

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE**15TH MARCH 2016****ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
15/0170/FULL	60	<p><u>Applicant - Western Power Distribution (WPD)</u> - Additional comments received in relation to the suggested Hoo Farm Industrial Estate sites:</p> <p>There is a 15m lattice tower at Geoff Hand Automotive Engineering, Arthur Drive (Orange Cell HER0150). There are currently sector antennas arrayed around the top of this tower. If the lattice tower at were made available to WPD it would only be able to install the three 600mm transmission dish antennas that would be required at or below 12m AGL. Two microwave dishes are required to provide the required links to Bishopswood Grid Substation and the Arqiva tower at Bewdley (for onward link to Stourport Grid Substation); a third microwave link is required back to Kidderminster Grid Substation, for which a minimum of a 15m tower would then need to be installed at the Tram Street site, to provide line-of-sight to this lattice tower. At 12m AGL clear line-of-sight for the microwave dishes over the adjacent woodland to the 'far-end' links at Bishopswood and Bewdley would be very marginal. WPD's designer has calculated these links would be grazing the tops of the trees and are far below the minimum clearance required to allow for the future growth of trees. He considers that within one year the links would be blocked by tree growth, which would prevent them from working.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>There is a 15m monopole at the rear of Chips Away, Edwin Avenue (Orange Cell HER0104). It would also be contrary to WPD's policy to use this type of structure and it is not a secure site. The 15m monopole is also of an unsuitable design <i>to install</i> the three additional 600mm WPD microwave dishes that would be required: two to provide the microwave links to Bishopswood Grid Substation and the Arqiva tower at Bewdley (for onward link to Stourport Grid Substation); the third for a microwave link back from the monopole to the Kidderminster Grid Substation, for which a minimum of a 15m tower would then need to be installed at Tram Street site to provide line-of-sight to this monopole. Even if it were possible to install 3 additional WPD microwave dishes on this monopole, which it is not for the reasons given, line-of-sight at the likely available height of ca 9m AGL, below the existing Orange PCS (now EE) microwave dishes on the monopole, could not provide line-of sight over the surrounding trees and buildings to Bishopswood or Bewdley.</p> <p>Both the suggested alternatives are totally constrained.</p> <p><i>(Officer Comment - In response to the comments made with regards to the possibility of locating the antennae on the Champney Flats a member of the residents association made contact with the Council to advise that the residents and freeholders would be open to considering the flats as a mounting structure. This was further put to WPD who comment as follows):</i></p> <p>That a member of the residents association now states that they will consider accommodating WPD's microwave dishes on their building does not change in any way the first reason why Champney Flats cannot be used. Line-of-sight cannot be provided back to Kidderminster Grid Substation from these flats.</p> <p>The designer has provided a terrain cross-section, to which needs to be added ca 10m to allow for 'clutter', buildings and trees on the land, which block clear line-of-sight. He calculates the required line-of-sight cannot be provided from Kidderminster Grid Substation to the top of Champney Flats, even with a 30m tower installed at the Grid Substation.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The option remains totally constrained.</p> <p><i>(Officer Comment - Whilst the above provides useful clarification, I agree that the problem of providing clear lines of sight would not be overcome by utilising the Champney Flats as a mounting structure).</i></p>
15/0329/FULL	88	<p><u>Correction</u> : Paragraph 4.10. The measurements quoted are incorrect. The paragraph should read: The proposed dwellings would be spread across three storeys and would have a height to the ridge of 10.15m. For comparison neighbouring properties at 20 to 24 Gardners Meadow measure approximately 8m to the ridge. The proposed dwellings would therefore stand 1.5m taller than the neighbouring property.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> – Revised floor plans have been received to meet the Environment Agency’s requirements. There is no longer the need for additional submission under recommended condition 12.</p>
15/0578/FULL	115	<p><u>Officer Comment</u> - Members may recall that additional representations were received on behalf of Stone Residents Group, in advance of the February Planning Committee, prior to the deferral of the application. Members are advised that further representations have been received by Officers in an email sent at 15:50 yesterday (Monday 14th March 2016) from a firm of solicitors acting for the Residents Group. A copy of the letter is attached for information.</p> <p>Members will note that the letter calls into question the basis for the Officer recommendation in terms of Green Belt policy and the exceptions listed under Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and in doing so takes the view that the application should be considered in terms of the replacement building exception, rather than as an extension or alteration. Furthermore, it is stated that they have received instruction to proceed to judicial review if the decision made on the application is, in their opinion, made unlawfully.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>As stated above, the author places the emphasis for their comments on the grounds that the development proposes a replacement building, whereas the Officer's report clearly considers the application in terms of an extension or alteration of a building, and, as a partial redevelopment of a previously developed site in the Green Belt, which are 2 of the listed exceptions found at Paragraph 89 of the NPPF. In considering whether development is appropriate in the Green Belt, there is no requirement to satisfy all of the 6 listed exceptions set out under Paragraph 89 of the NPPF, and it remains Officers' opinion that the development which forms the basis of the current application constitutes appropriate development in the Green Belt for the reasons set out in the Committee report.</p>