

## WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

**PLANNING COMMITTEE****18<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2012****ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<b>PART A</b>		
11/0534/RESE	16	<p><u>Officer Comments</u> - Proposal description should be amended to read:</p> <p>“Redevelopment of the site to provide a mix of uses including Residential, Class A Retail Uses and Class B Employment (Reserved Matters following Outline Approval 09/0588/OUTL – Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale to be considered)”</p> <p>Revisions to house types on relevant plots have been submitted to overcome issues of window to window relationships, thereby overcoming previously reported concerns expressed at paragraph 4.14 of the report.</p> <p>Whilst amended plans have been submitted to address the outstanding matters concerning Highways matters, there remain a number of minor issues which need to be addressed. As such, County Highways, whilst confident that these outstanding issues can be satisfactorily addressed, are unable to provide a “no objections” response at this stage.</p> <p>No further details have been provided regarding the potential alternative heating sources, as referred to under paragraph 4.48 of the report.</p>
12/0087/ADVE	35	<p><u>Correction</u> : Paragraph 4.4, Delete the second and final sentence which should read as follows -</p> <p>“The closest residential boundary is approximately 40 metres from the sign, the closest dwelling is approximately 52 metres. The boundary of the neighbour, who has objected, is approximately 53 metres from the sign”.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<u>Revised Condition 3</u> – Illumination of sign on side elevation of building to be turned off between 22:00 hours and 07:00 hours each day.
12/0096/FULL	39	<u>Officer Comments</u> - This application would have been eligible to be determined under the Scheme of Delegation but appears on the Planning Committee agenda because a third party had registered to speak. Since the preparation of the report and the agenda papers the registered third party has written to confirm that they no longer wish to speak against the application. This being the case, although the application report appears within Part A of the agenda, a presentation is no longer considered necessary. The application will, therefore, be treated as if it were a 'Part B' application.
<b>PART B</b>		
11/0664/FULL	55	The <u>applicant has submitted a letter</u> expressing concerns about some of the inaccuracies and irrelevancies expressed by the Parish Council and local residents in the committee report, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lighting columns. There are none</li> <li>• There are no covers over the mirrors</li> <li>• Business hours</li> <li>• Commercial use. It is indeed a commercial operation</li> <li>• A busy car park</li> <li>• Late night parties</li> <li>• House prices</li> </ul>
12/0099/FULL	63	<u>Correction</u> : Paragraph 4.4 last sentence should read -  It is considered that the buildings are of a suitable size for conversion. However the proposal is purely a link rather than an extension, in the strict sense of the meaning of the word, it is not required to achieve the conversion but to allow a more pleasing development as a whole.
12/0106/FULL	74	Stourport on Severn Town Council - No objections

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Conservation Officer</u> - Since my previous comments of 20 March 2012 a further revision to the scheme has been received for consideration.</p> <p>Drawing No: KD 03951.13 illustrates a number of changes to the elevations of the building. First the street frontages have been somewhat enlivened by the use of contrasting rendered bays, the contrasting render carrying on past the eaves line to the dormers above. The overall proportions of the building appear to remain unchanged generally although the fenestration has been significantly revised to give a more vertical emphasis. In some ways this can be seen to reinforce the height of the building, but it also acts to break up the linearity of the street elevations which reduces the institutional feel of the massing in general and creates the impression of several smaller units.</p> <p>I think that it would be difficult to design a building of this scale in a residential area that would fully comply with Policy LB.5. The revised design still does not in my opinion relate <u>well</u> to the adjacent locally listed buildings. It does, however, relate better to them, although I feel the rear (east) elevation could be further improved upon.</p> <p>The proposal still does not comply <u>fully</u> with Policy LB.5. Given that refusal on this ground alone would probably be challenged I recommend that Committee approve this application.</p> <p><u>Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS)</u> - There is potential for residents to be adversely affected by noise from road traffic movements. I would therefore recommend that a noise impact assessment is carried out in accordance with Annex 1 of PPG24 in order to determine which noise exposure category each area of the proposed development is likely to fall within. The report should include mitigation measures where necessary and shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to development commencing. Mitigation measures should be completed before any of the permitted dwellings are occupied.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Due to the close proximity of existing residential properties to the proposed development care should be taken during the construction phase to reduce any adverse impacts caused to local residents. I would therefore recommend that the applicant follow Worcestershire Regulatory Service's Code of Best Practice for Demolition and Construction Sites.</p> <p><u>Officer Comments</u> – WRS have confirmed that in the absence of a noise assessment they would not recommend refusal. Notably no noise assessment was submitted or requested previously with respect to the approval for 14 dwellings on this site in 2010 (Ref.10/0125/FULL). They have also confirmed that the recommendation to follow the Code of Best Practice for Demolition and Construction Sites best be served by a note rather than a condition.</p> <p>The only outstanding matter is the current re-consultation period for neighbours to respond to the recently submitted amended plans. Therefore <b>CHANGE RECOMMENDATION</b> to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) no new objections raised by neighbours during the re-consultation process; and</li> <li>(ii) the conditions listed at the end of the report.</li> </ul>