

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE
13TH SEPTEMBER 2011**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A 11/0109/FULL	13	<p data-bbox="576 600 1374 707"><u>Officer Comments</u> - An additional letter has been submitted by the applicants to all members and this has been summarised below.</p> <p data-bbox="576 748 1390 819">There are distinct reasons why this structure is important to our business.</p> <p data-bbox="576 860 1422 1442">The first reason will no doubt strike a chord with anyone who has been a victim of crime, be that personally or professionally. As business owners, my fellow Directors and I take each and every act of vandalism and theft very personally. Over the years this has meant many thousands of pounds worth of damage and loss not to mention the time and effort that has been wasted clearing up the mess plus increasing insurance premiums as a result. Our site covers approximately 5 acres and backs onto common land. The proposed structure would cover 2 specific boundaries from where we have been consistently targeted; effectively closing the site in so that the current unsightly and costly security measures can be removed. Police records will prove the issues that Conveyor Units have faced on a sustained basis over a considerable length of time.</p> <p data-bbox="576 1482 1418 1818">The second reason is that from very humble beginnings in 1962, Conveyor Units now employs 107 people and despite the ongoing economic climate is still growing with increased turnover year on year; in fact it is envisaged that 2011 will be the best year in the company's 48 year history. We require the extra space to accommodate extra stock and assembly areas for the new products that have been developed and to keep pace with our growth strategy.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>We try to operate a good business and do not ask, nor receive, any form of financial assistance from either the government or banks. We pay our rates and taxes on time and employ locally. The average length of service of all employees is 12 years and we have more than 30 employees that have 20+ years service with the company. We are a UK manufacturer and export 40% of our goods to Europe. I believe that we very much fit the description of the kind of company Vince Cable is saying will be responsible for underpinning the British economy during these dark economic times, in fact I am meeting the MP for Wyre Forest next week to discuss the proposition of Conveyor Units being nominated by Mr Garnier MP as the districts 'made by Britain' representative.</p> <p>If these plans are not passed then we would need to reconsider the overall growth strategy of the business and this could have the following consequences: The extra jobs that would have been created (estimated to be 5 – 8 people initially) would not happen ; We expose ourselves to increased competition ; We remain open targets for vandalism and theft – as do other businesses that are targeted via our property; and The increase rates and tax revenue to the council and treasury will not be realised.</p>
<p>11/0163/FULL 11/0533/CAC</p>	<p>24</p>	<p><u>Officer Comment - Draft National Planning Policy Framework</u></p> <p>In July 2011 the Government launched for consultation the Draft National Planning Policy Framework. It streamlines national planning policy into a consolidated set of priorities to consider when planning for and deciding on new development. Despite this being only a consultation draft, Planning Inspectors have been advised that it gives a 'clear indication of the Government's direction of travel' and as such is capable of being a material consideration.</p> <p>Below are some of the main points in the draft Framework relevant to the current application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It retains protection for SSSI's and other environmental designations which protect the character of our country's landscape, stop unsustainable urban sprawl and preserve wildlife;

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it makes it clear that local authorities should seek to ensure good access to high quality local public transport for new developments, with priority given to cyclists and pedestrians; • Key facilities essential to local life such as schools and shops should be within walking distance of most properties; • the planning system should seek not just to protect, but, where possible, to enhance biodiversity, making sure that there is not isolated pockets of wildlife, but rich and connected green spaces for all kinds of species to thrive; • planners must seek to avoid noise pollution as a result of new developments and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution; • development should secure radical reductions in carbon emissions through the appropriate location and layout of new development, support for energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings; and • new development should be future proofed against climate change through getting its location and design right (making sure that new housing estates are not at risk of flooding and have good flood storage capacity to reduce flooding elsewhere). <p>There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This has been reported as designed to help turn the planning system round; from a system focused on barriers to one that prioritises opportunities. It requires councils to work closely with businesses and communities to plan positively for the needs of each area. And it makes clear that where plans are not in place or up-to-date, development should be allowed unless this would compromise the key principles for sustainability in the Framework, including protecting the Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>It is reported that this presumption will encourage plan-making by councils and communities, giving them a greater say in how they meet their development needs. It will also give communities, developers and investors greater certainty about the types of applications that are likely to be approved, and will help to speed up the planning process.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>In terms of housing the Framework indicates that Councils must be ambitious in delivering the new homes that their communities need. Together with incentives for communities to accept growth, the Framework makes clear councils should ensure their Local Plan meets the full demand for market and affordable housing in their areas.</p> <p>The Framework also maintains the expectation that councils should have a rolling five year supply of deliverable sites to meet their housing needs with at least a 20% additional allowance.</p> <p>It also reaffirms protections for the historic environment and heritage. Development causing substantial harm or loss to an important heritage asset remains prohibited, unless in wholly exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>It also reaffirms protections for the historic environment and heritage. Development causing substantial harm or loss to an important heritage asset remains prohibited, unless in wholly exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Finally the Framework promotes high quality design for all development, whether individual buildings or whole estates, municipal facilities or parks, and public or private spaces.</p> <p><u>Impact Upon Existing Properties at Waterside Grange -</u> The latest plans which are out to neighbour consultation indicate a revision to the proposed design of plots 209 and 210 sited adjacent to the boundary with the existing properties at Nos. 47 and 53 Waterside Grange. The revised plans indicate a hipped roof to reduce their impact upon the adjacent houses. Whilst the proposed position and design of these plots is considered to accord with the 45 degree guide in respect of No.53, the siting would fail with respect to No.47. However plot No.209 would be offset at an oblique angle in respect of the rear elevation to No.47, and the existing occupiers would have a clear view beyond the end of their garden. It is therefore considered that the conflict with the 45 degree code and the impact upon this property is not so harmful so as to warrant refusal.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	<u>ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS</u>
		<p data-bbox="577 297 1362 405"><u>Officer Comments</u> - Paragraph 1.9 should read " The Design and Access Statement advises that 104 people attended the exhibition over two days."</p> <p data-bbox="577 443 1420 920"><u>Corrections</u> - Paragraph 4.86 should read "Thirdly the draft Site and Allocations Policies DPD and KCAAP DPD promote Kidderminster as a strategic centre and encourages developments which will contribute to increasing the resident population within its boundary. Policy 1 of the KCAAP seeks to provide 900 dwellings within the KCAAP area within the plan period. The application site lies within the Churchfields area explained within the DPD as the largest regeneration site in the town and a priority for the District Council. Furthermore the Churchfields area is described as a new urban village where it is expected to provide the most significant proportion of housing within the KCAAP area."</p> <p data-bbox="577 958 1417 1429">Paragraph 4.86 should read "Thirdly the draft Site and Allocations Policies DPD and KCAAP DPD promote Kidderminster as a strategic centre and encourages developments which will contribute to increasing the resident population within its boundary. Policy 1 of the KCAAP seeks to provide 900 dwellings within the KCAAP area within the plan period. The application site lies within the Churchfields area explained within the DPD as the largest regeneration site in the town and a priority for the District Council. Furthermore the Churchfields area is described as a new urban village where it is expected to provide the most significant proportion of housing within the KCAAP area."</p> <p data-bbox="577 1467 1382 1610">Part 6 (v) of the recommendation listed in paragraph 5.7 should be consistent with paragraph 4.156 which indicates a contribution of £285,000 (rather than £284,000) for highway improvements.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Comments received from Agent in response to Water Course Officer</u> - I have spoken to our engineer regarding the drainage issues raised and we can provide the further detail requested. However, we will need to go back to Severn Trent Water for their opinion on amended discharge positions to the surface water sewer in Clensmore Street. Although we have no concerns with their likely response, we will not receive it in time for your Committee meeting. In this case your Watercourse Officer has suggested that matters are dealt with via condition and that seems the most expedient way to deal with matters in this instance given timescales. The comments will be addressed as a matter of course when we make our Section 104 to submission Severn Trent Water for the approval of the drainage; I therefore suggest we go with the condition.</p> <p><u>Comments received from Agent in response to Water Course Officer</u> - I have spoken to our engineer regarding the drainage issues raised and we can provide the further detail requested. However, we will need to go back to Severn Trent Water for their opinion on amended discharge positions to the surface water sewer in Clensmore Street. Although we have no concerns with their likely response, we will not receive it in time for your Committee meeting. In this case your Watercourse Officer has suggested that matters are dealt with via condition and that seems the most expedient way to deal with matters in this instance given timescales. The comments will be addressed as a matter of course when we make our Section 104 to submission Severn Trent Water for the approval of the drainage; I therefore suggest we go with the condition.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Worcestershire Regulatory Services</u> - I am not aware of any air quality impact assessments undertaken as part of this application. A development of this magnitude utilising a road junction with the worst air quality in Wyre Forest would require additional work to qualify its effects on air quality at the Horsefair junction. I believe that the traffic assessment does not act as a substitute or an alternative means of assessing impact. I would also consider that the proposed financial contribution is not justified on this basis, and we will not be offering a justification for this cost as it is not based on factual air quality impact parameters.</p> <p>In summary I cannot offer any further advice on this application as there is nothing specific we can comment on. However I would advise that the Council must consider a far more holistic approach to air quality with regard to all the development proposals within the Churchfields area, with careful consideration given to the combined impact on the AQMA. I would also advise that the Council is committed to its air quality management plan in this area and must place the onus of air quality improvements on developers in the area as a joint responsibility. It is therefore incumbent on Officers at the District Council to advise all future applicants in the area to consider joint air quality assessments when considering re-development. Piecemeal air quality impact assessments do not provide the full picture in air quality terms and do not address the Council's policies at local and county levels that they have signed up to. These policies may not be DC's policies but the Council's as a whole and therefore a joint responsibility must prevail. The risk of not doing so will jeopardise the delivery of the action plan on air quality and the safeguarding of the future health of all of the people who will reside and use the Churchfields area. I would also advise you that such progress will be reported by WRS in the near future on behalf of the local authority, and it is likely that the WFDC will be held to account on their air quality commitments and potential failure in addressing them. <i>(Officer comments - the technical report submitted has been carefully considered and suggests only a modest increase in vehicle movements into the AQMA. The highways authority considers that the degree of harm is not so significant as to require a full re-configuration of the highway and its associated buildings at the Horsefair. it is considered that a Section 106 contribution to support a future scheme to improve air quality as suggested in the Masterplan is acceptable)</i></p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Officer Comments</u> - Additional Condition - notwithstanding the details submitted no development prior to agreement relating to the interface between the canal and the application site.</p> <p>A report from Bruton Knowles regarding the viability assessment has been submitted. In summary it advises that the development appraisal is a reasonable reflection of the likely development viability of the site. The Gross Development Value, construction costs, development profit and projected timescales for the development are all considered to be realistic.</p> <p>Revised Recommendation - The recommendation is for delegated APPROVAL subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No objections from Community and Partnership Services Directorate; 2. No objections from British Waterways; 3. No objections to the latest plans from neighbours with respect to the amendments to the design of plots 209 and 210 during the current reconsultation period; 4. The signing of a Section 106 Agreement as set out at paragraph 4.156 and 5. The conditions as listed at the end of the report and above. <p><u>Dr Peter King (CPRE)</u> - I see no objection to this application, but it ought to be subject to archaeological conditions as to the recording of the corn mill. I have no detailed knowledge of the site, but I know that Clensmore Mill goes back to the early 19th century or even the late 18th. The mill is unusual for a corn mill in that it was presumably powered by a steam engine, rather than the usual water power. It is perhaps an early example of this, though certainly not the first. This makes it important that it should be fully recorded.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Kidderminster Civic Society</u> - it would be a loss to the industrial heritage to lose this interesting building frontage. The building was constructed as an educated guess between 1750 and 1820. It has a range of unusual windows and openings, two round openings either side of a semi elliptical window complete with cast iron window frame. Most of the surviving windows are complete with extant iron frames. This building is shown in the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal by Longford as 'Clensmore Corn Mill, Iron Foundry'. The society supports the need for regeneration but it would be a good idea to try to integrate the remains of this most unusual industrial survivor into the revitalised area. We would request if the society could have any pictures of the building for prosperity if the building is to be demolished.</p> <p><u>Conservation Officer</u> - Once the adjacent land has been developed for new housing the character of the boundary of conservation are will be changed. The informal canal boundary to the north of the Corn Mill is to be replaced with an ecological buffer zone which will continue for the length of the site boundary with the canal.</p> <p>The drawings supporting application 11/0533/CAC do not indicate clearly how this boundary is to be defined. I think that the housing development needs to have a positive site boundary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To delineate the boundary of the canal and the conservation area. A better definition of the boundary will help establish maintenance liabilities in the future. • To contain the proposed ecological buffer zone and to prevent slumping of steep banks into the canal. • To present a more uniform site boundary, reflecting the development which lies behind and which will enhance the character of the conservation area. <p>To achieve this I suggest that north of the Corn Mill a low brick retaining wall is constructed (preferably not higher than 750mm above water level) capped with bull nose blue engineering brick. Similar to that used to retain the towpath edge, this could apply to sections GG, HH, II, JJ, KK, LL, MM; also at section BB.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>A similar approach could be taken to the south of the Corn Mill where it is proposed to substantially reduce the historic boundary walls: by reducing the existing walls to ground level and using a bull nose blue brick capping. This would apply at sections DD, EE and FF – the height of the retaining wall being determined by the datum level behind it.</p> <p>At sections BB and CC where there is a concrete retaining wall I think that there should be some steps taken to enhance this to maintain a more uniform boundary treatment, although I anticipate this may not involve the use of brick cladding, a suitable form of capping should be considered, and the wall reduced in height to that required to contain the canal and the land behind it.</p> <p><u>I have no objections in principle</u> to the reduction of the historic boundary walls (<u>excepting some fragments of the Corn Mill</u>) to the south of the Corn Mill to a height which will usefully contain both the canal and the buffer zone. This on the condition that these are detailed sympathetically to the conservation area – re-use of bricks salvaged in the demolition to make up sections of wall and the use of bull nose blue brick cappings as elsewhere in the conservation area.</p> <p><u>I cannot support</u> the proposals for the site boundary to the North of the Corn Mill. I think these should be revised as suggested above. (<i>Officer comments - This will be addressed via an additional condition attached to the planning consent - this cannot be agreed under the conservation area consent</i>).</p> <p><u>Change of recommendation</u> - The second recommendation is for delegated APPROVAL of the application for conservation area consent Reference 11/0533/CAC subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) no objections during the remaining consultation period, 2) the submission of additional information to provide greater detail of the proposed level of the wall to the satisfaction of the Conservation Officer; and

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>3) the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notwithstanding any indication on the drawings prior to the first demolition or reduction in the height of the wall samples of materials to be agreed 2. Prior to first demolition or reduction in the height of the wall details of repair to be agreed
11/0390/FULL	93	<p><u>Officer Comment - Draft National Planning Policy Framework</u></p> <p>In July 2011 the Government launched for consultation the Draft National Planning Policy Framework. It streamlines national planning policy into a consolidated set of priorities to consider when planning for and deciding on new development. Despite this being only a consultation draft, Planning Inspectors have been advised that it gives a 'clear indication of the Government's direction of travel' and as such is capable of being a material consideration.</p> <p>Below are some of the main points in the draft Framework relevant to the current application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it makes it clear that local authorities should seek to ensure good access to high quality local public transport for new developments, with priority given to cyclists and pedestrians; • Key facilities essential to local life such as schools and shops should be within walking distance of most properties; • development should secure radical reductions in carbon emissions through the appropriate location and layout of new development, support for energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings; and • new development should be future proofed against climate change through getting its location and design right (making sure that new housing estates are not at risk of flooding and have good flood storage capacity to reduce flooding elsewhere).

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This has been reported as designed to help turn the planning system round; from a system focused on barriers to one that prioritises opportunities. It requires councils to work closely with businesses and communities to plan positively for the needs of each area. And it makes clear that where plans are not in place or up-to-date, development should be allowed unless this would compromise the key principles for sustainability in the Framework, including protecting the Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>It is reported that this presumption will encourage plan-making by councils and communities, giving them a greater say in how they meet their development needs. It will also give communities, developers and investors greater certainty about the types of applications that are likely to be approved, and will help to speed up the planning process.</p> <p>In terms of housing the Framework indicates that Councils must be ambitious in delivering the new homes that their communities need. Together with incentives for communities to accept growth, the Framework makes clear councils should ensure their Local Plan meets the full demand for market and affordable housing in their areas.</p> <p>The Framework also maintains the expectation that councils should have a rolling five year supply of deliverable sites to meet their housing needs with at least a 20% additional allowance.</p> <p>Finally the Framework promotes high quality design for all development, whether individual buildings or whole estates, municipal facilities or parks, and public or private spaces.</p> <p><u>Corrections</u> Within summary of policy the following policies from WMRSS are relevant:</p> <p>QE3, T3, T7</p> <p>Under paragraph 5.4, the reference to paragraphs 4.35 to 4.43 is incorrect and should read “paragraphs 4.37 to 4.47”.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Under paragraph 4.60 reference is made to a suggested level of contribution towards Air Quality monitoring and management, the exact amount was unknown at the time of the report being completed. The figure has since been confirmed as £10,000. This amount should also be referenced in the recommendation under paragraph 5.6 i).</p>
11/0427/FULL	114	<p><u>Neighbour</u> – 1 additional letter of objection received on the grounds of privacy.</p> <p>Whilst we have no objection to the building itself, we do strongly object to the siting of it so very close to our boundary. Having spent a large sum of money creating a relaxing area at the far end of our garden, which also included us taking into account the size of our summerhouse following planning regulations, we believe that the close proximity of this metal shed is definitely contravening your planning rules.</p> <p>We believe that an outbuilding of this height and size should certainly be further away than it currently is and, had planning permission been sought before erection, then this would have been a factor and would therefore have been placed further away thus becoming less intrusive.</p> <p>The initial impression from your Enforcement Officer when he viewed it was that the size of the building and the close proximity was unacceptable. How has it suddenly gone from a negative view to, following our telephone conversation a few weeks ago, a positive in favour of the applicants?</p> <p>When the applicant moved in 4 years ago she did say that eventually she wanted to house the engine on her property, but she told me it would start as a temporary cover, then over time become permanent, indicating this would be without permission, I did not envision such a huge shed.</p> <p>Her partner who lives in Brierley Hill as had the engine for nine years, and kept it in a shed, alarmed to the police station all this time.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>In regard to the trellising mentioned i at no point said that this would be acceptable by me. She came to see me to ask me to ignore my letter from planning and support her, i told her I was one of the people who had complained. She asked me to consider trellising or if i could suggest an alternative, my reply, out of consideration was that i would think about it.</p> <p>2 letters of support received:</p> <p>1) I support this application for the shed to house the steamroller because I think that it is important to preserve historical machinery so that they can be seen and enjoyed by future generations. Being left outside in all weathers (even when covered) is causing unnecessary damage. This shed is only just visible from the road so I fail to see why it should be a problem.</p> <p>2) I wish to support the application and I think every effort should be made to preserve and protect our heritage for future generations</p>
11/0437/FULL	120	<p><u>Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council</u>: Following the submission of amended plans the parish council have no objections.</p> <p><u>English Heritage</u>: English Heritage offer general observations but do not wish to comment in detail. Concern is expressed over the design of the flanking railings and they are compared to highway safety barriers. The Local Planning Authority have queried which set of plans English Heritage are using but have, as yet, received no clarification. In addition English Heritage point out that the works proposed may require the trimming or removal of adjacent shrubbery of trees and this may require consent. It is clearly stated that English Heritage has no objection in principle to the development but would suggest that the design and alignment of the gates and in particular the railings be given further consideration.</p> <p>No Objection to Revised Plans</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Neighbour</u> - Two further letters have been received from the occupants of neighbouring properties. One of these letters raises concerns about the possible removal of trees within the Conservation Area and which contribute to the setting of the Listed Building. The other letter points out that no gates were included in the listing of Wolverley House and the approval of the replacement gates would lead to a diminution in the integrity of an architecturally important building.</p> <p><u>Corrections</u> In Summary of Policy delete policy CA.1, CP11 and QE3.</p> <p>Last sentence of note should read "No such works..."</p> <p>Change Recommendation - APPROVAL</p> <p><u>Add note</u></p> <p>"This consent relates to Listed Building Consent only, and does not give any permission under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The applicant is advised that as the proposed gate is with the curtilage of a Listed Building formal planning permission will also be required. No works can take place until such permission has been granted."</p> <p><u>Reason for Approval</u> delete "...of Wolverley Conservation Area or..." and policies "CA.1 and CP11"</p>
11/0483/FULL	125	<p><u>Neighbour</u> - 1 letter of objection received raising the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is not the ransacking of Hospital grounds to provide saturation parking singularly inappropriate? It deprives In-patients of the holistic healing green dignity of surroundings • Seeking to shoe-horn ever more traffic into this "travelled-upon" neighbourhood stuffed to the gizzard with over-development strains credibility. The insatiable clamour to encourage self-defeating High-Impact travel constitutes an imposition of the surrounding community.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application contravenes PPG.13 - High-Impact travel is not favoured over Low-Impact travel. • The impermeability of this excessively hard-surfaced neighbourhood means roads routinely accumulate standing water. How can the unpleasant splashing negotiation of this by foot/wheelchair/bicycle possible be acceptable in a civilised District? • How on earth can the Application be compatible with District commitment to reduce carbon emissions...? • Absence of foresight to provide double-yellow lines...What are the prospects of this initiative? • Were permission granted, is it reasonable to require a condition of wheel clamping for vehicles abusing intra-hospital pavements? • Residents require unimpeded access by the Emergency Services plus utilities' and Artisan Trader vans. • Our "travelled-upon" neighbourhood is in danger of becoming even more of an automotive slum should this application be conceded. Rather than cravenly sheltering behind parking standards - and grovelling to, instead of managing, traffic - is there hope leadership will produce an enlightened human-scale decision. The proposal has the makings of a short-term "fix", storing up trouble for the not-too-distant future.
<p>PART B</p> <p>11/0398/FULL</p>	<p>131</p>	<p><u>Applicant</u> : Additional information received -</p> <p>1. In the past 100 years there has been no loss of life or any rescue needed at any time.</p> <p>2. Flood evacuation plan for site has already been submitted to Committee. Completely adequate.</p> <p>3. We have access to dry land from rear door onto high ground. We have many boats at our disposal on the meadow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tractors available to drive us to safety along lane. - Mobile telephones. - Flood warnings by environment by phone. - Sara rescue service. - Rescue service in Stourport fire station. - Access to dry land at front of bungalow via barn to Lickhill Road.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>4. Floor level of bungalow is far in excess of 600 mm freeboard clearance required. Bungalow raised off ground.</p> <p>5. In our opinion historically we are not at high risk or vulnerable.</p> <p>6. We wish to reside in our home legally and to abide by the law (unlike many others in the area), to pay our full council tax and to have the right to vote</p> <p>7. Several businesses, inns, houses, caravan parks mid gypsy caravan parks already have 12 months occupation along the River Severn, most being in a more vulnerable position than us.</p> <p>8. 13 bungalows can be used for 11 months of the year on our site, 3 of these are lived in permanently</p> <p>9. 6 of these have been rebuilt to a high standard presumably for permanent habitation.</p> <p>10. We feel that we should not be discriminated against and should be allowed to live as others do, for 11 months.</p> <p>11. We also feel our human rights would be undermined if our application was turned down.</p> <p>12. Any flooding of our site historically has been nothing but a minor inconvenience.</p> <p>13. The Environment Agency is only working in an advisory capacity and is not a set of obligatory rules (their words not ours)</p> <p>14. It is worth noting that there have been no objections to our application and was passed by the Parish Council.</p>