

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

20<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2018

**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<b>PART A</b>  17/0780/FULL	12	<p><u>Officer Comment</u> – As a result of colleagues in Housing Strategy team requesting that the affordable housing provision be secured by planning condition instead of a Section 106 Agreement, in order to maximise the Homes England funding, paragraph 4.26 is amended to read: <i>“An agreement under Section 106 of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is required to secure the financial contribution towards public open space and biodiversity”</i></p> <p><u>Add additional conditions</u> – 20. Removal of Permitted Development Rights – Residential 21. Affordable housing provision</p>
<b>PART B</b>  17/0792/REGS3	41	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> – No objection</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> : additional comment received – Concerns expressed over the process of providing the car park and car park charges</p> <p><u>Amend Recommendation</u> – <b>APPROVAL</b> subject to the following conditions ...</p>
18/0003/FULL	44	<p><u>Bewdley Town Council</u> – No objection and recommend approval. Bewdley Town Council felt that this extension was acceptable within the streetscape and the provision of off road parking would be a benefit to the street.</p> <p><u>Agent</u> : additional supporting information received – APPLICATION HISTORY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We understand that there have been no objections to the application and as such we are not permitted to speak at the meeting</li><li>• The original application was refused due to the<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- appearance; and</li><li>- impact on the adjacent property</li></ul></li></ul>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another application was submitted which substantially reduced the scale of the extension in line with planning policy and to reduce the impact on the adjacent property. (<i>Officer Comment – The amended application reduced the footprint of the extension by approximately 6 sq.m. It is not considered that this can be classed as a substantially reduced scheme</i>).</li> <li>• We were advised that this was due to be rejected on the basis that it spoilt the appearance of the terrace and also now due to highways objections. As such the application was withdrawn</li> <li>• A meeting was held with the planners to attempt to resolve the concerns</li> <li>• We were unable to provide an acceptable solution to provide a two storey side extension in line with the clients requirements and we were encouraged to utilise the permitted development rights of the property</li> <li>• We submitted a sketch showing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a single storey side extension which was the same width of the extension detailed in the application but which was the same depth of the property which would have an impact on the light to adjacent property</li> <li>- two storey rear extension which would impact on the light to both properties; and</li> <li>flat roof dormer to side to create a loft conversion</li> </ul> </li> <li>• We contested that these would have a more negative affect on neighbours as well as on the appearance of the terrace which appears to be the only reason for objection</li> <li>• The withdrawn application was therefore resubmitted along with details of a new vehicular access</li> </ul> <p>OBJECTION: APPEARANCE AND DESIGN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We feel that the scale of the proposed extension is not detrimental to the street scene of what is an ex-local authority house. The first floor has been set back and the ridge height reduced to less than the existing in line with planning policy. The revised plans have also been set in from the boundary which tapers back towards the extension to the rear.</li> <li>• On this basis we feel that the design of the extension is in line with others constructed throughout the district and therefore in line with the current planning policy.</li> </ul> <p>OBJECTION: IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This appears to refer to the first application and the notes go on to confirm that the revised design submitted is in accordance with planning policy</li> </ul>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>HIGHWAYS IMPACTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This again refers to the withdrawn application and the notes go on to confirm that the plans submitted are acceptable</li> </ul> <p>In support of the application we would add the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The property has been in family ownership since the mid 1950's</li> <li>• The applicant was born and raised in Bewdley and resides in the property with his wife and family</li> <li>• They have three children and another on the way</li> <li>• The PD extensions offered as a solution would not provide the additional sleeping accommodation the family need</li> <li>• The family would struggle to find or purchase a property in Bewdley large enough to accommodate their growing family and would be otherwise forced to leave the town and the amenities they benefit from</li> <li>• We understand that Bewdley Town Council have written in support of the development</li> </ul> <p><u>Correction</u> – The Applicant should read: <i>“Mr M Eaton”</i></p>