

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2016

**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<b>PART A</b> 16/0277/FULL	13	<u>Add Condition</u> – 10. Use to be limited to a coffee shop as proposed (A1/A3) and for no other purpose
<b>PART B</b> 16/0040/EIA	20	<u>Officer Comments</u> (For information/clarification only) - The comments of Kidderminster Harriers Development Centre FC, Birmingham Metropolitan College and Worcestershire Football Association all state objections on the grounds that the proposal would result in the loss of playing pitch provision, however the comments of Sport England suggest that these bodies do not object to the scheme. This contradiction reflects ongoing negotiations between the college and football club/association and the fact that their comments were received ahead of the final comments of Sport England and before real progress on agreeing interim alternative pitch provision and long term enhancements was made. The latest advice from the applicant is that Severn Trent Water is on the verge of agreeing heads of terms with Birmingham Metropolitan College on this matter as is required by condition suggested by Sport England.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Highway Authority</u> : The following should be noted relative to Note B for information - The Highway Authority has confirmed that the note is an informative to reinforce existing legislation and encourage good practice. The purpose of a joint inspection is to ensure that only damage as a result of the scheme is rectified and is a way of agreeing boundaries upfront. The Highway Authority consider it a way of protecting the applicant rather than burdening them.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> : The final sentence of Paragraph 4.42 should read - It would however be the case that during construction harm to the setting of Harvington Hall would arise, however given that this would be for a temporary period only there would not, in my opinion, be a lasting detrimental impact on this asset.</p>
16/0347/FULL	73	<p><u>Bewdley Civic Society</u> : Revised plans - We have seen the revised plans for the above development and would like to comment as follows.</p> <p>The Society is very pleased that these revised plans now show part of this site to be retained as Open Space. It is something we have been suggesting for a long time and it's good to see it come to fruition.</p> <p>However, we have grave reservations as to how it is to be laid out. We remain very concerned as to who is designing this scheme (it appears from the plans to be a tarmacking company). There seems to be no feeling for its location in the Conservation Area with scant details, the inclusion of galvanised fencing and its construction to prevent public access from the new car park to the open space!</p> <p>It is very concerning that the Council's own Conservation Architect has not been involved in this design at all. His comments on the application show a frustration that we echo and support.</p> <p>The Society wish to maintain an objection to this scheme for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We object to the line of fencing preventing access to the retained Open Space. It seems to negate the whole purpose of retaining the open space.</li> </ol>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>2. We suggest that the pedestrian access to this lower car park should be located to come down through the open space to allow pedestrians safer/earlier access to the new lower car park rather than 'run the gauntlet' of the existing car park. Land levels would seem to indicate that this could be a cheaper solution than constructing new steps and provide much better access for the disabled.</p> <p>3. Why is there is still no information on what those red 'blobs' are that pervade the layout. If this were anybody else other than the Council, full details of all constructions would have been required up front. We are being denied the ability to comment on these aspects of the design.</p> <p>4. We remain very concerned as to what is the edifice that is being suggested underneath the magnificent Beech tree? Is its construction in the interests of the wellbeing of this tree given that it is apparently not in good health? Why are we being denied details?</p> <p><u>Officer Comments</u> - With regards to the proposed layout and indicative car park furniture Members are reminded of the comments at Paragraph 4.8 of the report which confirms that, notwithstanding the detail shown on the proposed plans, such matters are to be dealt with by condition and with the strict guidance of the Conservation Officer to ensure an appropriate palette of materials and furniture for the site. Matters relating to the fencing (objection 1 as detailed above) are covered in the comments of the Arboricultural Officer. Whilst the suggestion of the Civic Society relating to the pedestrian access to the lower car park has been considered, it would not be feasible to provide disabled friendly access to this area. In addition the proposal would involve the 'punching through' of a historic wall which would not be acceptable. As stated at Paragraph 4.14 of the report it is not uncommon for pedestrians and motorists to share circulation space in a car park setting. With regards to objection point 3 the 'red blobs' are indicative of landscaping, a matter to be agreed and controlled by condition. With regards to objection point 4 Members are reminded that <u>all</u> street furniture is to be controlled by condition under the strict guidance of both the Conservation Officer and Arborist and as such the indicative detail on the plans should not be taken as the final scheme. No furniture which would prejudice the health of the tree or the visual amenity of this location will be approved. This approach follows a thorough assessment of the tree by the Arboricultural Officer and the suggested conditions added accordingly.</p>