

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

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
12/0317/FULL	19	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> – Objection and recommend refusal. The recommendation of the Town Council to refuse this application is based on two principal grounds. The Town Council first believes that the development proposed constitutes an over-development of the application site, both in terms of the density of the development proposed and the limited living space which will be available to some occupiers, particularly in respect of the one bed units and those of the Lodge Building which is proposed for conversion.</p> <p>Secondly, and while the County Highway Authority may regard access and highway arrangements as satisfactory, subject to conditions, the Town Council believes that the existing highway infrastructure in the vicinity of the application site is inadequate to cope with the likely increase in traffic which will be generated by the development; and equally doubt is cast on the adequacy of the immediate access to the site and likewise to the adequacy of the highway within the site. Whether the use of double yellow lines to prevent parking is a hypothetical or realistic means of traffic control is, in the Town Council's view, very open to speculation.</p> <p>Should the District Council not concur with the recommendation of the Town Council, and should planning permission therefore be granted, it is a further view of the Town Council that any Public Open Space contribution under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 should be available to the Town Council in its entirety, rather than a minor proportion with the remaining balance being used by the District Council.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>A Section 106 contribution (£34,508.40) is intended for off-set Open Space provision; and most Members will be aware that flanking the development site is the Town Council's War Memorial Park extending to nearly 30 acres, to which residents of the new development will have direct access. It seems logical in order to enhance the amenities for those residents that a major contribution to enhance the amenities of the Park is a very credible justification for the Town Council's views.</p> <p>As a post-script to this response, and again if planning permission is to be granted, it is hoped that the District Planning Authority will ensure via bonds and whatever other appropriate measures are available to it, to finally ensure a comprehensive and satisfactory completion of the development.</p> <p><i>(Officer Comment - Members are advised that there are no powers under the Planning Act that can require the completion as part of a planning permission either through a bond or any other mechanism).</i></p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> - A further Bat Survey has been undertaken and proposed mitigation demonstrated. This will form part of the application for a Licence to Natural England. This approach is considered acceptable and overcomes Natural England's and the Countryside Conservation Officer's concerns.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> - The last line of Paragraph 4.35 should read "heritage asset takes precedence" (not "president").</p> <p><u>Add additional conditions</u> –</p> <p>13. Footpath link provision before first occupation and retention for life of development</p> <p>14. Methodology for working within Root Protection Zones of Trees</p>
12/0323/FULL	37	<p><u>Strategic Housing Services Manager</u> has commented as follows - "There are concerns regarding the potential lack of support from the County Council's Joint Commissioning Unit (JCU) for the development in this location. However, it is acknowledged that these concerns relate more to future funding and support streams rather than the land use issues and principle of such a development."</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Officer Comment</u> - Members are advised that there is a factual inaccuracy contained within the report insofar as it relates to the size of the previously approved and proposed basements. Officers have revisited the site to check relevant dimensions of the proposed, as built (to date), basement compared with the previously approved basement (application 11/0343/FULL). Officers can confirm that the maximum dimensions of the basement as built are actually consistent with that which has previously been approved, albeit that the internal subdivision varies slightly. In light of this fact, there are a number of paragraphs in which reference to the basement is made which require amendment, as follows:</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 should be amended and replaced as follows:</p> <p>“Planning permission granted under 11/0343/FULL made provision for a basement, associated with the proposed replacement dwelling, with maximum dimensions of 10.5 m x 11.89 m. What has been constructed on site to date, whilst internally different, is in accordance with the previously approved dimensions.”</p> <p>Paragraph 4.17 should be amended, with the first 3 sentences to be omitted entirely, such that the paragraph should commence with the sentence which begins:</p> <p>“The basement, as already summarised, provides ancillary support” .</p> <p>Paragraph 5.2 should be amended, with the second sentence reading:</p> <p>“That said, additional accommodation is proposed by the use of what would have been the garage space, and the use of the basement to provide support and communal facilities to the above ground apartments.”</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>At paragraph 4.7 of the report, reference is made to the assessment of the 45 degree code at the time of the previous application for the single dwelling (11/0343/FULL). Whilst mention is made of the side facing ground floor obscure window to No. 24, nothing is mentioned of the rear facing windows within the previous extension to that property. Members are advised that officers have undertaken an assessment of these windows and find that there would appear to be a minor breach of the 45 degree code guidance in respect of the relevant rear facing window at No.24, with the plotted 45 degree line appearing to “clip” the rear corner of the proposed building. In applying the 45 degree code, the guidance states that it should be applied flexibly taking into account the particular circumstances of the site. Given the minor nature of the breach; the southern orientation of the rear elevations of the properties; the fact that No.24 is slightly higher (at the rear) than the application site (approximately 0.3 m higher); and, the distance between the relevant window and the corner of the building (in excess of 7 m measured along the 45 degree line), officers consider that the relationship between the windows at No. 24 and the proposed building remain within acceptable tolerances.</p>
<p>PART B 12/0593/ADVE</p>	<p>55</p>	<p><u>Officer Comment</u> – The application site straddles 2 wards.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> - Ward should read Sutton Park/Habberley & Blakebrook.</p> <p>In addition, site address should read “Park Butts Ringway/Proud Cross Ringway”</p>
<p>12/0607/FULL</p>	<p>57</p>	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> – No objections</p>
<p>12/0644/S106</p>	<p>60</p>	<p><u>Correction</u> - The third sentence of paragraph 4.7 should read “This service will operate from Birchen Coppice, Foley Park, Ferndale and Franche areas”. (not “France”).</p>
<p>12/0661/FULL</p>	<p>63</p>	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> – No objection and recommend approval</p>

Agenda Item No. 9

Kidderminster Library, Market Street, Kidderminster

12/0643/WCCR Page 117

Objector

We have precious little in Kidderminster culture wise, we have the Rose Theatre the library and the Gallery. Please do not take the Gallery for office space, there is plenty of empty office units. Reasons will be parking, its hard enough especially on Thursdays (market day) Loss of culture for our elderly who love listening to the piano playing while enjoying a coffee. Loss for our youth, who may never hear a real piano other than here. This building was to replace a beautiful old building which was left in disrepair after neglect by the council, I remember the old spiral staircase ... where is it now, along with all the artefacts in beautiful glass containers? This new building as I remember was to be a better choice for the people of Kidderminster and beyond to show art, listen to music, in all culture, then why fill it with office desks et al. Surely I am not alone in my thoughts, just how many people feel like I do, why don't you put a poll in the local paper, I'm guessing because it would not be the answer you want.