the design of the new centre to the existing gantry sign. We think there should be a requirement for this to be agreed in advance of permission being granted and to be in keeping with the Conservation Area in terms of lettering and colour. We are aware that Tesco use heritage signs at some of their other stores, for example, Regent Street in London and feel that the same should be applied to the Conservation Area in Bewdley.
14/0368/ADVE	44	<u>Bewdley Town Council</u> - Objection to the proposal and recommend refusal: a) The signs both individually and collectively are out of keeping with the Bewdley Conservation Area and with the building itself which although not listed is of an important and arguably unique design in the local street scene; b) The illuminated fascia sign in particular is made of a material which is not in keeping with the building itself and is discordant with the remainder of the front elevation; c) The “Hello/Goodbye” signage is sited close to the entrance/exit at a point where maximum visibility is required by motorists and thus constitutes a safety hazard by reason of added clutter. The Committee overall has grave reservations about the safety of pedestrians in what is a confined space and one that has a substantial footfall in what has effectively become a pedestrianised area leading down to the river with its many attractions.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Bewdley Civic Society</u> – Objects to the illuminated external fascia sign as it would set a precedent which is not suitable for the Conservation Area. Again, we consider that all designs and materials used for signage should be agreed before permission is granted and should be in keeping with the Conservation Area in terms of style and colouring. Again, the Tesco heritage signs, mentioned in our previous comments, should be used. We would also object to any unnecessary signage, such as the 'welcome' and 'goodbye' signs.</p>
14/0369/FULL	49	<p><u>Bewdley Town Council</u> - Objection to the proposal and recommend refusal: Although no objection is raised to the introduction of bollards in the two positions per se, the stainless steel material of which they are fabricated being of a bright and glossy appearance as opposed to a more subdued one is out of keeping with the locally listed building against which they will be placed. Consequently they diminish rather than enhance the overall amenity of the Conservation Area.</p> <p><u>Bewdley Civic Society</u> – Object to the design and material of the proposed stainless steel bollards and would wish to see them match existing bollards within the town. We would point out at this stage that no other shop or ATM in the town has considered these bollards, to prevent ram-raiding, to be necessary.</p>
14/0371/FULL	49	<p><u>Bewdley Town Council</u> - Objection to the proposal and recommend refusal: Though the drawing of the ATM was not as clear or as detailed as would have been desirable, the Committee would refuse on the grounds that the design and size of the ATM is not sufficiently in keeping with the building against which it is placed which is understood to be locally listed. It is an incongruous feature of a standard design which does nothing to enhance the amenity of the immediate area and should be redesigned in a more sensitive fashion.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
14/0370/FULL	53	<p><u>Bewdley Town Council</u> - Objection to the proposal and recommend refusal: Whilst visually not obtrusive the Committee are not satisfied that the level of noise and disturbance affecting neighbouring properties will in practice be as sufficiently modest as suggested by the consultant's report. Further, the applicant has failed to demonstrate to local residents in the vicinity that noise will not be a problem as it has not engaged or consulted with them sufficiently widely or at all.</p> <p><u>Bewdley Civic Society</u> – Some concern has been expressed as to the potential noise level from this equipment, which might impact on the quality of life of nearby residents. A clearer, non-technical, indication of the likely impact is required.</p>
14/0401/FULL	56	<p><u>Rock Parish Council</u> – No objections and recommend approval</p>
14/0415/FULL	59	<p><u>Rock Parish Council</u> - No objections and recommend approval subject to the support of the Environment Agency and that the site is monitored. In addition it is recommended that no work on the site is carried out at the weekend and that no contaminated waste is brought onto the site.</p> <p><u>North Worcestershire Water Management</u> - Reviewing the plan it is noticed that the proposal is to clay line the pool. This means that there will be no infiltration in the pool and that there will be a regular discharge from the pool towards the ditch. With the clay liner in place the discharge from the pool will basically equal the discharge into the pool, minus evaporation. Water from the ditch will end up in the Lem Brook, which is part of the Wyre Forest SSSI. It is understood that the proposal is to install a silt trap at the northern end of the ditch, to capture silt before it leaves the site. The drawing provides some information regarding the proposed silt trap, however no information regarding the outfall structure from the pool has been provided.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>In the design and access statement it is stated that the pool will be filled with water from a natural spring that is located south of the pool. The drawing submitted with the application (2010-07-50) does detail an existing stone drain from a spring, but it is not detailed how water from this stone drain will actually enter the pool. The drawing on the other hand details that water from the existing agricultural building will discharge into the pool, something that was not mentioned in the design and access statement. Clarification regarding the spring and building drainage would be welcomed in order to ensure that the information in the drawing and design and access statement complement each other.</p> <p>It is understood that the drainage from the car park will not discharge into the pool but will discharge to a new soakaway instead. This is welcomed as car park discharge will contain polluting elements and since the discharge from the pool ultimately ends up in a SSSI it is very important that any water quality deterioration is prevented.</p> <p>Conclusion It is considered that there is no reason to withhold planning permission for the pool. However, especially given the proximity to the Lem Brook, the following conditions are recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to the works commencing on site a method statement must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This method statement shall detail the measures that will be taken to ensure that the works will not adversely affect (pollution and silt) the watercourse, including during the construction phase. <p>As silt forms a specific risk at this location the method statement should describe measures to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Divert clean surface water away from exposed soils and working areas. b. Minimise erosion of exposed soils. c. Prevent water polluted with sediment from leaving the site.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>2. Prior to the works commencing on site detailed design information must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority regarding all inlet and outfall structures and the proposed new soakaway. The new soakaway shall be designed and installed to conform with Building Regulations (H3 – rainwater drainage).</p> <p><u>Add additional conditions –</u> As recommended by North Worcestershire Water Management</p>