

**From:** James Caird [james@caird.org.uk]  
**Sent:** 02 February 2009 10:05  
**To:** Rob Mills  
**Subject:** FW: Bishop's Castle  
 Rob

Here's the e-mail again.

As I said, it's agreement to Niall's proposed amendments to the conditions I need today. Everything else can wait.

Best wishes

James

James Caird

T: (01584) 876141  
 M: 07971 085090  
 E: [james@caird.org.uk](mailto:james@caird.org.uk)  
 W: [www.caird.org.uk](http://www.caird.org.uk)

---

**From:** James Caird [mailto:james@caird.org.uk]  
**Sent:** 30 January 2009 16:32  
**To:** 'jake.berriman@southshropshire.gov.uk'; 'Rob Mills'  
**Subject:** Bishop's Castle

Dear Jake and Rob

I attach for comment my Proof. Needless to say, it is the shortest I have ever done. I hope it represents the Council's provision adequately. I am sure Niall will want to cross-examine me so my line will be merely that the Council does not wish to disagree with the appellants excepting where proposals might be attempted to water down conditions.

It seems to me to be important, therefore, that we agree these in the Statement of Common Ground.

I have read Niall Blackie's draft of this and my comments are:

2. Second note: are we happy with this statement? I think it refers to landscaping outside the red line area.

5. Are we happy that this represents an accurate description of the highway layout? Should I encourage a fuller description of the geometry of the access to the Business Park from B4385 and the access to the site itself?

7. I have no knowledge of the accident record. Can we accept this?

11. It seems to me that 2 other Local Plan policies are relevant. ED1 – this refers to rural development which is also referred to on the subject of biomass in the Guide to PPS22. RE1 – this refers to renewable energy.

14 and 15. I am not in a position to judge the technical stuff. It appears to come from the application. Can we agree it?

16. Are you happy with the 11 receptor sites? I assume this means viewpoints?

Conditions:

8. It seems reasonable to agree this as some of the landscaping is to be off-site.
12. I agree with Niall that a Grampian condition is needed because at present there is no agreement with the owners of the route of the main.
13. The reworking is reasonable. The Inspector's guidance frowns on informative material in conditions.
16. There may be an issue here. 200 metres is not necessarily the optimum measuring distance as points of residential sensitivity are not uniformly at this distance. I can put a caveat in my proof on this and agree proportionate measurement if this is proposed.
18. The amendment clarifies the condition.
26. The Inspector is unlikely to agree to a condition running more than 5 years. I suggest we agree the amendments.
28. The amendment clarifies the intent of the condition.
29. Are you happy with the arrangements for the charity?
- 31(8), (9) and (23). Agree the omission of informative material.

Please let me know of anything else that occurs to you.

**I think the proof has to be submitted on Monday. If I send it to you could you do it? Alternatively can someone please let me have the submission details?**

Best wishes

James

James Caird  
Chartered Architect and Town Planner  
Glebe House  
Caynham  
Ludlow  
Shropshire  
SY8 3BN

T: (01584) 876141  
M: 07971 085090  
E: [james@caird.org.uk](mailto:james@caird.org.uk)  
W: [www.caird.org.uk](http://www.caird.org.uk)