

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th JULY 2017

ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
17/0045/OUTL	14	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> - Confirmed that they are in agreement with the Officer report and the recommendation to Refuse, for the reasons listed in the report.</p> <p><u>Spatial Planning Manager</u> – Recommend refusal as the application in principle is contrary to adopted policy.</p> <p>The majority of the site lies outside of Wyre Forest District within Malvern Hills. The western section within Wyre Forest District is unallocated on the Policies Map (July 2013) Land immediately to the west and north of the site within Areley Kings, is zoned residential. The application site is unallocated in the Adopted Local Plan and there are no proposals for development in this location. The district boundary is tightly drawn at this location along the edge of the built-up area apart from a small section of the proposed site to the east of Areley Common. Development at this location would fail to accord with the relevant housing policies as outlined in the Adopted Core Strategy (DS01 Development Locations) and the Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan (SAL.DPL1) which seek to guide development to appropriate locations. This development would fall outside of the settlement boundary and would be in open countryside.</p> <p>Policy DS01 states that 'new development will be concentrated on brownfield sites within the urban areas of Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn. The policy sets out a sequential approach to the allocation and subsequent phased release of sites.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The District Council can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply so does not require further sites. A Local Plan Review is underway and we are currently consulting on the Preferred Options. This site does not form part of that Preferred Options.</p> <p><u>Countryside Conservation Officer</u> : additional comments - I have had the opportunity to review the Updated Ecological Assessment June 2017. This report has significantly increased the ecological understanding of the site but there are still some areas that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Firstly, as identified previously, we have no information of who carried out the various surveys. Their qualifications , professional memberships and experience that would qualify them to undertake the works. Without this information we cannot make a determination if the report is fit for purpose.</p> <p>Previously concern was raised regarding flora/habitats, amphibians reptiles, hedge, bats woodland and grassland habitats.</p> <p>Habitat - there are some losses and gains being suggested. We need to quantify this and the applicant needs to clearly demonstrate what's being lost on a plan and what gains are being offered on a plan. Without this we can not adequately determine the application will demonstrate net gain and what is being offered can be delivered with the proposed development. I would suggest that a clear and detailed biodiversity mitigation plan should be submitted in support of the application.</p> <p>The floral list - includes a mixture of species but there are some wet grassland swamp species being identified in both the semi improved grassland and woodland. The existents of these species needs to be identified and the significant of these communities need discussion.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Great crested newts have been found - There will be some loss of terrestrial habitat which is a concern but a suite of mitigation is being offered that has the potential to both mitigate for any loss and potential to be of great benefit to the existing newt population. A more detailed mitigation plan is needed showing how exactly this newt population will conserved and enhanced is needed (including time scales) . I particularly liked the opening up of the pool and would greatly welcome ecologically connected additional pool(s) be provided as part of the general landscaping, given the isolated nature of this population. There is some discussion on using the sites suds scheme to assist with the newt population . This is an interesting approach but some further work is need to demonstrate the viability of this . Water quality and vegetation structure would need to be right. We need more information.</p> <p>Reptiles - are also present and habit associated with these animals is being lost but other gains are being offered, this need spatially demonstrating and a more detailed methodology of how harm to the reptile and amphibian population during the development operation needs preparing.</p> <p>Losses and gain in hedgerow - need to be quantified and the potential impact of this on other species needs discussing.</p> <p>Bat forage - has been investigated and lines of forage have been identified. We need to see these on a plan and the effects the proposed development is likely to have on these discussed. Consideration of how there feature are to be lit or not also need discussion at this stage to demonstrate the proposed development can be delivered with out impacting on the forage of these protected species.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> : Paragraph 4.6 – Commentary is made that a duplicate application is under consideration by Malvern Hills District Council (MHDC), which was the case when the report was drafted. Members are advised that this duplicate application has since been Refused by MHDC on 5 July 2017, under MHDC’s scheme of delegation, for essentially the same reasons suggested at the end of the Officer report.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
17/0256/FULL	51	<p><u>Historic England</u> – No objection. The proposed development of the northern walkway is within the setting of the scheduled monument known as Rock Farm moated site, deserted medieval village and ridge and furrow, 100m SE of St Peter and St Paul's Church (National Heritage List for England (NHLE) UID 1008658) and the Grade I listed building of Church of Saint Peter and Saint Paul (NHLE UID 1100696). The rural setting of the church and scheduled monument contribute to the appreciation of these nationally designated monuments and development adjacent can result in harm to their significance.</p> <p>The proposed development is located adjacent to the existing track to Rock Farm. The boundary adjacent to the track is a post and rail/wire fence and therefore the construction of a 2m wide aggregate track would have the appearance of increasing the width of the existing hard surface of the track to Rock Farm. This causes a small degree of harm to the contribution the rural setting makes to the significance of the scheduled monument.</p> <p>We advise that, in line with NPPF 129, the planting of a native species hedge between the proposed track and the current boundary will assist with reducing this impact by visually separating the existing track from the proposed track. Although we do not object to the proposed scheme, we strongly recommend that the addition of a hedge is included in the scheme.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> - Condition 1 should read “use as horse walk only, except for maintenance and emergency purposes” .</p> <p><u>Add Condition</u> – Hedge planting to boundary of northern track.</p>
<p>PART B</p> <p>17/0334/FULL</p>	71	<p><u>Bewdley Town Council</u> - No objection to the proposal and recommend approval subject to the satisfactory resolution of neighbour's concern regarding access and maintenance of side wall. (<i>Officer Comment - Matters of access and maintenance are private matters which will be agreed between the two parties</i>).</p>