

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCILPLANNING COMMITTEE
13TH MARCH 2012**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
11/0701/FULL	38	<p data-bbox="587 640 1442 824"><u>Applicant</u> - Further to the application, which is for a modest and straightforward extension to my home, may I express my surprise and concern that a site visit has been deemed necessary following the planning committee meeting of 14th February 2012.</p> <p data-bbox="587 864 895 898">My proposals are for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="639 938 1366 1010">(i) a small single storey rear kitchen extension, which is uncontested; <li data-bbox="639 1050 1390 1189">(ii) a first floor extension over my side garage, which has attracted comments or objections from four of my neighbours and from Cookley Parish Council. <p data-bbox="587 1234 1426 1413">The fact of the matter is that the summary report presented to you and your fellow councillors by the WFDC Case Officer prior to the 14th February meeting, made a clear and unequivocal case for APPROVAL of this application.</p> <p data-bbox="587 1458 1442 1749">Each of the neighbours' comments were scrutinised, yet not one single point of objection was upheld. Similarly the specific objection from Cookley Parish Council that because my house has already been extended, any further development would constitute an 'over-development', was also dismissed by the Case Officer, who maintained that the size and scale of my proposals was entirely acceptable and in keeping with the neighbourhood.</p> <p data-bbox="587 1794 1398 1883">According to the report that was put before you by the Case Officer, there is not one single aspect of this application that contravenes current development policy.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Indeed, I would ask you to note that before submitting this application I had twice taken pre-application advice from the WFDC planning department (initially in 2006 and more recently in 2011). On both occasions I had been advised in writing that there would be no objection from the planning department to what is now being proposed.</p> <p>The main theme of the objections seems to be the suggestion that building over the garage somehow constitutes 'over-development' of the property.</p> <p>Woodlands Road forms a 'triangle' of three connecting roads, to include Westhead Road and Westhead Road North.</p> <p>I trust that at the time of your site visit you will note that 8 houses in Woodlands Road have already extended over their garages.</p> <p>In Westhead Road there are 13 houses which have extended over their garages, and in Westhead Road North there are a further 11 houses which have done the same.</p> <p>This makes a total of no less than 32 examples of similar extensions in the near neighbourhood.</p> <p>In the face of such evidence, I trust you will agree that the parish council's assertion that my own proposals are detrimental to the street scene, is simply ludicrous.</p> <p>With the above facts in mind, I sincerely hope that following your site visit on 8th March you will further agree that there can be no reasonable grounds for refusal of this application.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS																		
		<p><u>Officer Comment</u> - During the Planning Committee Site Visit on 8th March 2012, Members attending asked for clarification as to the cumulative floorspace increase in the size of the original dwelling as a result of the previous and proposed extensions. These details are set out as follows and are based upon dimensions taken from the plans as submitted:</p> <table data-bbox="603 607 1353 831"> <tr> <td>Original floorspace(without garage)</td> <td>102 m²</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Original floorspace (including garage)</td> <td>122 m²</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing floorspace (without garage)</td> <td>150 m²</td> <td>- 47% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing floorspace (including garage)</td> <td>170 m²</td> <td>- 39% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed total floorspace (without garage)</td> <td>171 m²</td> <td>- 67% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed total floorspace (including garage)</td> <td>191 m²</td> <td>- 57% increase</td> </tr> </table>	Original floorspace(without garage)	102 m ²		Original floorspace (including garage)	122 m ²		Existing floorspace (without garage)	150 m ²	- 47% increase	Existing floorspace (including garage)	170 m ²	- 39% increase	Proposed total floorspace (without garage)	171 m ²	- 67% increase	Proposed total floorspace (including garage)	191 m ²	- 57% increase
Original floorspace(without garage)	102 m ²																			
Original floorspace (including garage)	122 m ²																			
Existing floorspace (without garage)	150 m ²	- 47% increase																		
Existing floorspace (including garage)	170 m ²	- 39% increase																		
Proposed total floorspace (without garage)	171 m ²	- 67% increase																		
Proposed total floorspace (including garage)	191 m ²	- 57% increase																		
11/0706/FULL	44	<p><u>Tenants of the Public House</u> - When we took over the business in June 2010, the profitability of the business was barely viable. There was play equipment but it was in need of replacement and therefore the new children's play equipment was replaced by the Landlord. We are a country pub and as such are a destination pub, we are trying to develop a business which focuses on family trade with particular emphasis on the quality of our food. The dry takings are of particular importance to us and the presence of the new play area has proved to increase our turnover by 20%. It is essential in this industry to provide facilities for children so that we are a destination pub for family trade for both eating and drinking. We very much rely on the increase in trade from families over the summer holidays and school holidays throughout the year. It is estimated that in the summer time family trade accounts for approximately 65% of our overall turnover. In the event that we were not able to offer a modern and attractive play area for use by children then the loss of the family trade which would occur would mean that 30% of our turnover would be lost and the business would no longer be viable.</p> <p><u>Accountants of the Tenants</u> - Since taking over the business, a children's play area has subsequently been opened in the grounds to improve turnover of the business. Since the opening of the play area the business has shown improvements to the profitability.</p>																		

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The play area has proved to be a success with customers and has complimented the business. ...the play area has proved essential during summer months to boost revenue as being a country public house, family trade during winter months is reduced and the extra business generated by the increase customer volume has proved essential to the success of the business. It is understood from our Clients that the viability of the business may be threatened by the loss of the children's play area.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> – These additional representations support the statement that the "...play area is significant to the continued success of the enterprise." These have not been verified given the time available and, as such, Members should attribute weight accordingly.</p> <p><u>Revised Information has been received</u> - Since the last Committee the Applicant has modified the play equipment by removing the roofs to the climbing apparatus and painted plastic sections dark green. Revised photographs have been received showing the play equipment as now exists. The Applicant seeks to retain the equipment as modified. A re-consultation exercise has been undertaken with neighbours that will expire on 21st March 2012.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> : 1 letter of objection received on revised information - The revised play area design still has not addressed the residents' concerns about the noise nuisance generated by such a large play area in a rural Green Belt area, and the officer's initial view on the noise impact can only be described as nonsensical assuming only a few houses would hear any noise. Also the amended design does not change the fundamental fact that this is a development within the Green Belt. My view is that the new play area should be classed as a new building in the Green Belt and can only be accepted if it falls within the Council's approved development plan or that if there are special circumstances. Unless the officer has other information, the public house owner had not demonstrated any special circumstances to allow the development, so I urge the Committee to reject this application.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> - Paragraph 4.1 should read "... surrounded by 1.1m high close boarded fence..."</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<u>Change Recommendation</u> - DELEGATED APPROVAL subject to the expiry of the consultation period and no new issues being raised and the conditions set out in the report.
PART B 12/009/FULL	64	<u>Agent</u> - Correspondence has been received clarifying the nature and extent of each of the pitches which would measure 11.5m x 11m of which 9m x 5m would be hardstanding, the remaining area would be grass.
12/0014/FULL	70	<u>Severn Trent Water</u> - No objection <u>Environment Agency</u> - No objection subject to condition regarding flood evacuation management plan. <u>Add Condition</u> - Flood evacuation management plan
12/006/FULL & 12/0061/LIST	80	<u>Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council</u> – No objections subject to a report from the Conservation Officer
12/3003/TE	85	<u>Bewdley Town Council</u> – The planning committee noted the contents of the Planning Officer's report to the WFDC Planning Committee which was to recommend approval. The Town Council also raises no objection to the proposal and would recommend approval subject to a strict condition that the cabinet currently in situ having been put in place recently close to the Guildhall and Pelican crossing must be removed and that BT be reminded of their responsibilities to gain approval in such instances before such work is undertaken. The planning committee had sympathy with the views of the Conservation Officer and in particular the reference to the prospect (if this is a correct interpretation) that there will be a series of cabinets of this type at 50 metre intervals running through the town centre conservation area.

