

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

12TH MARCH 2013

RUNNING ORDER

PART A Reports

Ref.	Address of Site	Speaker	Page No.
12/0634/FULL	SEVERN VALLEY RAILWAY STATION DRIVE KIDDERMINSTER		17
12/0770/FULL	KWIK-FIT CHURCHFIELDS KIDDERMINSTER		30
13/0033/FULL	LUCY BALDWIN HOSPITAL OLIVE GROVE STOURPORT-ON-SEVERN	John Holden (Stourport on Severn Town Council)	35

PLANNING COMMITTEE
12TH MARCH 2013

ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
13/0033/FULL	35	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> (additional comments) – The Town Council was glad to note that this latest application did not in fact result in the loss of one unit of social housing, as previously believed; a fact also kindly confirmed before the Town Council's meeting.</p>
		<p>The Town Council remains concerned, however, about the highway system, including the impact that the development would have on Olive Grove as it is at the moment. For the density of development which is proposed (even if said to comply with policy standards) the Town Council still believes the proposed cul-de-sac extension to Olive Grove to be narrow and unsatisfactory notwithstanding the emergency access which is also proposed. The Town Council meeting was interested to learn from the applicants that they had in fact proposed to the County Highway Authority the prospect of serving the proposed development with a gyratory highway system but, that such a system was not apparently favoured by the Authority. The Town Council believes that a gyratory highway system would be much better, would reduce possible highway hazards and would enable some, if not all, of the existing waiting restrictions in Olive Grove to be removed. As it is it looks as though additional restrictions (yellow lines) are going to be needed when with a gyratory system they could be avoided – as could the need and cost of enforcement. If it was possible to do so, the Town Council feels that the Highway Authority should be requested to reconsider its stance about a gyratory system and the benefits which a system would provide, e.g. a convenient traffic flow without the need for the reversing manoeuvres which the present proposals will necessitate.</p>

12th MARCH, 2013.

ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS Continued.

13/0033/FULL

Highway Authority (in response to the comments by Shourport or Severn Town Council) - If a one-way order was considered, notwithstanding the suitability of the road layout, we would have to consult with the existing residents. It is anticipated that residents would object as they would have to drive further to leave the estate. Furthermore, in the peak hours more vehicles will pass the existing residential properties and one way roads have a tendency to result in increased speeds as there is no conflict with opposing traffic.

I would not encourage a one way order without the ability to fully consider the possible negative impacts that could arise to respond to a concern which the Highway Authority does not share nor consider a matter to warrant a recommendation of refusal. It is not asserted however necessary to make the development function nor would it be unacceptable without it.

In addition, the proposed layout does not allow for a one way loop to be formed and the suggestion cannot be considered reasonable under this application as it cannot be implemented without amending the current layout.

12th MARCH 2013.

ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS continued.

13/0033) Full.

Should the applicant wish to promote an alternative access arrangement then this would be considered, but it should be noted that there are disadvantages with one way systems as well as advantages.

Strategic Housing Services Manager (additional comments) - the number, size of unit and mix as proposed is now acceptable and fully supported.

Neighbour (additional comments) - we would obviously wish to comment further if the idea of the gyratory system is developed and detailed plans are drawn up; but our initial concern (which we believe is in line with local opinion) is for the general safety of park users, particularly children and animals.

We are also confused as to [the] view that a gyratory system would remove the necessity for ~~small~~ all of the proposed yellow lines in Olive Grove.

Corrections -

Paragraph 1.5 - The site is allocated for Hospital and other Health Care Establishments within the Adopted Local Plan not as residential as mentioned in the report

(3)

17th MARCH 2013.

ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS continued.

13/0033/FULL.

Paragraph 1.6 - should read "... conversion of the Lodge Building to three flats..."

Paragraph 3.15 - the developer has re-numbered the plot and such reference within the Neighbour comments to Plots 27, 28 and 29 should now be Plots 7, 8 and 9.

Paragraph 4.11 should read "Given that the amount of large vehicles will reduce from the lawful use and there is more or less a status quo on the northern access..."

Paragraph 4.34 - Reference to Plot 36 should be Plot 1 following re-numbering.

Paragraph 4.42 - The application site is not covered by an area Tree Preservation Order. This was amended so that only specific trees which have a high amenity value are protected.

Officer comment - Given the correction to the local Plan allocation under paragraph 1.5, notwithstanding the residential allocation within the emerging Site Allocation and Policies DPD, the development has to be viewed as a Departure and it has been advertised as such.

12th MARCH 2013

ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS Continued

13) 0033) FULL.

Addition to Recommendation - Delegated
authority subject to the conclusion
of the departure consultation procedure
and the items i and ii as set out in
paragraph 5.3 of the report.