

## WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**9<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2013**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<b>PART A</b>		
12/0760/FULL & 12/0761/LIST	14	<p><u>Correction</u> –</p> <p>Paragraph 2.7, the final sentence should read: “The current applications are the culmination of the protracted negotiations to seek to secure a viable future for the Weavers Cottages.” (not negations)</p>
13/0049/FULL	23	<p><u>Highway Authority</u> - Recommends that any permission which the District Planning Authority may wish to give include conditions and notes regarding: Single access – new – footway; Visibility splays; Vehicle access construction; Access closure – occupation – vehicular; Driveway Gradient; Access, turning and parking; Cycle Parking (Multi Unit) (1 or 2 bed); Cycle Parking (Multi Unit) (3 bed); Welcome Pack Condition</p> <p>Notes: Private Apparatus within the Highway; Section 278 Agreement; Section 38 Agreement Details; Drainage Details for Section 38; No Drainage to Discharge to Highway</p> <p><u>North Worcestershire Economic Development and Regeneration</u> (amended plans) - I think the revised street scene drawing provides a much stronger frontage onto Stourport Road. (<i>Officer Comment - Revised plans have been submitted that alter the layout and appearance of the street scene to the Stourport Road. This has now overcome any concerns in respect of the design of the properties</i>).</p> <p><b>Change of recommendation</b> – Amended plans have been received and resolved the design and highway concerns. Therefore the recommendation is for <b>delegated APPROVAL</b> subject to the signing of a <b>Section 106 Agreement</b> to secure a contribution towards Open Space; and the conditions listed at the end of the report and on the Addenda and Corrections sheet.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
13/0094/FULL	32	<p><u>Rock Parish Council</u> – No objections</p> <p><u>Correction</u> – Paragraph 1.1, the first sentence should read: “The Old Police House is a detached two-storey dwelling located on the edge of Clows Top settlement boundary.” (not Rock).</p>
<p><b>PART B</b></p> <p>13/0103/TREE</p>	41	<p><u>Corrections</u> – Paragraph 4.4, the first sentence should read: “I do not feel that the tree is an immediate threat, as the decay appears to be localised around the pruning wound.” (not treat)</p> <p>Paragraph 5.2, sub-paragraph 2, the first sentence should read: “Within the first planting season following the removal of the tree hereby approved, a replacement tree of <i>Betula utilis</i> of 8 -10cm diameter at 1.5 metres up the stem, in a location to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, shall be planted.” (not 8108cm)</p>
13/0110/RESE & 13/0111/RESE	43	<p><u>Highway Authority</u> – (13/0110/RESE) - The proposed layout does not accord with the Local Transport Plans Highway Design Guide as the application boundary of the site only allows for a partial construction and utilisation of the carriageway. There is no vehicle or pedestrian access to the application site and the conditions applied in the outline permission only allow for access to the development block and not to this part of the site</p> <p>The applicant has failed to demonstrate a means of access to the site for any user from construction traffic to future residents by any means. The application therefore cannot be constructed or occupied. <i>(Officer Comment – It is anticipated that these matters could be resolved via the negotiation process)</i></p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>(13/0111/RESE) - The proposed layout does not accord with The Local Transport Plans Highway Design Guide as the application boundary of the site only allows for a partial construction and utilisation of the carriageway, access the properties fronting Stourport Road will be restricted and there is no provision for the refuse vehicle to maneuver. Practically speaking the construction of the road based on the red line boundary is not possible. The application proposes a substandard access road which will hinder future residents and makes no provision for the refuse vehicle. <i>(Officer Comment – It is anticipated that these matters could be resolved via the negotiation process)</i></p> <p><u>Environment Agency</u> - (Comments relate to both applications). We note that this is a reserved matters application for four dwellings relating to scale, appearance, landscaping and layout on a small part of the former British Sugar site, granted outline approval under ref. 12/0146/EIA. We have no objections to the proposed development but wish to make the following comments.</p> <p>We would refer to our response made on the outline application. We are currently reviewing information submitted in relation to condition 40 (contaminated land) of the outline approval, which is considered ongoing at this time.</p> <p>Your Council decided to impose a condition (39) on the outline approval requiring each reserved matters application to submit a detailed surface water drainage scheme that adheres to the principles agreed as part of the overall drainage scheme (required under condition 38). We note that a drawing showing surface water drainage to mains surface water sewer has been submitted with this reserved matters application. We have recently provided comments on the overall proposed surface water drainage scheme, including issues relating to the use of SuDS and level of treatment provided, to assist consideration of this matter (condition 38 of the outline approval).</p> <p>I would refer to our response which still applies, for your consideration in consultation with the North Worcestershire Water Management Team, as the Lead Local Flood Authority. Severn Trent Water Ltd. would comment on the acceptability of connecting to the mains surface water sewer.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The applicant should confirm discharge rates tie in with the overall rate (maximum rate of 1000 l/s) calculated for the whole site.</p> <p><u>Arboricultural Officer</u> – (Comments relate to both applications). The majority of the proposals are adequate, however I am not convinced by the number or species choice of the proposed tree planting along the Stourport Road. I am also not happy with the lack of a 5 year establishment plan for the trees and method of staking/irrigation. (<i>Officer Comment – these amendments could be achieved via current negotiations</i>)</p> <p><u>Worcestershire Wildlife Trust</u> – (Comments relate to both applications). We note that they are not yet supported by a development-block-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) or a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) as required by conditions attached to the outline permission for the site (12/0146/EIA) and whilst the broad CEMP (delivered under condition 23 of that application) delivers helpful guidance it also suggests that further details will be required.</p> <p>This is particularly important with respect to matters of sustainable drainage and biodiversity enhancement within each of the development blocks, the details of which are not shown on the plans so far submitted in this case. We would be pleased to comment further on these applications once the additional information becomes available but in the meantime I'm afraid we must submit a holding objection to both applications on the grounds that they do not show sufficient detail concerning biodiversity enhancement. We consider that our position is supported by the NPPF and the overall aspirations of the site landscaping plan. It is especially pertinent to note that the block under consideration here keys into Landscape Area 1 and the edge of Landscape Area 2 and opportunities to improve the built environment for wildlife (for example through the installation of bird and bat boxes etc) should be taken where possible.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The strategic CEMP discusses the need for a sensitive lighting scheme and we would recommend that this be considered within the development block as well. (<i>Officer Comment – The submission of a HMP to enhance biodiversity within the strategic seven landscape areas, four of which are to be adopted by the District Council in due course forms a condition attached to the outline consent whilst a HMP for the current application sites is proposed via a condition</i>)</p> <p><u>Crime Risk Advisor</u> – No objections to application reference 11/0110/RESE however the plans for 13/0111/RESE indicate that there are to be two areas that make use of courtyard parking. The parking courtyards appear to be unsecured. Car parking courtyards are discouraged for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They introduce access to the vulnerable rear elevations of dwellings where the majority of burglary is perpetrated.</li> <li>• In private developments such areas are often left unlit and therefore increase the fear of crime.</li> <li>• Particularly where un-gated the courtyards provide areas of concealment which can encourage anti social behaviour.</li> <li>• Although not specifically an SBD issue the introduction of large paved areas can lead to excessive run off of water into storm drains and subsequent flooding.</li> </ul> <p>Where rear car parking courtyards are considered absolutely necessary they must be protected by a gate, the design of which shall be discussed with the Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor (CPDA) at the earliest possible opportunity. Where gardens abut the parking area an appropriate boundary treatment must be discussed and agreed by the CPDA. The Design Council CABA did some research in 2009/10 on how the design of modern urban housing developments affects crime and I think the findings are worth quoting here</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p data-bbox="606 306 1377 478">“It is clear particularly from the walkabout and stakeholder interviews that parking and problems associated with parking are a major source of neighbour disputes, anti-social behaviour and in some cases criminal damage and assault. Specifically:</p> <ul data-bbox="651 509 1384 1535" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="651 509 1384 986">• The default use of rear parking courts as the main parking type, especially if large with multiple access points, should be challenged – they performed poorly for crime both of vehicle crime, assault and criminal damage in those case studies that relied upon them significantly. Also there was clear evidence of residents avoiding using particularly poorly designed courts and displaced parking causing problems elsewhere. If rear or side parking courts are used they should be small, close to owner’s dwellings, well overlooked by occupied rooms, not connected to foot paths, designed to the same quality as the “fronts” of the development and should not open rear access to many dwellings.</li> <li data-bbox="651 990 1384 1224">• Specific attention should be made to where visitors are likely to park – visitors seem particularly unwilling to park in areas away from the public carriageway and will tend to park up on kerbs nearest the dwelling they are visiting. So a street design which incorporates clear on street parking is likely to reduce conflict with residents.</li> <li data-bbox="651 1228 1384 1400">• Some schemes had garages in unusual locations such as at the rear of properties accessed via side lanes or rear access. These appeared to have a high burglary risk so should be considered very carefully.</li> <li data-bbox="651 1404 1384 1535">• Schemes where parking seemed to be working particularly well also tended to have strong management approaches to monitor and correct unofficial parking or misuse of provision.”</li> </ul>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>As the redevelopment of the British Sugar site is at an early stage I do think the use of parking courtyards should be discouraged from the outset. Whilst gating them would be an option this does bring with it issues with maintenance and long term on a site of this size it is conceivable that gates will stop working and in turn this will bring with it issues with anti-social behaviour, crime and parking problems. If parking courtyards are to be used then I would like to see a little more imaginative design that encourages active surveillance which will in turn reduce the opportunity for crime</p> <p><u>Health &amp; Safety Executive</u> – (Comments relate to both applications). The HSE does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.</p> <p><u>Natural England</u> – (application ref. 13/0110/RESE comments are within the report). Application ref. 13/0111/RESE - Natural England is satisfied that the Green Infrastructure proposals submitted with this application conform to the requirements as set out in your authority's Green Infrastructure Plan (Policy CP 13 of the Wyre Forrester District Council Core Strategy). We therefore have no further comment to make on this element of the proposal. You should ensure that the scheme is in line with the South Kidderminster Enterprise Park Green Infrastructure Concept Statement.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><b><u>Addition to recommendation:</u></b> -</p> <p><b>13/0110/RESE</b> (Taylor Wimpey) - Should the current negotiations fail to produce acceptable amended plans prior to 6th May 2013, the alternative recommendation is for DELEGATED authority to REFUSE the application for the following reason:</p> <p>Whilst the siting and orientation of the proposed properties fronting Stourport Road provide an active frontage to this main thoroughfare, it is considered that the design of this frontage fails to take the opportunity available to create a locally distinctive development which significantly raises the standard of design and character in the area at this prominently located and strategically important site for regeneration within the District. As such it is considered that the development is contrary to Policy CP11 of the Adopted Wyre Forest Core Strategy, Policy SAL.UP7 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2012) and the advice of the NPPF.</p> <p><b>13/0111/RESE</b> (Bovis) - Should the current negotiations fail to produce acceptable amended plans prior to 10th June 2013, the alternative recommendation is for DELEGATED authority to REFUSE the application for the following reason:</p> <p>Whilst the siting and orientation of the proposed properties fronting Stourport Road provide an active frontage to this main thoroughfare, it is considered that the design of this frontage fails to take the opportunity available to create a locally distinctive development which significantly raises the standard of design and character in the area at this prominently located and strategically important site for regeneration within the District. As such it is considered that the development is contrary to Policy CP11 of the Adopted Wyre Forest Core Strategy, Policy SAL.UP7 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2012) and the advice of the NPPF.</p>