



Date: Tuesday, 13 October 2020

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: THIS IS A VIRTUAL MEETING - PLEASE USE THE LINK ON THE AGENDA TO LISTEN TO THE MEETING

Contact: Emily Marshall, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257717
Email: emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE

SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 13th October 2020		
<p>NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee.</p> <p>Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting</p>		
Item No.	Application No	Originator
5	20/02744/FUL Chestnut Close	Councillor Nutting
<p>I wish to object to this application on the grounds that a two-storey extension on the boundary will have a seriously detrimental effect on the neighbouring property. Can this objection be reported to the committee please.</p>		
Item No.	Application No	Originator
6	20/02760/FUL Primrose Drive	Public representation
<p>Continued objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the digital representations submitted only serve to evidence the prominence of the proposed newbuild which would be overbearing and overshadow the open aspect of the street scene due to the proximity of the property to the pavement and road of Primrose Drive - all other properties on the Sutton Park development, including the most recently constructed Garden Cottage and Garage are set further back and those in the immediate vicinity are of a much lower elevation than the proposed newbuild - all have open aspect to the fore; newbuild is set only 2.6 metres from the footpath - overall footprint is smaller than all previous applications, but it continues to be invasive to privacy of adjacent properties; - query why application is recommended for approval when more than one of the key reasons for refusal by the Council on 3 occasions and by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal, are blatantly evident - Inspector's conclusions in relation to appeal remain unchanged - Officer report does not comment on applicant's failure to fully address the loss of privacy to adjacent properties due to overlooking - Officer report fails to acknowledge that the changes made do nothing to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area - conifer hedge can easily be returned to its previously controlled cultivated state, reducing height and impact caused by overhanging the footpath; would be far less invasive and intrusive action than building a new house - significant negative impact for the benefit of one. 		

This page is intentionally left blank