

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 23 August 2022		
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		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	21/03090/FUL	Agent
<p>We can confirm that notice has been served on the council as there was a query over landownership along the access/highway edge. In order to prevent any further delay to the determination of the application, we have served notice on the council. The legalities of land ownership however, fall outside the planning process and are a civil matter, therefore the determination of the application can proceed.</p> <p>Can officers please look at proposed condition 3 as the it refers to touring pitches and these have been removed from the proposal. Can you please emphasise to committee members that we have removed the touring pitches from the proposal following their comments at the last committee meeting. There will no longer be any cars with touring caravans waiting to turn into or out of the site once in operation.</p> <p>The road safety audit has confirmed that the site can operate without impacting upon the Harworth development. Please refer to the Highways Officer's comments within the committee report, they raise no objection to the proposal from a highway safety perspective. The road safety audit also confirms that the buildwas bank access point is not suitable for use – this is because of highway safety concerns crossing the crawler lane up the bank (details within the committee report) and must be discounted from any assessment and discussion please.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	21/03090/FUL	Local Member
<p>Presently a Supplementary planning document (SPD) is being drawn up by Telford and Wrekin to cover the World Heritage Site, 23% of the land sites within SC. This SPD will impact on this site and also the Harworth site. Local members have recently been made aware after member protocol was Bypassed from March until June. Presently this is being looked by the local plan group. It is expected that SC will contribute to the SPD and on that basis I ask you to defer this application so that due process and protocols can be followed. The site will be very visible and although covered by a conservation area Presently there is no doubt that the Leisure site will impact on a world heritage site. The extent of this impact is yet to be determined.</p> <p>I further understand that there is an ongoing issue with the ownership of the visibility splay on the Buildwas side of the access and egress. On that basis any decision needs to be conditional on adequate and safe access and egress under the control of the applicant.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	21/03090/FUL	Case officer
<p>Amendment to condition 3 to delete reference to touring caravans and refer to 106 static caravans and 48 lodges.</p>		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	21/03090/FUL	Case officer
Amendment to condition 5 to refer to caravans/lodges to avoid any potential confusion or challenge to the occupancy restriction.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	21/03090/FUL	Planning Policy and Strategy Manager
<p>Whilst Shropshire and Telford Councils are jointly working on and SPD for the Ironbridge Gorge WHS, this has neither been agreed in draft by either Council, or subject to any consultation. In this scenario, it is considered this should be given no weight in decision making.</p> <p>In any event, any future SPD (if agreed), would not be part of the development plan or able to introduce new policy. It is therefore considered the SPD would not materially change any current or future considerations relating to the former Power Station site.</p> <p>In addition, I consider there is no reason why a proposal would be deferred in order to wait for an SPD to gain weight</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	19/05560/OUT Harworth Ironbridge	Councillor Claire Wild
<p>Whilst the item relating to Telford and Wrekin delegating their authority to SC over decisions on the Power Station site is welcome yet again the planning department have bypassed the local member protocol which seems to be the norm where Buildwas is concerned. There are 2 of the 4 local members on the committee. I would ask committee to minute the breach of member protocol.</p> <p><u>Case officer note</u> <i>The report does not relate to a planning application and as such it was not subject to the normal automatic member notification procedure which occurs for planning applications through the Uniform back-office system. The committee officer has confirmed that appropriate Member notifications took place when the report was published. Officer discussions will take place to determine the best way to ensure prior Member notification on equivalent non-application reports in the future.</i></p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	22/02338/FUL	Public Comment: Daisy Trow
<p>Regarding the planning application for the above property, which I 100% support. Having read the 'Objectors' comments, three main things stand out (1) size of planned house development (2) brook water and (3) traffic.</p> <p>My view is (1) most 'incomers' to the village have bought cottages and have renovated and extended them, so why is this property any different? The only property this development really</p>		

affects is Carpenters Cottage next door, and I assume when all works have been completed everyone will wonder what all the fuss was about.

(2) The brook water, once the brook and pond have been dug out to its original course and has naturally filled with water there should be no difference to the flow of water through the water course, and the benefits to wildlife etc will be very beneficial.

(3) Traffic – planning has just been granted for a development at the other end of the village, where there was comment on traffic concerns. Once the construction work is completed I doubt there will be any noticeable change in traffic flow – many times I have travelled to the village and on very rare occasions meet any traffic.

My interest in this development and 100% support for it is because several generations of my family lived and worked in Clee St Margaret, and I spent most of my childhood growing up there, including regular visits to the Mill. I admire the person who has bought this property and wishes to preserve it for future generations – there are so few of these ‘intact’ mills around and should be preserved, after all its our/my heritage, I doubt many people have actually seen a fully working mill. As far as I can see the owner has bent over backwards and at a great cost to himself to do everything humanly possible to satisfy every interested body. In my opinion planning should be granted as soon as possible before further deterioration occurs.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	22/02339/LBC	Public Comment: Daisy Trow

Regarding the planning application for the above property, which I 100% support.

Having read the ‘Objectors’ comments, three main things stand out (1) size of planned house development (2) brook water and (3) traffic.

My view is (1) most ‘incomers’ to the village have bought cottages and have renovated and extended them, so why is this property any different? The only property this development really affects is Carpenters Cottage next door, and I assume when all works have been completed everyone will wonder what all the fuss was about.

(2) The brook water, once the brook and pond have been dug out to its original course and has naturally filled with water there should be no difference to the flow of water through the water course, and the benefits to wildlife etc will be very beneficial.

(3) Traffic – planning has just been granted for a development at the other end of the village, where there was comment on traffic concerns. Once the construction work is completed I doubt there will be any noticeable change in traffic flow – many times I have travelled to the village and on very rare occasions meet any traffic.

My interest in this development and 100% support for it is because several generations of my family lived and worked in Clee St Margaret, and I spent most of my childhood growing up there, including regular visits to the Mill. I admire the person who has bought this property and wishes to preserve it for future generations – there are so few of these ‘intact’ mills around and should be preserved, after all its our/my heritage, I doubt many people have actually seen a fully working mill. As far as I can see the owner has bent over backwards and at a great cost to himself to do everything humanly possible to satisfy every interested body. In my opinion planning should be granted as soon as possible before further deterioration occurs.

10	22/02338/FUL	Case officer
----	--------------	--------------

Amendment to proposed condition 5, to read:

“No insulation work shall be carried out or roof trusses or other structural components of the buildings, including internal mechanical and electrical services and / or internal and external fixtures cut, altered, removed or replaced until a full schedule and detailed method statement for such works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter, all

historic internal and / or external components agreed for retention shall be preserved for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To safeguard the fabric and character of the listed buildings”.

Amendment to condition 11 to read:

“No new external windows, doors, roof lights or any other external joinery shall be installed until details of glazing bars, mullions, sill mouldings and surface treatments/decorative finishes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the external appearance of the development is satisfactory”.

Amendment to condition 12 to read:

“Prior to installation or application, samples/precise details of all new external materials and finishes, (including that of the bat house) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory”.

Amendment to condition 16 to read:

“At no time shall the restored Corn Mill building be sold or let separately or otherwise severed from the main dwellinghouse, known as Mill House, to form a separate unit of accommodation or be used for commercial or business purposes.

Reason: To define the consent and in the interests of residential amenity”.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	22/02339/LBC	Officer

Amendment to condition 4 to read:

“No insulation work shall be carried out or roof trusses or other structural components of the building, including internal mechanical and electrical services and / or internal and external fixtures cut, altered, removed or replaced until a full schedule and detailed method statement for such works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter, all historic internal and / or external components agreed for retention shall be preserved for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To safeguard the fabric and character of the listed buildings”.

Amendment to condition 8 to read:

“No new external windows, doors, roof lights or any other external joinery shall be installed until details of glazing bars, mullions, sill mouldings and surface treatments/decorative finishes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the external appearance of the development is satisfactory”.

Amendment to condition 9 to read:

“Prior to installation or application, samples/precise details of all new external materials and finishes, (including that of the bat house) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory”.