

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE**19TH JANUARY 2016****ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
15/0050/FULL	13	<u>Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council</u> - Confirm that the queries raised at points 1, 2, 5 and 6 of their initial comments have been addressed in the Committee report. The Parish Council do wish to emphasise the importance of ensuring points 3 and 4 are controlled and this could be achieved through a suitably worded condition. The Parish Council also reiterate the requirement for the proposal to accord with Policy CC10 of the Chaddesley Corbett Neighbourhood Plan.
15/0602/FULL	67	Add Note – SN12 (Neighbours' rights)
15/0624/OUTL	72	<u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> - At the Town Council Meeting held on 12 th January 2016 the Town Council reviewed its former decision whereby it recommended to the District Council approval of the application for planning permission. The result of the review was that the Town Council decided to rescind its former resolution and passed a further resolution that it now wished instead to recommend that the application for planning permission should be refused. The basis on which the further resolution was passed at the Meeting was that the Town Council now wished to support the objection lodged by St. Wulstan's Roman Catholic Church to the development of land forming part of Vale Road Car Park.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Additional Neighbour representation</u> - Three letters received from previous objectors stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have been forwarded your latest report on the subject Application and I have come to the conclusion that all of the objections have been brushed aside with total disregard for their validity. It has all the attributes of a document prepared by an organisation that cannot be seen to have made any miss-judgements. As has been pointed out, with photographic support, the car-park is a public amenity, which has specific, regular, peak utilisation by the adjacent Church. To remove this facility, without any immediate replacement, will severely damage the functioning of the Church. I am not a church-goer, but I did not expect to see a Conservative dominated Council so directly targeting a Christian community, especially as the addition of a further six building plots to the already undeveloped two hundred in the town, is insignificant. And, surely, not all necessary public amenities have to be 'economically viable'. That is one reason why Council Tax is paid. You talk, glibly, about 'sustainability', but there is not one word in your report that supports this, as there is no analysis of the impact upon the community. You state that the site contains ' a redundant toilet block'. To use your words of elsewhere in the report, this is 'factually incorrect', as it was the Wyre Forest District Council that, unilaterally, shut the block and removed the amenity from public use. . Some facilities must be designed for peak usage, for example, you would be very frustrated, if your telephone system was designed for average use only! I can only hope that the Planning Committee is more in tune with the real intentions of Government policy, where Councils should investigate allowing building on public land, but not at the expense of damage, or lasting inconvenience, to the community.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="580 264 1422 779">• I cannot find in your report any mention of where the lost parking spaces are to be provided in this area. The riverside car parks are not acceptable alternatives, as they are too far away for elderly or infirm people to walk to or from, or to carry bags from. They also flood. Shop car parks are of course not an alternative as they are short stay and are for shoppers only. The (at least) thrice weekly demand for the full capacity of the car park is again dismissed as not important or necessary, with no mention I can find of how this proven needed capacity is to be suitably relocated nearby, or indeed what effects the plan might also have on the local businesses or the church. All that is just seemingly pushed aside. <li data-bbox="580 819 1422 1659">• I would just like to once more express my dismay at the proposal to sell the majority of the car park. I know it belongs to the council but it has been in the public domain for nearly 70 years. It is true that for a lot of the time there are less than 25 cars parked but a lot of other times there is well in excess of this number. When a smaller car park is full I don't know where the extra cars will park. Also, although I have no connection with the Catholic Church; I can see it declining as people won't be able to park and in time it may close. I live in Mitton Gardens and have adequate off road parking and, from a personal point of view, a few houses would be preferable to a car park in front of my house. However, I don't believe that only six houses will be built as I would imagine this would be unprofitable. Any potential developer will apply to built considerable more houses/flats which will inevitable be approved. It is this inevitably that I find frustrating. You just know that regardless of what objections are raised by how many people, the council will push through its agenda. The proposed sale procedure is a repeat of when we were asked to comment on the introduction of car park charges. <p data-bbox="580 1700 1422 1839">A representation has been received from the objector's solicitor. This has been circulated to Members along with Officer's responding comments by e-mail. This document is attached.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Officer Comment</u> - Since the publication of the report additional survey data has been received from the objectors. This has been incorporated into the survey data already to hand. Members have been provided with the entire survey data on email. This document is also attached.</p> <p>The additional survey data has resulted in the need to update Paragraph 4.8 as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">During the course of the planning application (from 29th October) Officers have undertaken additional surveys at various times of the day, and have incorporated data received from objectors (some of which is verified and some is unverified). As such a count of vehicles using the car park was done on 65 occasions. This data shows on average 27 vehicles using the car park, taking up 47% of the available spaces. The two surveys identify peak usage showing 32 vehicles on 17th May and 72 vehicles on 1st November. The most recent data collected shows that in the main peaks take place on Sunday mornings or when church services are in operation over the Christmas holidays. Indeed the data shows that there is only 14 occasions reported during a week days and Saturdays when 26 spaces would be exceeded, whereas 7 out of 9 of Sunday mornings it is shown that 26 spaces would be insufficient. In summary latest survey data shows that of the 65 occasions when data was collected 43 of those occasions there were 26 cars or less using the car park.</p> <p><u>Corrections</u> - The last two sentences of Paragraph 4.7 should read:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">This is a matter for the decision maker to attribute weight as it sees fit, although Members are advised that the financial information is disclosed to demonstrate car park usage and that the positive or negative financial position is not a material consideration. Based on the foregoing it is considered that limited weight should be afforded to the financial aspects of this case in respect of usage.</p> <p>The Recommendation on the first page should read: APPROVAL.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<p>PART B</p> <p>15/0607/RESE</p>	<p>92</p>	<p><u>Officer Comment</u> – Members are advised that since the publication of the report the sale of the land has been completed and the site is no longer within the ownership of the District Council.</p>