

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th OCTOBER 2018

ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<p>PART A</p> <p>18/0517/FULL and 18/0519/LIST</p>	<p>16</p>	<p><u>Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council</u> : additional comments –</p> <p>As noted in the Case Officer’s report to WFDC Planning Committee, the Parish Council has no objections in principle to the proposed changes to accommodation, but must object most strenuously to the proposed arrangements for parking, including the proposed number of spaces. In particular, we struggle to understand the basis for the comments from Highways about “no loss of car parking spaces.”</p> <p>County Council Highways Officers should be only too aware of the efforts that the Parish Council has made to implement a basket of measures aimed at minimising congestion without adversely affecting the availability of on-street parking. In addition to the carefully considered use of measures such as double yellow lines, the Parish Council has engaged with all residents and businesses possessing off-street parking, to reduce wherever possible the need for residents, customers and employees to park on the Village street.</p> <p>The Parish Council acknowledges the statements from the agent stating that “on-street parking for customers in Chaddesley is quite common and there are other premises within the vicinity that rely on on-street parking for their customers”. The limited amount of on-street parking available to some businesses has been a major contributor to congestion, and underlines why it would be a retrograde step to add to the problem.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The Parish Council has spent over £6,000 pounds on consultancy advice and contributions towards the cost of Highways works aimed at minimising congestion. In addition, the Parish Council has been at pains to maintain good relations with Licensees in the Village, to gain their forbearance of a level of parking by non-customers. This is a delicate balancing act, and abuse of the arrangements by customers of other businesses could jeopardise these understandings, as well as having a negative effect on nearby residents. What little on-street parking there is in the Village is required by residents and businesses that have no off-street parking. As the proportion of elderly residents rises, parking for health and care professionals is also adding to the pressures for parking space.</p> <p>From previous Planning Applications, it is clear that in 2006 there were spaces for 11 cars on the salon car park. The 2011 application shows only 7 spaces. The current application shows only 4 spaces, potentially displacing, at any one time, up to 3 vehicles onto the street. This may not sound significant, but any reduction in off-road parking runs the risk of negating the reductions in congestion achieved over recent years.</p> <p>The Parish Council urges the Planning Committee to make it a condition of any development on this site that there should be no further reduction in off-road parking from the 7 spaces shown in 2011.</p> <p><u>Neighbours</u> : 1 additional response received – I note following the initial plan for four spaces the plans were adjusted to five spaces following comments from Highways and at this point it was suggested all cars would be able to enter and leave the parking area in forward gear. We are now back to 4 spaces and it is recognised the turning aisle will take place in the lane which Highways do not object to. I remain concerned at the impact of this for my property, myself and all users of the lane.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Corrections</u> : the first bullet point in Paragraph 3.4 should read -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In response to the above application we have no problems with the provision of the living accommodation but we have serious concerns in with the parking proposals. At the moment this very busy business has a customers' car park where at least 4 vehicles can drive in, turn and drive out again. In these plans it only allows a maximum of 4 car spaces for the residents and customers who will have to drive in and reverse out. <p>Paragraph 4.4 should read -</p> <p>The current application shows a two storey rear extension, longer but narrower than both the 2011 and 2015 approvals after removal of the flat roof garages that currently exist on the site. An ordnance survey map from 1926 shows that a cottage occupied the site of the proposed rear extension and the footprint of the two would be the same. The cottage formed the boundary of the site whereas the proposed extension is set within the site and back from the boundary. The extension would be constructed in materials to match the existing, however all materials are to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.</p>
<p>PART B</p> <p>18/0245/FULL and 18/0246/LIST</p>	<p>29</p>	<p><u>Officer Comment</u> (in relation to Paragraph 4.15) - Members are advised that the Highway Authority has taken into account the nature of the highway leading to the property include the risk of flooding.</p> <p>(in relation to Paragraph 4.18) - Members are advised that the provision of a bar would require approval through the Licensing Authority. It is appreciated that a bar may be ancillary, and therefore an additional condition is proposed to require formal submission of a planning application should the applicants wish to provide public drinking facilities at a later date.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Add Additional Condition</u> –</p> <p>6. Provision of a drinking facilities for non-residents is not permitted without formal permission.</p>
18/0306/FULL	37	<p><u>Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council</u> : additional comments –</p> <p>These comments have been prepared following sight of the Case Officer’s report to WFDC Planning Committee, and use the report’s page and paragraph numbers to assist in cross-referencing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On pages 40, 41 and 42, the Conservation Officer and Historic England mention the potential for future nuisance to the Grade 1 listed Church and its churchyard setting. In all cases, the comments conclude that this is “unlikely to have a greater impact than its use as a school and community hall.” This conclusion appears not to take account of the 24/7 occupancy of the building if converted to residential use, whereas continued use as a community hall could be limited to prescribed hours, types of use and levels of sound and light emanating from it. • Paragraph 4.6 (page 44) refers to the Parish’s Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Site Allocation Policy CCSA2, which states that “<i>The Old Grammar School building will be retained for a continued educational or related D1 use, including a library, internet access, advice centre and/or meeting rooms.</i>” The Case Officer’s report erroneously states that this policy has its derivation from Action 9 of Appendix 1 to the Plan, which sets out an aspiration of the Parish Council to (inter alia) “... seek to: 1. Secure the use of the old grammar school by long term lease, in order to provide a range of services to benefit the community.” Paragraph 5 of Section 4 (Vision and Objectives) of the NP refers to the Actions, and states that “These are not part of the statutory neighbourhood plan but are an important tool in the implementation of the plan.” It is therefore incorrect to describe any policy in the statutory Neighbourhood Plan as deriving from or relying upon anything set out in the ‘Actions’ appendix.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The derivation of Policy CCSA2 is from the results of the Chaddesley Corbett Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Survey (April 2013), in which 98% of residents responding to the survey supported the future use of the Old Grammar School as a Community facility. As set out in previous comments on the application, policy CCSA2 was developed in collaboration with Trustees of the Educational Foundation, who were then clearly in favour of retaining it as a centre serving the community. • The Case Officer's report does not mention that the Old Grammar School is registered as an asset of community value under the Community Right to Bid regulations, emphasising the importance that the Parish council places on the building's potential to be a hub for services and activities that support the local community, and the wish to extend as much protection to it as possible. If converted for residential use, this facility would be lost forever. • The Parish Council has taken steps to assist in preserving the building for the community. The Council has paid for a structural survey of the building, the report of which was passed on to the applicant (The Educational Foundation). The Parish Council is confident that grant funds can be secured to renovate and equip the building as a base for community-orientated services and activities. Although the applicant has not explored this possibility, the Parish Council remains happy to work with the Educational Foundation to this end. • We understand that, at an earlier stage in processing this application, WFDC Planning may have suggested to the Educational Foundation (the applicant) that they should discuss the application with the Parish Council. The Educational Foundation has made no such approach to the Parish Council. • Paragraphs 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 of the Case Officer's report refer to correspondence from the Trustees of the Village Hall and the Primary School. The Parish Council has not seen this material. For information, some Village Hall trustees also sit on the Educational Foundation (the applicant), and there are obvious links between the Foundation and the school. The Parish Council recognises that the Village Hall and School offer important community facilities, but neither are within the Village itself.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 4.10 mentions that the building has been vacant for a number of years; this stems entirely from the decisions of the applicant. The paragraph states that “despite best efforts there has been no interest from the community to provide a suitable use.” The Parish Council questions whether one meeting, one advert and the simple passage of time should be accepted as constituting ‘best efforts’. • The level of community interest should be set in context. At its one public meeting, the Foundation indicated an annual rent of approximately £8,000 to £10,000 per annum, based on estimates of the costs of renovation. This is (for example) equivalent to approximately one third of the Parish Council’s precept. Collaboration with the Parish Council to seek grants for the building’s renovation could deliver a more achievable economic equation. • Since the Foundation held its public meeting to assess community interest, new initiatives have take off, such as the Dementia Friendly Community initiative. This is receiving strong community and financial support, and is currently exploring charitable status in order to widen its reach and access additional funding. The Parish Council understands that, based on recent experience, the organisers feel that by harnessing the power and commitment of the local community they could develop a hub to provide a range of services and support across the generations. <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>The Old Grammar School is an important heritage and community asset with the potential to act as a valuable hub, continuing to provide services that support the local population. These possibilities are dynamic and continually developing. For example, when the Educational Foundation held its public meeting in May 2017, the Dementia Friendly Community Initiative did not exist. Most recently, we have seen the move in the NHS to encourage GPs to develop ‘social prescribing’, encouraging patients to take up activities or join groups as a better response to issues relating to loneliness and isolation than medication. The national strategy aims to bring together health services, businesses, councils, charities and community groups to help people build connections to lead happier and healthier lives. This will need action and facilities in local communities.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The applicant, the Educational Foundation, is a registered charity; a not-for-profit organisation. It is not a commercial developer, nor is it a registered social landlord. The Parish Council urges the Planning Committee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognise the level of resident support for retaining this building for community services • consider the weaknesses in the Officer’s report, including understating the potential for nuisance to the Grade 1 listed Church, erroneously citing the basis for the Neighbourhood Plan’s site allocation policy CCSA2, and overly crediting the efforts made by the applicant to find alternative community uses for the Old Grammar School. • reject this application and urge the applicant to work collaboratively with the Parish Council to bring the building back into productive community use. <p>FINALLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the Planning Committee decide to allow this application, we urge that this be on condition that the rent is set according to criteria used by Wyre Forest Community Housing, to ensure that the redevelopment of this final element of the former school site delivers at least one unit of affordable housing. <p><u>Officer Comment</u> (in relation to Paragraph 3.3) - The comments of the Conservation Officer in respect of visual nuisance of domestic paraphernalia is noted, however the churchyard is outside the application boundary and any such concerns are private matters between the Church and any future owners.</p> <p>(in relation to Paragraph 4.20) – Members’ attention is drawn to paragraph 14 of the NPPF (2018) where it is stated that in situations of a ‘tilted balance’, where conflict with a neighbourhood plan exists “...it is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits...” Members are advised that Officers are fully aware of this paragraph, which does not give a veto to development but gives the control to Local Planning Authorities. Officers have rightly attributed great weight to the conflict of the Neighbourhood Plan and have balanced ‘material considerations’ in the report. The conclusion is that planning balance is clearly in favour of the development. To provide clarity, it is Officers’ view that the weight would be in favour of the development even if a normal planning balance was taken.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Corrections</u> : Paragraph 3.4 should read – 4 objections received raising the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan • Ownership concerns • Known requirements for community space – need for community hub. • Parking arrangement would cause conflict with other properties. • Requirement for obscure glazing for windows facing properties in St. Cassians Way. <p>Paragraph 4.13 should read -</p> <p>On this basis the proposal will conform to Policy SAL.UP6 of the Adopted Wyre Forest Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan and paragraphs 192 and 196 of the NPPF (2018). This positive contribution, particularly in providing a viable use, along with the ‘special regard’ weighs heavily in favour of the application.</p>
18/0363/FULL	48	<p><u>Correction</u> : Paragraph 3.1 should read -</p> <p><u>Broome Parish Council</u> – Objection. The Parish Council is not able to support the planning application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site lies in the Green Belt and is presently the site of a single dwelling. • In order for residential development to be considered appropriate one or more of the following policies (WFDC – Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan) must apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policy SAL.DPL1 – Sites specifically identified for residential development. This site is not identified for development and does not apply. Development would be inappropriate. ○ Policy SAL.DPL2 – The proposed development is not in accordance with this policy dealing with Rural Housing and is in conflict with Green Belt policies. Development would be inappropriate ○ There are exceptions to Policy SAL.DPL.2 such as Exception sites, Rural Workers Dwellings or Replacement Dwellings in the Open Countryside, however these provisions do not apply to this site. Development would be inappropriate.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are policy provisions allowing “limited infilling within villages” but it is clear this site is outside the village boundary. See paragraphs 4.19 and 4.20. The closest settlement where there is a relevant settlement boundary is Blakedown and this site is not within the village boundary. Development would be inappropriate. ○ There are policy provisions that relate to accommodation for dependants (Policy SAL.DPL6) but again these do not apply in this case. This policy states “Accommodation should be provided by way of extension which is physically incorporated into the existing dwelling with a shared entrance and strong links at both ground and first floor levels”. It goes onto say “the dwelling and annex should share vehicular and pedestrian access and the extension should usually only incorporate one bedroom”. Development would be inappropriate. <p>The Parish Council cannot see any policy provisions that would allow the Parish Council to support the planning application.</p> <p>The Parish Council is concerned that granting consent would set a harmful precedent.</p>
18/0423/FULL	53	<p><u>Bewdley Town Council</u> – Recommend approval</p> <p><u>Correction</u> : Paragraph 4.1 should read -</p> <p>The application site relates to a residential garden which belonged to the original bungalow known as The Little Ranch which stood on the site. Approval was given in both 2013 and 2015 for the demolition of this bungalow and the erection of two detached bungalows in its place. The current application proposes the erection of a further detached bungalow on the remainder of the garden land which is located within a residential area of Bewdley. Policy SAL.DPL1 of the Adopted Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan advises that new residential development is normally allowed subject to the site comprising previously developed land. As the application site comprises garden land it is not a previously developed site, and therefore contrary to Policy SAL.DPL1.</p>
18/0557/FULL	68	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> – No objection and recommend approval</p>