

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**8<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2014****ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<b>PART A</b>		
13/0670/FULL	15	<p><u>Officer Comment</u> - At Paragraph 4.5 of the report, reference is made to the proposed Anchor Unit being capable of sub-division into multiple retail units. The applicant has confirmed that the maximum number of units, should sub-division occur, would be 5 retail units.</p> <p>Following receipt of additional information, the Environment Agency have confirmed that they are now satisfied with the overland flood flow routes and details submitted; have provided further confirmation that they now withdraw previous objections to the new section of culvert proposed (beneath Retail Unit 4); are supportive of the alternative indicative proposals for the de-culverted section of the River Stour. However, formal comments with regard to the Otter mitigation and protection strategy are awaited.</p> <p><u>Additional Conditions</u> are suggested -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved use of Retail Units 2, 3 and 4 for uses within Use Class A1, A3 or A4.</li> <li>• Sub-division of Anchor Unit 1 permitted provided that not more than 5 separate units are created.</li> <li>• Retail Unit 4 shall be capable of sub-division into no more than two separate units.</li> <li>• Submission and approval of Flood Evacuation Plan.</li> <li>• Maintain flood routes clear from obstructions.</li> <li>• Submission and approval of surface water discharge rates.</li> <li>• Finished Floor Levels of buildings to be agreed.</li> </ul>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Corrections –</u> Under Paragraph 3.1 which details the Highway Authority response, at the first bullet point on page 18 there is an incorrect reference made to “Government Office for the North East”. This should read “ ..... should apply to the National Transport Casework Team, Department for Transport, Newcastle Upon Tyne”.</p> <p>At Paragraph 4.35, there is an unfortunate typographical error. The final word on the fifth line should read “dual” and not “duel”</p>
14/0095/OUTL	105	<p><u>North Worcestershire Economic Development &amp; Regeneration</u> - The current application site, now known as Silverwoods, is the largest redevelopment site within the District and is identified as a mixed use destination and is allocated within the adopted Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan, under policy SAL.SK2. This policy identifies that the site is suitable for the following uses:</p> <p><i>Proposals for this site should:</i></p> <p><i>Provide a mixed use development incorporating a significant number of residential units (C2/C3) (approximately 320 dwellings), and employment generating uses (approximately 12ha) including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>B1, B2 and B8 development</i></li> <li>• <i>Ancillary commercial uses</i></li> <li>• <i>Community Facilities (Use Class D1)</i></li> <li>• <i>Tourism and non town centre leisure uses (Use Class D2)</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Subject to the sequential test and the impact of the proposal being considered.</i></p> <p>This application falls within Use Class D2 and is therefore considered to be appropriate for this location – subject to the sequential and impact tests being satisfied. It is understood that a sequential test has been carried out for the purposes of this application and that the alternative sites have been ruled out due to a range of physical, highway, land ownership or planning issues associated with them. Therefore, it is considered that in this instance, this particular use could be supported on the site.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The current application site straddles the boundary between phase 1 and 2 and would therefore remove some of the land approved for 'B' use classes within Phase 1. However, it should be noted that the policy identifies the suitability of the Silverwoods site to provide for employment generating uses and it has been estimated that this development will provide for approximately 50 jobs, and this needs to be taken into account in the decision making process. It is also considered that the siting of the proposed use within the site is chosen well. This is because a leisure centre in this location would help to provide an ideal buffer between the residential element of the site and the employment element and thus would avoid any awkward juxtaposition of what could potentially be un-neighbourly uses.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the proposed development could bring wider spin offs to the strategic Stourport Road Employment Corridor, through providing job opportunities for the local communities as well as offering sport and recreation activities to help improve the health and social wellbeing of Oldington and Foley Park ward, in which this site is located. Furthermore, it is considered that a leisure offer in close proximity to employment designations could help to encourage further business interests in the corridor due to the fact that leisure facilities in close proximity to businesses could be an attractive offer for a workforce.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that the proposal would provide for an employment generating use to be developed on the Silverwoods site, providing job opportunities for the local area. The development of this leisure centre would also allow for other regeneration projects proposed for the existing leisure centre locations to be brought forward in accordance with the Council's adopted policies. Whilst it is disappointing to be 'losing' land identified for B use classes it is considered that, on balance, support should be given to this application due to the benefits its implementation could bring, as identified above.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Correction</u> – The table shown under paragraph 4.58, which lists the sites assessed as part of the sequential test refers to the Civic Centre (at site 21) as being in Council ownership. By way of clarification, whilst this was indeed the case at the time of the application submission, this is no longer the case, as of 28 March 2014.</p>
14/0126/FULL	141	<p><u>Officer Comment</u> - Revised plans received showing revisions to parking layout</p> <p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> – Strongly objects to the prospect of planning permission being granted. Unless the Planning Committee is minded to refuse the application, the Town Council will urge the Planning Committee to make a visit to the application site before a resolution to determine the application is passed.</p> <p>There are several other grounds which the Town Council believes justify a refusal of planning permission. Those grounds will include such matters as the inadequacy of Areley Common as a highway, and not only the volume of traffic using the highway and also the constraints on traffic flows created by the parking of vehicles. The parking of vehicles is seen as somewhat inevitable as many residents at Areley Common have no other parking provision for their vehicles.</p> <p>Apart from those highway constraints, Town Council members are aware that Areley Common is also a bus route, and the prospect of service vehicles manoeuvring into and out of the development site can only contribute to the unsatisfactory traffic conditions which prevail at Areley Common. The Town Council feels that anyone travelling Areley Common will be aware that for much of the time the highway is a single lane carriageway only.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The Planning Committee is asked to bear in mind that within about the past three months the County Council as Highway Authority has decided to place double yellow lines in the vicinity of the junction of Swiss Heights with Areley Common because of difficulties which have arisen from but a few motor vehicles being parked by the Town Council's allotment site. The circumstances which prevail at that junction are modest compared to those which prevail for a great deal of the time in the vicinity of the development site. Double yellow lines by the development site, however, would deprive some residents of their only parking facility. The prospect of incorporating an ATM machine within the development is almost certainly going to contribute to the already unacceptable level of congestion in that part of Areley Common.</p> <p>Another major concern to the Town Council is the air quality in this part of the town. Within the town centre there are areas where the level of air pollution is unacceptably high, and the prospect of the density of traffic at Areley Common becoming intensified could prejudice the standard of air quality.</p> <p>The different types of problems outlined above can also be considered as environmental matters which affect the quality of residents' lives – and in a prejudicial manner in terms of the development which is proposed.</p> <p><u>Highway Authority</u> – No objection subject to conditions</p> <p><u>Worcestershire Regulatory Services (Noise)</u> – No objection subject to condition restricting hours of operation for air conditioning units <i>[Officer Comment – Such a condition has already been recommended]</i></p> <p><u>Neighbours</u> – A total of 114 objection letters have been received (79 additional letters since publication of the report). All the letters raise the issues highlighted within the report with particular emphasis on highway safety</p> <p><u>Corrections</u> – At Paragraph 3.6, there is a typographical error and the final bullet point should read “Loss of public house as community facility”.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The penultimate sentence under Paragraph 4.3 has missing punctuation and is unclear. It should read:</p> <p>“Although Policy SAL.DPL11 seeks to retain community facilities, including public houses, the loss of the use cannot be controlled by the Local Planning Authority as it constitutes permitted development, as described at paragraph 4.1 of the report, and as such this policy cannot be invoked on this occasion”.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.11 should read “...enclosed by a 2.4m high close board fence...”</p> <p><u>Add additional conditions</u> -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11. Access closure – use of site – vehicular</li> <li>12. Access, turning and parking</li> <li>13. Cycle parking</li> <li>14. Parking for site operatives</li> <li>15. Site traffic management</li> </ol> <p><u>Add additional note</u> -</p> <p>Alteration of highway to provide new or amend vehicle Crossover</p> <p><b>Change Recommendation to APPROVAL</b></p>
<p><b>PART B</b></p> <p>14/0056/FULL</p>	<p>159</p>	<p><u>Corrections</u> –</p> <p>At Paragraph 3.12, the last line of the first bullet point should read “Lowe Lane ....”.</p> <p>Whilst, with regard to the second bullet point, an OFFICER COMMENT should be inserted which would read –</p> <p>Officer Comment – With regard to the absence of bungalows, this has since been rectified through the submission of amended plans. To clarify, the reference made to lack of consultation is understood to be directed towards Wyre Forest Community Housing as part of their pre-application considerations for the site, rather than the Council as part of the planning application process.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
14/0101/FULL	167	<p data-bbox="607 281 1300 348"><u>Rock Parish Council</u> - No objection and recommend approval</p> <p data-bbox="607 386 1386 453"><u>Highway Authority</u> – No objection subject to the addition of a condition relating to the provision of cycle parking</p> <p data-bbox="607 491 1170 590"><u>Add additional conditions</u> – 8. J7 (Obscure Glazing – South Elevation) 9. Provision of cycle parking</p>
14/0026/FULL	176	<p data-bbox="607 627 1370 762"><u>Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council</u> - Have expressed concern and disappointment about the need for a change of position after a relatively short space of time since the original agreement was completed.</p>