

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2019

**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<b>PART A</b>		
19/0242/FULL	12	<u>Application</u> DEFERRED
<b>PART B</b>		
19/0049/FULL	31	<u>Rock Parish Council</u> : Further comments - The Rock Parish Council having considered the application and voted unanimously to recommend its refusal is left frustrated and dismayed by the subsequent decision of the planning department to recommend approval.  The Parish Council recommended refusal on sound principles, namely that, <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was development outside a current settlement boundary</li><li>• The land in question had never been subject to development</li><li>• The proposed site was good quality agricultural land</li></ul> The proposal also appeared to run contrary to the Wyre Forest's own development plan, a fact which the planning officer in her report acknowledges. It is difficult to understand the reasoning applied in this report especially the important test of sustainability. We would argue it is not sustainable development for the following reasons.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite the water authority not raising any objections (it has a legal duty to provide water) the nearest water main is 0.7 miles away necessitating substantial works to provide water to this site or alternatively the sinking of a borehole with all its attendant environmental issues.</li> <li>• What is sustainable about processing effluent by allowing it to be discharged into a septic tank and its run off allowed into the water course? This is a large house with a number of bathrooms. Within the planning statement submitted on behalf of the applicant there are various vague mentions of water and energy saving mitigations but no firm commitments to such things as rain water harvesting, solar panels or high value insulation.</li> <li>• We note that the Highway Authority have recommended refusal and it is not difficult to see why, all traffic will have to negotiate a very narrow lane to gain access to the site, traffic will be generated not just by the owners but by delivery vans including the potential for oil or gas tankers and septic tank cleaning. The reports suggested Dunley is a viable option for purchasing essential items when in fact it is only served by a garage with a very limited range of items. This will necessitate journeys to Stourport or Abberley.</li> <li>• It is difficult to understand what is sustainable about destroying wildlife habitat and good quality farmland. It might be argued this is just one small site but if this application is allowed then in our view it sets a dangerous precedent.</li> </ul> <p>In terms of housing need within the Parish, a search just on Rightmove undertaken on 5/7/19 showed 6 x 4 bedroom properties for sale some had been on the market in excess of 5 months.</p> <p>We would ask the Planning Committee to vote against approval of this application as in our view it sets a very dangerous precedent or alternatively, at the very least, defer the application so further consideration can be given and possibly a site visit made by Members of the Planning Committee.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Neighbour</u> : 1 further letter of objection received expressing the following concerns:</p> <p>1) Wyre Forest has declared a climate emergency (22nd May), but I find no information these plans as to sustainable sources of energy. Solar energy, for example, does not appear to have been included in the planning document, and no detail as to what heating sources are going to be used are included. To approve, without this information in a climate crisis would be reckless. Furthermore, No provision for electric car charging points has been made, and given the report notes that there is no access to public transport, car charging points should be made a condition - in order to future proof any development. If the planning authority considers this to be outside their remit, they may want to opine on the declaration of a climate crisis by the council.</p> <p>2) I assume the provision of water will be via a bore hole - this again is unsustainable as the local water table continues to be altered by the climate emergency. In accessing this precious resource in such a way, the proposed development is likely to irreparably damage local land, upsetting the fine balance of the local ecology.</p> <p>3) Given it has been noted that this is designated good agricultural land, and as above, the climate emergency acknowledges we need to build less and plant more, I strongly suggest the proposal - even though it contains the planting of a limited number of trees, is incongruent with this statement. Agricultural land plays an important part in bio diversity. Although the ecology report does not suggest any special species of note relating to this land, there is no doubt whatsoever there is life in this field, and the balance and ecology of the local area will be impacted by the loss of more land. This will manifest itself in small localised flooding (even with permeable solutions to driveways) exacerbated by the proposed property sitting on a hill for rainwater runoff, and damage the local wildlife, pushing all species to smaller and smaller areas. Indeed, in the report condition number 14, acknowledges a need to mitigate against the ecological impact, therefore it must be acknowledged there will be a greater impact than not building, even with mitigation. I am particularly concerned by the phrase “low value to wildlife” contained within the report. I do not agree with this statement and struggle to understand how that can be concluded given wildlife uses the field year round.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>4) Furthermore the garage has now been separated for the main residence, which means there is more driveway and areas requiring interference from other materials such as gravel. This large area size should be reviewed as it appears excessive for the requirements of a garage and pathway to the residence.</p> <p>5) The property being considered is situated on good agricultural land. I suggest the convenience of this plot is merely the current ownership of the land. I suggest the proposal might be better made on land designated for residential use, closer to amenities and support networks.</p> <p>6) The local infrastructure, roads etc, will be unable to cope with increased volumes</p> <p>7) To set a precedent to build on agricultural land opens up the area to a level of development that is unacceptable. To have purchased a property in an agricultural area gave us good faith there would be little to no development where there were no existing structures. To continue to encroach on the countryside is ecocide, but furthermore, incredibly misleading to those residents that invested in good faith respecting the boundaries of agricultural land.</p> <p>8) I'm given to understand the proposal is from a resident that already has a property in this area. If the current property is not suitable - they could find alternative ways of improving the existing property to suit their needs rather than building a new one. This would therefore negate all the issues I raise above.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>9) The property plans submitted are for a 3 bedroom dwelling, but I note that a large upstairs office means it is likely to be repurposed on any future sale particulars to a 4 bedroom dwelling. This in turn means the market for any future sale is unlikely to include younger first time buyers that would genuinely enhance the communities in Abberley and Dunley. The report notes "that the development would help to enhance and maintain the vitality of the rural community of Dunley and Abberley which would add to the benefits of the scheme" yet, these communities are made up of expensive large dwellings already - therefore the benefits of this property in the future are limited to a much smaller section of society and do not represent the benefits alluded to in the policy. The report does not acknowledge the number of properties being built in Abberley today, and the access to public services being much more convenient than in the proposed site, which is situated over 2 miles from such amenities. The highways report concludes cycling and walking are unlikely alternatives to access Abberley from the proposed site.</p> <p>To summarise, to build this large development on land that has not been previously used for this purpose is unacceptable and irresponsible. The property and plans have not duly considered essential matters of sustainability and infrastructure and therefore I must object most strongly to any approval of the application.</p>