

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL**PLANNING COMMITTEE**
14TH AUGUST 2012**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|--|
| PART A | | |
| 12/0114/FULL | 16 | <p><u>Applicant</u> (Additional information submitted) -</p> <p>POTENTIAL DRAINAGE SCHEME TO FORGE POOL AND CONCERNS RAISED BY THE COUNCIL'S COUNTRYSIDE CONSERVATION OFFICER</p> <p>Within the adopted roads of the development surface water will be collected via trapped gullies which will prevent oil and silt from entering the downstream system.</p> <p>Permeable paving is proposed to collect surface water in all private hard-standing areas. Permeable pavements allow stormwater to infiltrate through the block paving and into the granular sub-base. The water undergoes absorption, filtration and microbiological degradation; in turn, there is less pollution entering directly into the downstream system and ultimately the Forge Pond.</p> <p>Prior to surface water flows entering the Forge Pond, they will be controlled by a flow control chamber to a maximum discharge of 7 litres per second and pass through a headwall structure dissipating any energy and preventing scour to the bank.</p> <p>The ecological impact on the Forge Pond will be negligible as a result of the measures outlined above. (The applicants have also submitted information published by the Institution of Civil Engineers in Australia entitled 'Stormwater Treatment Using Permeable Pavements').</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|---|
| | | <p>PROVISION OF MARKET HOUSING WITH A LOCAL LINK Further to our ongoing discussions concerning the Affordable Housing element and Local Link for Market Housing I confirm the Barratt position is to provide 19 Affordable Housing units to be passed to a Registered Provider who can operate a “Local Link” scheme in accordance with the District Council policies. The Principal Strategic Housing Officer has previously accepted this concept.</p> <p>Of these 19 units 4 would be what we describe as bungalows, 2 x 1 bed, and 2x 2bed but with an additional room in the roof space for visiting relatives. The other 15 units include 2 x 2 bed flats and a mix of two and three bed houses. The Council’s Principal Housing Officer has confirmed that this mix is acceptable. Given the current Waiting List and Parish Needs survey indicate a need for smaller units and this mix is considered to be reasonable.</p> <p>In terms of the remaining private market housing our views on a Local Link are still as the Statement. However in the spirit of compromise and given the Parish concerns Barratt is prepared to offer the three other proposed bungalows in the scheme on plots 8,9 and 10 (house Type C) to locals with a bone fide connection for a 6 week period, at a time to be agreed with the District Council. This could be either on commencement of site works or any period before formal marketing of the remaining private market units. The proposal would be for the initial sale only and not relate to subsequent re sales as we believe this would be seen as a restriction on the property and create future mortgage difficulties for the owners/purchasers concerned.</p> <p>With the 19 affordable units the additional 3 local link units would provide over 52% of “Local Housing”.</p> <p>ENERGY & SUSTAINABILITY In terms of Fabric First we are constantly seeking ways to comply with the improving energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations through the built structure.</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|---|
| | | <p>Using the 2006 Part L1A Building Regulations as a base, to comply with the 2010 AD PartL1A Building Regulations which we will do involves improved insulation to ground floors, floors over garages, external walls, party walls and lofts. External cavity walls are increased in size to give an extra 10mm in cavities to allow platinum board inside. Extra thicknesses of roll fill and mineral wool are included in lofts and party walls. Air tightness is improved with better fitting doors, windows, draught excluders. Gas Boilers have a better 'A' rated system with weather compensator and zone controls to the heating and hot water systems. All internal lighting is low energy and external is low energy with PIR operation. All of this provides a 25% minimum improvement over the 2006 Regulations. It achieves CfSH Level 3 ENE1. This therefore achieves improved thermal efficiency. In terms of other Sustainability/ carbon reduction matters you will note we are employing a SUDS system for the storm water which will also help maintain and enhance the vegetation and wildlife ecosystems in the adjoining Pools Area which has suffered in recent years through dropping water tables/supply. The Travel Plan highlights the intention to produce travel welcome packs for new residents to encourage use of movement by means other than the car. The Barratt Construction Phase Safety Health and Environmental Plan hopefully provides comfort that as a Company we try to source materials responsibly, minimise waste, be as energy efficient as possible during the building operation process and reduce materials needing to go to landfill sites.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> - Section 106 obligations should be to overcome legitimate planning objections to a proposal and only to that extent is it a material consideration. In advice on the use of planning obligations, the Secretary of State emphasises that they should not be abused, either by authorities seeking extraneous inducements or benefits or by developers offering unrelated benefits in an attempt to get planning permission for unacceptable development. In this case the restriction of the sale of the market properties is not material as there is no planning policy framework in place locally to support an Agreement for this purpose. Therefore the offer proposed should not be pursued</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|--|
| | | <p><u>Neighbours</u> (additional 5 objections received) - It is a little disappointing that throughout all these plans, we have been told that traffic- calming/slowing things will be implemented when Barratt Homes build; so we had been expecting something to 'calm/slow' traffic. Obviously cars only go at 30mph through that section because the majority of those houses on the north side are terraced cottages and have to park on the road, thus causing chicanes etc. Once past that site, and for about 75-85% of the Belbroughton Road the cars accelerate at a very high speed, hitting around 50mph+ as they go up past the Stables on the South side.</p> <p>It's a shame that nothing will now be done as we had been told that the issue would be dealt with whilst building new homes.</p> <p>The most obvious traffic calming which works very well throughout Europe is the traffic light system. Once the detector detects a car travelling above legal speed limit (30mph) a set of traffic lights 200m further down the road turn to red. The car(s) must then wait and wait until they have lost more time than it would have taken them to drive at 30mph. Everyone behind will get annoyed with that first car, and they will realise their mistake and won't repeat it, because they will not save time next time.</p> <p>Many residents are away with prime Summer Holiday season and the Olympics and will be unable to respond properly to this latest Consultation.</p> <p>There is a feeling locally of exclusion from the planning process since the fanfare of consultation by Barratt in 2011, and it seems that this application is being rushed through ahead of the Planning Process (Inspector's Review of the Site Allocations and Policy Document) and further consultations regarding housing need which is on going.</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|--|
| | | <p>The provision of additional affordable housing does not meet with either Barratt’s own “consultation” process or the original Parish Housing Needs Survey and are mainly clustered in one corner of the site – almost like a ghetto? I understand the affordable houses will be reserved for residents with a local connection – I fully support this</p> <p>The housing mix is extreme – small affordable units, very small bungalows, few mid range houses, and eleven 5/6 bed houses.</p> <p>The proposals still disregards the great local need for downsizing in their design, and the provision of smaller market units.</p> <p>I understand a new Housing Needs Survey has been commissioned by the Parish to establish what the LOCAL need really is - Until this is done a proper decision cannot be made and the wrong housing mix will be provided</p> <p>The Site Allocations and Policies Document for this site is still subject to representation and will not be reviewed by the Planning Inspector until Autumn 2012. Until this Review any application is premature and contrary to Policy.</p> <p>None of my original comments appear to have been acknowledged and all of them are valid planning issues.</p> <p>Barratt’s off-site proposals have still not been clarified – their plans focus exclusively on site.</p> <p>They have not taken sufficient steps to mitigate the effect of their development on Blakedown: The highways effect – both on Belbroughton Road and the Forge Lane/Birmingham Road junction – is greatly understated. What parking restrictions will there be?</p> <p>The boundary treatment to the Green Belt paddocks is wholly insufficient</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|--|
| | | <p>Light and noise pollution from 42 houses has not been addressed</p> <p>There has been no discussion publicly regarding Section 106 contributions</p> <p>The effect on Blakedown School, which is currently having to extend already, has not been mentioned</p> <p>The housing mix and design is inappropriate.</p> <p>There are possible future access points into the rear garden of 34 Belbroughton Road and the pony paddocks along the eastern boundary</p> <p>The large detached house on Plot 24 looks directly up the rear gardens and to the rear elevations of 34 to 48 Belbroughton Road – as it will effectively be 3 storey with rooms in the loft this will affect existing neighbours' amenity</p> <p>We have seen no Contractors' Management Proposal – how much disruption will there be during works?</p> <p>The Planning Committee should inspect the site to witness the issues first hand.</p> <p>This application is now being rushed through after months of delay and I call on the Planning Committee to defer a decision until they can give this application the consideration such a major development in Blakedown deserves.</p> <p>We had a “fanfare” of Consultation in 2011 - little regard has been paid to what was said. Since the application was made in February 2012 there has been no contact between Barratts, the local community or the Parish Council.</p> <p>This is a major site in Blakedown and will increase the number of houses on Belbroughton Road by 36%</p> <p>We have 1 chance to get this development right – Please let us ensure we have a development that meets local needs and is the best scheme - The current proposal is neither</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|--|
| | | <p>I understand that Barratts on 27th July submitted 16 further plans and revisions. I have been unable to view these in full and am particularly concerned that the date for the Planning Committee is set for 14th August - giving the Planning Officer just 1 day to make a recommendation and would very much like to see both of these extended given that many local residents will be in a similar situation to myself - away - given we are in prime Summer Holiday season and with the Olympics upon us - and will be unable to respond properly to this latest Consultation.</p> <p>Barratts own "consultation" showed that residents wanted 35 to 40 houses with 20% to 30% affordable, not 45% as they now propose. They have also disregarded the great local need for downsizing in their design.</p> <p><u>Corrections -</u></p> <p>Paragraph 4.31 should read, "Of the 7 proposed <u>4</u> are for social rent."</p> <p>Paragraph 4.46 should read, "Concern has been raised regarding the loss of privacy as a result of the proposed new properties overlooking the existing, notably the 2½ storey dwelling at plot no.24 which is orientated in a south west / north east direction. This proposed dwelling would however overlook the adjacent field which lies beyond the rear gardens to those properties which front onto Belbroughton Road and there is a separation distance of over <u>30m</u> between the rear gardens to these existing properties and the footprint of the house at plot no.24. "</p> <p>Paragraph 4.75 should read, "However under Circular 05/05 and the CIL Regulations <u>2010</u> it is considered that due to its location Springfield Park is not reasonably related to the application site. Therefore it is suggested that the total amount is spent within the ward, subject to the Parish Council's agreement."</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|--|------|---|
| | | <p><u>Change to Recommendation</u> – Officers understand that the latest consultation to neighbours and the Parish Council was not received by the Parish Council until 2nd August 2012. Therefore to allow the required consultation period to elapse the recommendation has been updated as follows:</p> <p>Delegated APPROVAL subject to:</p> <p>a) No new objections being received by the Parish Council within the consultation period</p> <p>b) the signing of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - affordable housing - open space - education provision <p>for the amounts outlined at paragraph 4.75 of the committee report; and</p> <p>c) the conditions as listed at the end of the report.</p> |
| 12/0312/RESE | 67 | <p><u>Corrections</u> –</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2 - the first sentence should start “Members are advised that”.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8 – the final sentence is incomplete and should read “ thereby ensuring that the Local Planning Authority maintains control over any potential future alterations and additions within the roof spaces and the external appearance of the roofs”.</p> |
| <p>PART B</p> <p>12/0268/S106</p> | 78 | <p><u>Correction</u> –</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5, add “All affordable units will be subject to Local Connection which will mean the properties will be let/sold to households with a local connection to Wyre Forest District”.</p> |
| 12/0284/FULL | 82 | <p><u>Conservation Officer</u> - I have now received further details as outlined in the applicant’s letter of 19th July 2012.</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|--|
| | | <p>There is no doubt that the substantial 1671 Grade II former farmhouse which stands on the proposed development site has benefitted from the refurbishment and repairs carried out by the present owners, and its use for specialist training facilities is a good example of the best utilisation of an historical building.</p> <p>The key issues which affect the listed building are the extension of the car park to create a circuitous route around the building, involving the loss of the “garden” area, and part of the historic brick wall which divided the farmhouse gardens from the operational farmyard.</p> <p>The supplementary information dated 16th July 2012 makes reference to: <i>“... the framed and picturesque setting of the building will be preserved by embellished planting , a deep lawned margin, planted islands amongst new parking bays and the omission of any spaces that would or could abut its main frontage to Hartlebury Road. (See revised drawing 104/Rev A)”</i>.</p> <p>However drawing 104/Rev A indicates a row of parking spaces abutting the frontage to Hartlebury Road, which is directly at odds with the above statement.</p> <p>I maintain my view that these proposals will have an adverse effect on the setting of the listed building, contrary to Policy LB.1. The setting of the building will be less attractive surrounded by parking than it currently is.</p> <p>Policy LB.4 requires gardens associated with statutorily listed buildings to be retained substantially undeveloped and their special features conserved. Notwithstanding the applicant’s willingness to undertake a desk-based assessment followed by a field evaluation to accord with the NPPF paragraphs 128 and 141, the application is contrary to Policy LB.4.</p> <p>Discussions have taken place with the applicant regarding the possibility of an alternative parking configuration and re-routing the one-way traffic system away from the listed building, which I still consider to be a feasible alternative to the scheme proposed, but to now avail.</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|---|
| | | <p>Object.</p> <p>The proposals are contrary to LB.1 and LB.4.</p> <p>It should be noted that the demolition of the listed wall will require listed building consent for which no application has yet been received by the Local Planning Authority. Unless that consent is granted the one-way system proposed in this application cannot be lawfully implemented.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> – The views of the Conservation Officer are noted, however as set out in the report Officers feel that there is sufficient weight in favour of the application to enable the recommendation for Approval to stand. The issue of the requirement for Listed Building Consent is noted and as such a note reminding the applicant of this is recommended.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> -</p> <p>Paragraph 4.3 - At the end of the paragraph continue, to read: “Given the impact upon the wall, which is curtilage listed, a separate Listed Building Consent application would be required for its proposed partial removal. The applicants are aware of this requirement, but no such application has been received to date.</p> <p><u>Add Note</u> –</p> <p>Listed Building Consent required prior to any works to the wall.</p> |
| 12/0319/FULL | 94 | <p><u>Corrections</u> –</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2 – second line should read “ the four phases had been fully justified and demonstrated that Very Special Circumstances existed.”</p> <p>– penultimate line to read “provide better educational facilities it is considered appropriate to allow the development under Very Special Circumstances”.</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|---|
| 12/0340/FULL | 104 | <p data-bbox="656 281 1306 348"><u>Kidderminster Foreign Parish Council</u> (Additional comments received) -</p> <p data-bbox="656 385 1285 451">We have found this quote in respect of the new permitted development criteria:</p> <p data-bbox="656 488 1375 588"><i>“Side extensions to be single storey with maximum height of four metres and width no more than half that of the original house. “</i></p> <p data-bbox="656 625 1397 1309"><i>Each proposed side extension on either side of The Hawthornes is the same width as half that of the original chalet, making the total of the two side extensions equal to the entire width of the original chalet. We wonder if that comes within permitted development? It seems to depend on how you interpret the Law. Does it mean (total of both) side extensions to be no more than the half the width of the original house or does it allow extensions on either side, each no more than half the width? If this is the case then the law allows the chalet to be doubled in size within permitted development rights. If many of the owners do the same it would be detrimental to the landscape character of the area. These rules apply to houses – I am not sure if the same rules apply to chalets. If they do, then these people are proposing to extend The Hawthornes to its absolute maximum within the rules. If it is allowed, surely it will set a precedent for many other chalet owners to follow, with devastating effect on the landscape.</i></p> <p data-bbox="656 1346 1391 1680"><u>Officer Comment</u> - Since the introduction of the changes to the nationally set permitted development rights in 2008, planning case law has established that the permitted development rights in respect of side extensions can apply to either side of a property. Therefore, in this instance, the applicant could extend half the width of the building, on either side, without the need for planning permission. This is the fall back position referred to in paragraph 4.4 of the report.</p> |

| REFERENCE NO. | PAGE | ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS |
|---------------|------|---|
| | | <p><u>Agent</u> (on behalf of Severn Valley Railway [SVR]) - Express concern at the excavations for both foundations and drainage in close proximity to the SVR running line, particularly given the known instability of the slopes in the area. If WFDC are minded to approve the application then appropriate conditions are added to the approval to require that appropriate site investigations are undertaken and professional advice on the foundation solution is obtained. Particular concern at the possible implications of the drainage, especially if these are taken to soakaways within the slopes below the SVR track.</p> <p>No objection in principle to the proposals we are simply looking to protect SVR's interests in an area of known ground instability.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> – The concerns are noted and as such additional conditions are recommended.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> –</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1 – final line should read “site prior to officer involvement”.</p> <p><u>Change to Recommendation</u> – APPROVAL</p> <p><u>Add Additional Conditions</u> –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Details of Foundation design and any retaining structures 2. Details of drainage and position of soakaways. |
| 12/0350/TREE | 108 | <p><u>Correction</u> –</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5, 4th line should read “... which supposedly condemns the tree” (not “both trees”).</p> |
| 12/0389/FULL | 116 | <p><u>Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council</u> – Recommend approval</p> |
| 12/0433/FULL | 121 | <p><u>Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council</u> – Recommend approval</p> |