

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

19TH APRIL 2022

ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
21/0598/FUL	13	Correction – 1.0 History – Add the following paragraph 1.6 19/9004/NMA - Non Material Amendment to Planning Permission 08/0839/FULL to amend the design and position of Plot 1 - Approved
	15	Two Additional Neighbour comments; <u>Comment 1</u> As before in statements by the applicant/agents, there are numerous inaccuracies in the latest submission. In the latest submission there is a statement about 'allowing for existing constraints to be accommodated' including TPO. We have already commented that to state anything about Tree Preservation Orders on the site is nonsensical when the developer removed all the established trees early in 2020. On the massing view diagram, the houses on the eastern (left) side of Mill Close are inaccurately sketched to be larger than they are, giving a misleading impression of the size of houses. In the existing planning application the nearest building to the rear of our property at 14 Mill Close is a small, single storey garage/ground floor room, not the full side wall of a four bedrooms, two storey house where the rear windows look into our garden and the front windows look directly into the garden and living accommodation/bedrooms of 16 Mill Close. Under CP11 there is the suggestion that there will be no loss of sunlight to the existing neighbouring properties. No. 14 will lose all late afternoon/evening sun. There is also a statement under 'Adverse visual impact' that there will still be views from no. 14 and 16 across to the mature trees on the western boundary. We will have no views other than a brick wall!

21/1064/HYB	15	<p>Under figure 1 there is reference to ‘anti-social behaviour on the site’. This has never been a problem - not until the current owner removed and burnt established trees without any consideration for the environment or ecology of the site.</p> <p><u>Comment 2</u> The following are quotes from the March 2022 document with my comments in italics.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two typically sized garages would equate to approximately 36 sqm, leaving only approximately 12 sqm difference between the schemes. <i>They use carefully the square metreage but the comparison is false as our concerns are about the height not the simply presence.</i> 2. The staggered positioning of the extant 3 unit scheme would by contrast obscure much of the western site boundary when viewed from Nos 14 and 16 Mill Close. <i>Again the distance away is critical as opposed to simple existence.</i> 3. The development responds to the local context and knits into the surrounding context. <i>It does not address the fact that no other houses on the whole site do not directly face a gable end, a fact addressed in the previous appeal report.</i> <p>It does not address how the Wannerton resident managed to influence the plans prior to publication.</p> <p>I am still investigating the veracity and source of the statement “We understand the site was included originally in proposals for developing Mill Close itself and the likelihood of development has presumably been apparent since the principle of development is not contrary to planning policies.” Any evidence the developers have should be provided or the statement withdrawn.</p>
21/1064/HYB	49	<p>Corrections to conditions –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Condition 9 to be amended following submission of details relating to the acoustic fencing to be installed to the rear boundary of Plots 14 – 26, and approval of these details by WRS.
	49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Condition 13 to be amended following submission and approval of the Sustainability Statement which states that the development would achieve water efficiency of 104.5 litres per person, in accordance with emerging policy 15A. - Condition 32 to be omitted following submission of a Written Scheme of Investigations (WSI) for

21/1154/HOU	50	Archaeologist and approval by WCC Archaeologist.
	50	- Condition 33 to be amended to require the development to implement the approved WSI prior to commencement of development.
	50	- Condition 47 to be omitted as the applicant have agreed to pay £220 per dwelling for WCC Highway Authority to deliver the Welcome Pack, which is to be secured through the Section 106 Agreement.
	50	- Condition 48 to be amended following submission of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and approval of the CEMP by the Highway Authority.
	51	Additional planning obligations to be secured by the Section 106 agreement, which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the requirement to pay £220 per dwelling to allow WCC Highway Authority to deliver the Residential Welcome Pack; and b. a financial contribution towards Community Transport Service to provide access for mobility impaired residents to essential services including Acute Health, which would be calculated at £4,000 for the 94 dwellings and either £12,000 for the care home or £680 for 16 dwellings. c. WCC Monitoring Fees
	53	Correction 1.5 14/0045/FULL – Proposed Sun Lounge – Refused
	2.1	<u>Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council</u> – Recommend Refusal in line with the comments of the Conservation Officer.
REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART B		
21/0604/FUL	70	<u>Officer Comment</u> Since the publication of Committee Report, the applicant has confirmed that they are not willing to enter into a S.106 agreement to secure Local Needs Housing. Following discussions with the Principal Solicitor, it has been confirmed that the Local Connection requirement can be secured through an appropriate condition without the need for the legal agreement. The NPPF is clear that development should be approved where unacceptable development can be made

	71	<p>acceptable through the imposition of conditions that are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. The imposition of a condition to require in perpetuity a tiered Local Connection Policy for the three bungalows is considered to meet the tests above and be necessary to ensure the development is in accordance with the development plan.</p> <p>Change in Recommendation</p> <p>5.2 I therefore recommend APPROVAL subject to the following conditions;</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> To ensure control over the size of the two bedroom bungalows it is considered necessary to remove permitted development rights.</p> <p>It is also considered appropriate to require details of sustainable energy requirements to serve the whole development.</p> <p>Additional Conditions;</p> <p>17. Removal of PD rights for Extensions</p> <p>18. Scheme for sustainable energy to be submitted</p> <p>19. Occupation of 3no. Bungalows to be restricted to Local Connection Only in accordance with tiered condition – 1. Parish, 2. Adjoining Parishes, 3. District, 4. Unrestricted. Condition to remain in perpetuity and required initially and to be repeated at the point of every resale or rental.</p>
--	----	---