

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCILPLANNING COMMITTEE15<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2015**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<b>PART A</b>		
14/0591/FULL/ OUT	12	<p>Following receipt of a specific request, clarification has been sought from the Highway Authority regarding any potential highways impact of the proposed development on the junction of Sutton Park Road with the A456 (Bewdley Hill/Kidderminster Road).</p> <p><u>Highway Authority</u> (Additional Advice in respect of the junction of the A456 and Sutton Park Road) - The application considers the traffic generated by the proposed waterpark and Conference Centre, the other uses of the hotel, spa and restaurant are not considered to generate any additional trips and act as an amenity the park. The transport assessment considers the impact on the junction of Sutton Park Road and the A456 on a normal working day and on a bank holiday, this has been undertaken using the County Councils VISUM model of the area and data collected by the applicant.</p> <p>The results show that there is a modest alteration in traffic flow at this junction in the AM and PM periods, this is mainly attributed to the hours of operation of the existing and proposed elements of the park, and an increase in the inter peak periods, but at this time background traffic is reduced and the impact is less than experienced at the traditional AM/PM peaks. Two assessment years have been considered on 2016 and 2026, the most significant uplift in traffic is in the inter peak in 2016 where an additional 86 cars in an hour is experienced, this represents 4.5%, in the morning and evening hours there is negligible change. The 2026 scenario shows similar results.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Junction capacity has also been assessed using JUNCTIONS 8 software, full details can be found in section 9.23 of the transport assessment, this shows in the junction to operate within capacity with one exception and further assessment of this shows that the implications of this are not significant.</p> <p>Therefore when considering the impact of this planning application on this junction the impact is very modest and cannot be considered to be severe, there is no evidence to suggest that this application results in such an impact to require any form of junction improvement and therefore Worcestershire County Council is satisfied with the impact at the junction with the A456 and Sutton Park Road. Worcestershire County Council is however mindful of the cumulative impact of development within the Wyre Forest area and will be working closely with Wyre Forest District Council to assess future infrastructure requirements was the Core Strategy is refreshed and the emerging development sites that are promoted. It is anticipated this will see the development of an infrastructure delivery plan (IDP) which will allow contributions to be levied to provide improvements to the transport network for all users. Should the junction of Sutton Park Road require alteration to accommodate future development needs then the IDP will make allowance for this. This approach is already being applied within the other District, Borough and City Councils within Worcestershire and is seeing contributions towards key pieces of strategic infrastructure and local sustainable transport schemes.</p> <p><u>CPRE (additional representation)</u> - I would ask you to reject this application. CPRE's basic objection is that this is unacceptable development in the Green Belt. The Safari Park obtained a qualification to the normal Green Belt restrictions to enable it to continue to develop (under SALP, page 166, paragraphs 18.12-14, in respect of 92 ha defined on a plan). However, what is now proposed goes far beyond what was previously anticipated, both in scope and area. Both the water park and hotel, but particularly the latter are a very different kind of development from the existing Safari Park. Furthermore, the area to which the application relates is much larger than delineated on the SALP Plan. Accordingly, much of the site is subject to full Green Belt restrictions.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Your Cabinet has adopted a Masterplan for this development. However, this has not been through a Public Examination, such as is required to amend the Adopted Plan. This Masterplan adoption should have no influence on your decision, because you are required to determine this application according to the Development Plan, of which the Masterplan is not part.</p> <p>SALP Policy GPB5 speaks of enhancing the Safari Park, and the Masterplan purports to conform to that. However, this is still required (inter alia) to be “acceptable taking into account its location within the Green Belt”. This still means that the application should be subject to the five purposes of the Green Belt (listed with comments on page 67 of your agenda), including preventing sprawl and keeping towns apart. In identifying Green Belt, councils are expected to identify a landscape feature for its boundary. The Bewdley Bypass is such a feature, which might provide a satisfactory boundary for the town, if it were necessary to remove further land from the Green Belt for development, but this development is beyond the bypass.</p> <p>Currently, the land south of Bewdley Bypass appears to be open countryside. In fact the presence of the Safari Park means that it is not strictly such, but that is out of sight. In contrast, the proposed development will be highly visible, on the hill above the bypass. Development having once breached the existing landscape barrier, your council will come under pressure to allow further infill development between the enlarged Safari Park and the bypass. In other words the development will set an unwelcome precedent for further development.</p> <p>The gap between Kidderminster and Bewdley is a relatively narrow one. The purposes of the Green Belt include preventing towns from coalescing. Since the development lies in the strategic gap, it will tend to erode the gap.</p> <p>Even if you take the view that the Water Park element of the application is acceptable, the provision of a hotel is inappropriate development for the Green Belt. As your officer points out, this is sequentially a town centre use; and there is already a hotel on the west side of Bewdley.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>You are required either to approve or reject the application. The inclusion of the hotel proposal in the application (as something alien to the Safari Park) should be sufficient to enable you to reject it.</p> <p><u>Add Additional Conditions</u> –</p> <p>24. Lighting scheme to be submitted. 25. Air Quality Mitigation Plan.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> –</p> <p>Paragraph 4.6 – The first line should read: “Whilst the detailed design of the proposed hotel is not known at this outline stage ....”</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10 – the second sentence should refer to “7 rides”, not 7 rider.</p>
<p><b>PART B</b></p> <p>15/0424/FULL</p>	<p>90</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.1 of the report refers to “LLDD courses”. In the interests of clarity and completeness, Members are advised that LLDD is an abbreviation for “Learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities”.</p>