

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL**PLANNING COMMITTEE**
11TH FEBRUARY 2014**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
13/0395/FULL	14	<p><u>Neighbour</u> : Since the agenda was published an additional 22 letters of objection (including a petition with 16 signatories) from local residents have been received (taking the total to 40). Concerns not already covered in the report are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The revised scheme addresses the deficit in parking spaces the previous submission failed to do - an overall deficit of 49 spaces. The revised plan now includes an extension to the Dog Lane car park in front of the properties on Sabrina Drive; a piece of land that is currently open space. This is an important amenity area along the riverside that is enjoyed by both visitors and town's people alike. The loss of this open space simply compounds the problem - this is simply the wrong site for the new medical centre. - The proposal would result in a serious degradation to the river frontage and the permanent loss of riverside open space. This is to the detriment of the attractiveness of the town. - In the event of this poor scheme being approved there will be 2-years (at least) of disruption to town centre parking. This has the potential to take some of the bespoke independent retailers in the town centre over the brink. Bewdley will become a town of charity shops... Not much to attract visitors. - The sale of this land from public ownership to private ownership is fundamentally wrong and the consequences for the town are significant. - There is no provision for a pedestrian thoroughfare in the Load Street Car Park in this scheme. - I understand that the Council have decided to tarmac over the green amenity triangle in Gardners Meadow car park in order to create additional car parking spaces to improve the chances of the new Surgery obtaining a planning permission.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>- The Council should perhaps pursue the option tabled at the Town Council meeting to remove the parking restrictions from Sabrina Drive as a potential solution. The removal of these yellow lines from a public highway in proximity to Dog Lane and the proposed new medical centre provides a much more satisfactory solution significantly closer to the town and proposed surgery, and significantly more cost effective</p> <p>- Firstly, it has been reliably intimated that a significant sum of public money has been earmarked for the process of bringing the vacated site into use. This includes provision to demolish existing buildings, raising ground levels where appropriate, providing Tarmac, signage, pedestrian access, etc, etc. The proposed development, despite popular assumptions, and despite being grant-aided by NHS England, is essentially a business proposition, which under normal circumstances would be expected to fund amenity enhancements as a condition of its acceptability, even more so if those enhancements are a forced consequence of the development itself. In these circumstances, provision of these public funds might be deemed a subsidy, and therefore not a proper use. The remodelling of the existing site arises as an issue many times in the executive summary, with the clear implication that it is an integral part of the proposal. As such, it should be part of the committee's deliberations, with all relevant details, including the contingent cost to the District Council, clearly in the public domain.</p> <p>- Secondly, although it is an understandable policy of NHS England to allow for growth and expansion in new buildings, the exceptional constraints on parking in Bewdley must introduce a special and necessary qualification. The business plan for the building envisages between 4000 and 6000 patients registering with the practice in the next few years, patients who must come from outside the town, and must, therefore, come by car. It is not unlikely that the accommodation of traffic in the Town will become so difficult that the District Council will be forced into an expensive and unpopular emergency improvisation. The size of the building is a critical issue for the developers, but it is the planning committee's responsibility to fit it to the town and its infrastructure.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>- There are options [for parking] but all of these need to be approved and funding guaranteed before approval for the new Bewdley Medical Centre is given. I still feel that the profit of the doctors is being put before the livelihoods of the other businesses.</p> <p>- If the library site is available, this opens up an opportunity to explore a redevelopment of the Load Street car park – in line with the Town’s ambition, reinforced by adopted policy.</p> <p>One letter of support received. I fully understand that there could be a short term impact on the town while this is being built, but Bewdley needs a new modern medical centre especially due to the changes in the NHS where more & more services will be provided in the community. Currently they could not be done in Bewdley due to lack of facilities and as such I believe our very good, professional medical centre would be down graded. This would require Bewdley town folk having to travel outside and could effect business on the high street.</p> <p><u>Bewdley Civic Society</u> : Additional comments received –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We urge the Planning Committee to make it a condition that the initiatives proposed to counter the removal of car park spaces caused by the building and associated works are put in place before the new building begins. Otherwise the trade and economic wellbeing of the town will suffer greatly. 2. With regard to the overspill car park fronting Sabrina Drive, the Society believes that this area will need to be available for use all year round and as such the proposed system of just strengthening the grass surface will be insufficient and subsidence problems will result. It should also mean that the regulating gate and all the associated problems of control can be avoided. 3. We are concerned that the reconfiguration of Gardner’s Meadow Car Park will destroy a much valued amenity space. This includes a picnic area that is well used in the summer months. We ask please that proper public consultation is carried out with details of the proposals for re-siting the picnic area and the plaque celebrating the erection of the flood defences.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>4. Similarly we urge public consultation in regard to the layout of the Load Street car park. As this is within a Conservation area we would expect that the area will be prepared so that it is not just tarmac and white lines. Also we believe this is an opportunity to provide a much improved pedestrian walkway through this busy car park which also serves as a rat run for motor vehicles. We believe there needs to be a pedestrian thoroughfare all the way from Load Street through to Dog Lane Car Park with priority crossing of Dog Lane and improved access to the car park and the new medical centre and library. This thoroughfare needs to be attractive and have plenty of interest built-in and have a clear separation from the proposed car park that is not just plain brick walls and soft landscape screening. The route should widen to take in squares such as the seating area in front of St George's Hall entrance.</p> <p>5. We also urge the Council to carry out public consultation for the temporary parking proposals, particularly along Severn Side South which, we believe, need to be looked at very closely in view of a number of potential problems in permitting parking in this street.</p> <p>6. There appears to be no alternative provision for the existing recycling facility where the present site will be consumed by the new building. We ask that the Council provide the town with an alternative for this essential facility.</p> <p>7. There is a suggestion that the Dowles Road bus stops are converted to 2 parking spaces but it is important that the town retains a dedicated set down for the coaches that bring thousands of visitors to the town every year. We expect that the council retain this space for buses and coaches and that provision is made for several coach spaces at the Blackstone car park so that they have somewhere to wait while their guests enjoy the town and support local businesses</p> <p><u>WFDC Environmental Services Manager</u> - Concerns are raised about parking provision within the Town during the construction phase, and the need for alternative arrangements for coach parking and the recycling facilities.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Add Paragraph 4.31 –</u> “The District Council is aware that concerns have been raised relating to the procedure for informing residents of the application, with particular reference made to potential alterations to Gardners Meadow car park. In this regard, Officers would wish to reiterate the points made at 4.26 of the report regarding any alterations to Gardners Meadow Car Park. Officers can confirm that all local and statutory consultation requirements have been adhered to in full in relation to the application under consideration.”</p> <p><u>Corrections -</u> Paragraph 4.4; the last sentence should read “An area of car private car parking for the surgery is proposed to the front of the building, accommodating <u>33</u> spaces.”</p> <p>Paragraph 4.18 should read “In consideration of the above and being mindful of the strategic importance of this project Officers consider that the short-term loss of a maximum of 37 spaces is acceptable, especially when the long term gain for the town would be 12 new spaces. However Officers are aware that the applicants, as evidenced within the Additional Car Parking Option Appraisal, have identified other potential opportunities within the town to further supplement this level of parking. Officers do accept that the phasing of the project with respect to car parking loss and gain will be crucial to ensuring minimal disruption to overall car parking provision. Officers would therefore propose a condition to be attached to any consent which would require a full programme of works to be submitted prior to the commencement of development. Such a programme which should show works to Gardners Meadow, Dog Lane and Load Street car parks would be agreed prior to any works on the proposed medical centre site being carried out. The programme should also set out a timeframe for the implementation of the demolition of the existing medical centre and construction of the new car park following first occupation of the new medical centre. Officers consider this would offer the District Council and local community the assurance and certainty that only minimal disruption to car parking provision during the lifetime of the development would occur”.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		Paragraph 4.16 : It has been noted that the headings in the table are not clear and cannot be easily read in the agenda. A duplicate table is therefore detailed below -

	Public Spaces	Private Spaces (Medical Centre)
Existing Parking Provision		
	202 Dog Lane	26 Medical Centre
	35 Load Street	
	123 Gardner's Meadow	
Total	360	
During Construction		
	143 Dog Lane	26 Medical Centre
	- 99 (construction site)	
	+ 17 (minor reconfiguration)	
	+ 23 (proposed extension)	
	35 Load Street	
	145 Gardner's Meadow	
	+ 22 (reconfiguration/extension)	
Total	323	
Loss/Gain	- 37	
Post Construction		
	143 Dog Lane	33 New Medical Centre
	84 Load Street	
	+ 49 (proposed new car park)	
	145 Gardner's Meadow	
Total	349 (permanent) 372 (inc.extn)	
Overall Loss/Gain	- 11 (permanent) +12 (overspill)	+ 7

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Add Condition</u> – Removal of PD rights for fences/means of enclosure at proposed medical centre site.</p>
13/0465/FULL	43	<p><u>Neighbour</u> : one additional letter has been received raising the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be direct overlooking between my kitchen at Pudner Court and the proposed lounge room windows of the new apartment block. I feel that this is a blatant oversight in the report. • The last sentence of paragraph 4.4 states that there is parking for visitors, there is now none. The 3 visitor spaces shown on the plan have been removed. <p><u>Officer Comment</u> – It is considered that details of designated parking spaces for Pudner Court could be agreed via condition 7 as listed.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> – The final sentence of Paragraph 4.4 should read “An area of car parking for the apartment block is proposed opposite the site entrance”</p> <p><u>Add Conditions</u> – 14. Details of noise attenuation for bedrooms, living rooms and garden areas 15. Lighting plan 16. Details of fencing to be agreed (to take account of noise attenuation as required); and timetable of implementation to be agreed</p>
13/0620/FULL	61	<p><u>Neighbour</u> - Additional representation received objecting to the proposed development raising no new issues over and above those already summarised within the Officer report</p> <p><u>Letter from Applicant</u> : Officers are aware that the applicant has emailed Members of the Committee in order to address some of the points raised during the last Committee meeting. The points raised are as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Extension out of keeping with neighbourhood:</i> The extension was approved under 13/0482/FULL with no objections. The new application does not propose to change the size / shape of the current building / extension.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Inadequate parking:</i> The Wyre Forest policy for flats is one parking space per one-bedroom flat. We have allowed for three spaces which meets policy requirements and has been approved by highways. According to Google Earth images going back to 2004 there has always been two parking spaces at the front of the property (like many other properties in Middleton Road). There is sufficient room to have two spaces at the front and two at the rear if required. There is also little used communal parking for 10 cars within 20 metres. • <i>Family area / family homes:</i> Choice of neighbours is not a planning consideration. However, it is understood that the previous occupants, for over ten years, were a family. The immediate next-door neighbour is an elderly single lady (not a family). This is just the type of person that our proposed flats could appeal to as well as single people who may have lived on the estate and are in need of a starter home, for example. The applicant can see no reason to support the objectors' view that flat-dwellers are deemed to be inferior in some way. • <i>There are no flats in the area:</i> 28 Middleton Road is the last property at the end of the cul-de-sac on the left before the block of shops with flats above. According to rightmove.com flats have recently been sold in Puxton Drive, Aintree Close, Beaulieu Close, Mallory Drive and Brabham Close – all within a quarter of a mile of 28 Middleton Road and all on the Marlpool Estate. • <i>Noise nuisance:</i> The planning officer has recommended that the application is approved subject to condition F4 (Noise insulation of flats). Sound-proofing is also an integral part of Building Control and is strictly enforced. The proposed layouts demonstrate that kitchens and bathrooms will not be adjacent to the party wall, which in any case is subject to noise insulation testing. Details of the sound insulation scheme have been submitted to the planning officer. It is worth noting that a 4-bed family house with maybe 3 grown-up children would not be subject to noise insulation requirements.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Estate agents claim that the area is “crying out” for family homes and there is no requirement for flats:</i> Again this should not be a planning consideration but according to rightmove.com there are currently 36 family homes (2+ beds) for sale within half a mile of Middleton Road on the Marlpool Estate • <i>There is no similarity between this application and 22 Belbroughton Road, Blakedown (12/0343/FULL):</i> The applicant agrees that this application was very similar to the current application. Whilst the Belbroughton Road scheme was for replacement of a six bedroom house by a building split into six self-contained flats most of the objections were similar to those mentioned above. <p>In fact, it could be considered that application 12/0343/FULL had the potential to offer more harm as it was thought that 10-18 people could occupy the flats as opposed to 7 occupants for a 6 bed house. The need for carers and other visitors to have access to the property was also a factor.</p> <p>In the case of 12/0343/FULL the planning officer recommended approval, the planning committee refused the application and the application was approved on appeal. Costs were awarded against Wyre Forest District Council on the basis that the planning committee had acted unreasonably in refusing the application.</p> <p>Some points to highlight from the Appeal Inspector’s Decision are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) “I do not consider that the intensification of use would be so great as to have a significant impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings in terms of additional noise and disturbance”. b) “The effect on the overall character and appearance of the area would not be significant” c) “Many of the houses on the road have parking areas in their front gardens.” <p><u>Officer Comment</u> - The applicant has supplied details of the sound proofing standards appropriate to the proposed apartments as well as the credentials for those due to carry out the conversion works.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
13/0645/FULL	70	<p><u>Neighbour</u> : Since publication of the agenda an additional neighbour letters have been received. The total number of representations is 9. The following new matters were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The location is very poor for singles with children or the elderly due to the poor location with regard to shops and the steep Sion Hill. - The open space is not surplus to requirements, here is no proposal to replace it and but it would be possible to put together a proposal for an alternative use of the land. Interest has been expressed by relevant parties for the need of such things as a 'community orchard' and combining it with a 'forest school'. A benefit to the Local Community and the Education department. - The Leylandii hedge belongs to the Barnhouse. <p><u>Update Parks and Green Spaces Manager's comment</u> to read (Paragraph 3.3) - "No objection to the proposal. The applicants have agreed to fully fund the construction and maintenance of a BMX track at Springfield park in association with Friends of Springfield park, I consider this contribution mitigates for the loss of this area of open space"</p> <p><u>Update Paragraph 4.6</u> - Following publication of the Agenda officers have successfully negotiated monies towards the full costs of installing a BMX track as suggested by the Parks and Green Spaces Manager and a five-year maintenance agreement. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposal does offer full mitigation for the loss of the open space area in accordance with Policy SAL.UP4.</p> <p><u>Add to Paragraphs 4.21 and 4.22</u> - ... "in addition to the commuted sum towards open space provision at Broadwaters Park the following additional contribution has been secured; - Installation and maintenance (for a five year period) of a BMX track at Springfield Park".</p> <p><u>Corrections</u> – Paragraph 1.2 should read: "There is a wooded escarpment that lies to the western boundary of the site which leads to Springfield Park. A designated public footpath runs to the north of the application site and links Badland Avenue to Springfield Park to the west. An informal pathway leads from Badland Avenue to the north across the site and southwards towards Upton Road."</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Paragraph 4.2. sentence should read “The majority of the site is covered by a site specific policy (SAL.KSS1) contained in the Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan. The policy allocates the site for residential development and as such the principle of the proposed use is in general conformity with the Policy. It should be noted that the application site extends further than the site identified by Policy SAL.KSS1 as it includes an area of land formerly in the ownership of the owners of 17 Baskerville <u>Road</u>. The land does not appear as former garden land as it is separated from the residential curtilage by fencing, two buildings occupy the site and would be demolished to facilitate the erection of a terrace of four properties. Being outside of the residential curtilage and having permanent structures on the site, Officers are satisfied that this area of the site would <u>comprise</u> previously developed land and as such the principle of residential development is acceptable</p> <p>Paragraph 4.12 should read...” Confirmation from the applicant has been acquired stating that the Leylandii hedge to the northern boundary would be maintained, this cannot be secured by condition as the hedge is not within the ownership of the applicants. Given that the applicants have no intention of doing any works to the hedge Officers are satisfied that this would help to address the concerns of occupiers of The Bungalow and The Barn House”.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3 b) - Remove Condition 6 as the hedge is not believed to be within the ownership of WFCH or included within the application site.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
13/0656/FULL	89	<p><u>Neighbour</u> : A total of 48 neighbour letters have been received. In addition to the points noted at Paragraph 3.9 of the report, the following additional matters have been raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development would result in an adverse impact on privacy with people walking past houses in Clee Avenue to get to the KFC. - The development would impact on the wellbeing of residents - I was not notified of the change of use from offices to a food establishment - Another fast food establishment will increase the risk of obesity in the area - The plans are misleading as they do not mention a drive-through KFC - Traffic backing up will cause serious air pollution problems - The office block is open 8.30 – 5.30 during office hours the new proposed uses could be 24hour. - There is no need for additional retail in the area as it is already well served - House prices will be negatively impacted on - The revised plans do not represent a design which is acceptable <p><u>At Paragraph 3.4 add –</u> “(Air Quality) “The transport assessment indicates an increase in trips for both units as; 5 in the morning peak hour and 28 in the evening peak hour, this is stated as negligible in respect of the traffic generally in the area and falls below the levels that we would look at in regard to Air Quality. The Air Quality Assessments done in the area indicate that this is not a current area of concern in regard to Air Quality. No objection.”</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> - Additional information received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WRS officers have confirmed that opening and delivery times should be limited to 7am to 11pm daily. - No adverse concerns relating to odour from the KFC restaurant. - No consideration given to light spillage into residential areas. So with respect to this element of the application the information is also insufficient for WRS to be able to gauge the level of potential light intrusion.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>At Paragraph 4.9 add -</u> “The proposed KFC drive-through restaurant would have a gross external area of 280sq.m and as such there would be no requirement for a sequential test in this instance. However the ‘Planning and Retail Statement’ which accompanies this application details how the sequential test has been considered by the applicants who conclude that there are no suitable sites within locations which are sequentially more preferable. In light of the comments of NWEDR at Paragraph 3.6, Officers are satisfied that the requirements of the development plan are satisfied in this instance”.</p> <p><u>Add Paragraph 4.25 –</u> “Since publication of the agenda additional neighbour representations have been made and are summarised on this Addenda and Corrections sheet. Officers consider that the majority of matters are covered in the report however would comment that material planning considerations do not include the devaluation of property. The impact upon obesity, without information to demonstrate that it would be significant, is not considered to be sufficient to warrant refusal. In respect of the concerns relating to procedural matters and the publication of information relating to this application, Officers can confirm that all statutory and local requirements have been met”.</p> <p><u>Correction to Paragraph 4.20 –</u> Additional feedback from WRS has been received which indicates that a light spillage plan is required. A condition to this effect is therefore proposed.</p> <p><u>Corrections</u> : the following Conditions to read - 5. Hours of opening to be limited to 7am to 11pm daily 7. Full details of noise insulation to the approved extraction equipment to the KFC unit to be submitted and approved. 13. Notwithstanding details submitted, submission of lighting plan (including light spillage plan and any mitigation measures) to be submitted and approved</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Add Conditions</u> –</p> <p>14. Tree protection during construction</p> <p>15. Willow tree to frontage to be retained</p> <p>16. The net retail sales area of the proposed A1 retail unit shall not exceed 280sq.m</p> <p>17. No deliveries between 11pm and 7am on any day.</p> <p>18. Bollards to be installed to the front of the A1 retail until of a specification to be agreed</p>
<p>PART B</p> <p>13/0667/FULL</p>	<p>109</p>	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> – No objections</p> <p><u>Countryside and Conservation Officer</u> - It needs a wildlife assessment as there is some potential for bats. In terms of mitigation it may be necessary to look slightly off site. The riverside area would not be a bad spot</p> <p><u>Worcestershire County Council Archive & Archaeology Service</u> - From the information provided with the application, it does not appear that there will be any intrusive groundwork's, and that the existing structures will be demolished to ground level. The site is in an area of archaeological significance, and should this scheme involve any ground reduction or subsurface services then an archaeological watching brief will be required, however based on the current information it appears that the archaeological impact will be low. If this assumption on proposed groundwork's is incorrect, please contact me so I can provide more specific advice.</p> <p><u>Add Conditions</u> –</p> <p>6. Ecological survey to be undertaken prior to commencement of works and demolition with details of mitigation to be agreed if required</p> <p>7. Approval granted to reduce existing buildings to existing ground level only; no works below the existing ground level are consented. If these additional works are proposed, then an archaeological watching brief will be required</p>
<p>13/0676/FULL</p>	<p>122</p>	<p><u>Rock Parish Council</u> – Object to the proposal and recommend refusal. The Parish Council consider it inappropriate to establish a live/work unit in this location. The Parish also state that there are no clear drawings showing what business is going into the unit and note that no statement has been provided to show why a live work unit should be in this location.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
14/0016/FULL	129	<p data-bbox="607 279 1127 308"><u>Bewdley Town Council</u> – No objections</p> <p data-bbox="607 348 1382 722"><u>Highway Authority</u> – Recommend refusal. The application will introduce a new access onto a classified road which is a well used route into Bewdley and this is proposed to serve a single car parking space for a property which presently does not have off road parking. Any new accesses are assessed against the adopted policies within the local transport plan, specifically the Development Control (Transport) Policy and the Highways Design Guide. These documents indicate the obligations on applicants to protect the highway network and layout design standards.</p> <p data-bbox="607 762 1382 1136">The highway design guide requires that all new accesses places on routes of importance require the ability to enter and exit the site in a forward gear to prevent reversing on to or off the highway which would create a safety hazard and obstruct the free flow of traffic. This application does not have sufficient space within the curtilage of dwelling to make provision for maneuvering space and therefore if permission is granted a vehicle must reverse in or out of the driveway. This will result in additional conflict on the highway network which will be to the detriment of highway safety</p> <p data-bbox="607 1176 1382 1444">There is insufficient space within the curtilage of the site to allow for a vehicle to park without overhanging the pavement and this will have a detrimental effect on pedestrians who will experience reduced pavement width. The obstruction of the pavement will force pedestrians close to the carriageway if not needing on occasion to enter it which will result will have an adverse impact on pedestrian safety.</p> <p data-bbox="607 1484 1370 1642">This application will introduce new conflict on to the highway network which will have an adverse impact on pedestrians and motorists, it is therefore recommended that this application be refused in the interests of highway safety.</p>