

**Committee and Date**

Central Planning Committee

17th July 2013**Item****2**

Public

**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 20th June 2013
2.00 p.m. – 5.50 p.m. in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury****Responsible Officer** Ken James
Email: ken.james@shropshire.gov.uk

Telephone: 01743 252899

PRESENT**Councillors:**

V. Bushell (Chairman)

T. Clarke (Vice-Chairman)

A. Bannerman, D. Carroll, M. Kenny, J. Mackenzie, P. Moseley, P. Nutting,
K. Pardy and D. Roberts.**20. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor T. Bebb.

21. MINUTES**RESOLVED:**That the Minutes of the meetings of the Central Planning Committee held on 23rd May 2013 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.**22. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

23. DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

With reference to planning application 13/01313/FUL, the Chairman, on behalf of all Members of the Committee, stated that the land was in the ownership of Shropshire Council. All Members remained in the room during consideration of this item.

With reference to Shrewsbury Town Council's comments on planning applications 13/00156/FUL, 13/01081/FUL and 13/00841/OUT, Councillor D. Carroll stated that he had been a member of the Planning Committee of Shrewsbury Town Council at the time the proposals were discussed. He indicated that his views on the proposals when considered by the Town Council had been based on the information presented at that time and he would now be considering the proposals afresh based on the information as it stood at this time.

With reference to Shrewsbury Town Council's comments on planning applications 13/01585/COU, 13/00156/FUL, 13/01313/FUL, 13/01081/FUL and 13/00841/OUT, Councillor P. Nutting stated that he was a member of the Planning Committee of Shrewsbury Town Council. He indicated that his views on the proposals when considered by the Town Council had been based on the information presented at that time and he would now be considering the proposals afresh based on the information as it stood at this time.

With reference to Shrewsbury Town Council's comments on planning applications 13/01585/COU, 13/00156/FUL, 13/01313/FUL, 13/01081/FUL and 13/00841/OUT, Councillor A. Bannerman stated that he was a member of the Planning Committee of Shrewsbury Town Council. He indicated that his views on the proposals when considered by the Town Council had been based on the information presented at that time and he would now be considering the proposals afresh based on the information as it stood at this time.

With reference to planning application 13/01585/COU, Councillor M. Kenny stated that the applicant was known to him and he had no pecuniary interest or bias in the consideration of the application.

With reference to planning application 13/01081/FUL, Councillor D. Roberts stated that the owner of the site was known to him and he had no pecuniary interest or bias in the consideration of the application.

With reference to planning application 13/01585/COU, Councillor T. Clarke indicated that he had been contacted a number of times on the proposal by members of the public but had not predetermined the matter and therefore had no bias in the consideration of the application.

24. CASTLE COTTAGE, PULVERBATCH - 13/01428/TPO

The Trees and Woodland Amenity Protection Officer presented his report on a request to fell an Araucaria Aranucana (Monkey Puzzle tree), protected by Shrewsbury & Atcham Borough Council (Castle Pulverbatch) Tree Preservation Order 1980, at Castle Cottage, Pulverbatch.

The Area Planning Manager drew Members' attention to the updated officer response included in the schedule of late representations and further late representations from the applicant that had been circulated at the meeting. He then confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the tree on the property and the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the area.

Mr. W. Higgins, representing Church Pulverbatch Parish Council, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The parish council supported the application.
- The tree was too close to the house and there was a clear danger that the roots of the tree could damage the house or the highway.
- A Beech tree had been removed from the garden recently.
- The tree was not a native species and had no arboricultural merit or amenity value.

Councillor T. Barker spoke on this item, during which the following points were raised:

- The tree was part grown and would become obtrusive.
- There were no objections to its removal from neighbours.
- The applicant was undertaking to plant a fruit tree orchard in the garden which would outweigh the loss of the tree.
- The impact of the tree on the property and the road would continue to increase.

Mrs. C. Worsdell, the Applicant, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Experts had been engaged to assess the risk the tree posed to the property following concerns raised after soil testing.
- A structural engineer had detected signs of movement in the property and an independent arboricultural report was sought and as the tree was found to be growing at a relatively fast rate removal of the tree had been recommended.
- The advice received from experts could not be ignored.
- The tree was threatening the security of the family home and the property could not now be insured against damage from the tree.
- A fruit tree orchard would be planted in the garden to compensate for the loss of the tree.

The Trees and Woodland Amenity Protection Officer emphasised that all professional guidance cautioned against the removal of a protected tree. He indicated that he would support the removal of the tree if evidence could be supplied by the applicant that it was the tree that was causing structural damage to the property, but he was unable to support the request on the information provided.

In response to points and queries raised by Members, the Trees and Woodland Amenity Protection Officer indicated that the tree was potentially close enough to the property to cause damage and considered that the tree's activity should be monitored for a six month period to enable firm evidence to be established on whether the structural damage to the property was being caused by the tree

RESOLVED:

That the request be refused.

25. SHREWSBURY REGISTER OFFICE, COLUMN LODGE, PRESTON STREET, SHREWSBURY - 13/01585/COU

The Principal Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the late representation that had been received on this application included in the schedule of late representations. In introducing the application the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the building is now under the ownership of the Shropshire Bangladeshi Welfare Society and the application sought permission to operate the premises between 4am – 11pm during the summer months and between 7am – 7pm during the winter months. For the majority of the time there would be a maximum of 5 people using the building who would only require two of the four on-site car parking spaces. On a Friday between 12:30pm and 2:30pm there would be a maximum of 50 visitors at the premises. Additional car parking provision had been sought and a licence for the use of 10 car parking spaces at the Shropshire Council overspill car park on London Road was to be granted by the Council to meet the additional requirement. There would be two volunteers outside the premises managing traffic and pedestrian flows in times of operation.

The Principal Planning Officer indicated that the traffic levels associated with the proposed use of the building were not expected to be any more significant than those that were associated with the building's former use as a Registry Office, which conducted 260 marriages a year in addition to the registration of births, deaths and receipt of notices for marriage and civil partnership 5 days per week. As such, it was not expected that the numbers of visitors would be as high as the numbers attending the building when the venue was used as a Registry Office, and this was a material planning consideration in the determination of the application.

Mrs. S. Challis spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- She had lived in London Road for 25 years and the nature of the community was important to her, particularly the traffic.
- The parking provision for the proposed use of the building would meet the applicant's needs and the applicant had asked their community to be quiet when attending and leaving the premises to respect the local community.
- She was pleased to see that the premises would have a community use.
- The local community in the vicinity of the premises was a harmonious mix of cultures and the applicant's proposal represented a continuation of that culture in the area.

Councillor J. Tandy spoke on this item, during which the following points were raised:

- Shrewsbury was an open community which welcomed all cultures.
- Concerned about where users of the premises would park should the privately owned section of the overspill car park be developed.
- Concerned at the opening times and there was a need to see what would be suitable for the local community.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed development and discussed at length the hours of use and traffic and parking issues, particularly the future provision of the additional parking requirements, associated with the proposed change of use of the premises and whether these were likely to have more of a detrimental impact on the local community than the use of the premises as a Registry Office.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to a Section 106/Legal Agreement to secure additional parking provision, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

(Councillor D. Roberts wished it to be recorded that he had abstained from voting due to his concerns about parking provision.)

26. 33 KENNEDY ROAD, SHREWSBURY - 13/00156/FUL

Further to Minute 177, the Principal Planning Officer introduced the updated application report and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that House B had been repositioned on site and the retention of the Coach House in the development had been secured.

Members considered the amended plans for the proposed development and indicated their support for the officer's recommendation.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure affordable housing provision on site and an affordable housing contribution, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

27. RETAIL UNIT ADJACENT MINSTERLEY GARAGE, STATION ROAD, MINSTERLEY - 13/00987/COU

Further to Minute 17, the Area Planning Manager introduced the updated application report and indicated that having researched and checked the site history it was now apparent that planning permission 09/00156/COU did not actually relate to the application building, but instead referred to a store room that was contained wholly within the main shop/former garage building at the site. He confirmed that the correct planning permission relating to the application building was planning permission reference 10/04945/COU granted on 14th January 2011 that allowed for the change of use of a B1 office/store building to an A1 retail use. The the Area Planning Manager confirmed further that the applicant's agent had confirmed that this permission had been implemented and had submitted a letter written by the building's owner along with a sample of a relevant advertisement for the site, stating that the building had been used to retail alloy wheels for a short period in 2011.

Mr. D. Leeson, representing Minsterley Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The application building had only ever been used as a store and had never been a retail shop.
- The previous application had been refused due to parking issues and since that time the number of inhabitants in the area had increased, therefore increasing the dangers from traffic.

- The parish council had requested the provision of Traffic Regulation Order restrictions on that part of the highway adjacent to the site.
- There was no provision to deal with the litter that would be generated from the premises.
- The parish council strongly objected to the proposal and the Committee should take account of local views.

The Highways Development Control Area Manager (Central) indicated that he sympathised with the views of the local community on the proposal. However, given the confirmation of the existing business use, he could raise no objections to the proposal and considered that the intended use would not create a high volume of additional traffic, and anticipated that the existing car parking provision on site would be used by customers of the premises on an informal basis particularly during linked trips to the Co-op store. He confirmed that a request for the provision of Traffic Regulation Order restrictions on that part of the highway adjacent to the site had been received and was being considered.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed development. Members expressed uncertainty that sufficient evidence had been provided to confirm the previous retail use of the application building.

The Area Planning Manager and the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that from the evidence provided by the applicant they considered that the permission for A1 retail use of the application building had been implemented.

Members expressed concern about the lack of parking provision on the site and considered that the proposal was likely to produce more business and vehicle movements than the currently permitted A1 use of the premises, with no certainty that the limited parking on the site would be available for its customers.

The Principal Planning Officer indicated that the applicant had no formal agreement with the Co-op store to permit the parking of customer's vehicles but it was anticipated that they would be unlikely to prohibit visitors from using their facilities.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation for the following reasons:

It is considered that the proposed change of use is likely to generate significant activity and vehicle movements at sensitive times of the day. As a result, given that there is no clear evidence that the limited parking on site will be available to customers of the proposed takeaway, it is considered that the proposal would be highly likely to have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties and on highway safety, as the lack of parking provision on the site to meet the demand could potentially lead to inappropriate parking on residential streets, on the A488, and in the bus stop lay-by adjacent to the premises. Consequently it is considered that the proposal fails to accord with the requirements of adopted and saved Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Core Strategy.

28. BESFORD HOUSE, 42 TRINITY STREET, SHREWSBURY - 13/01313/FUL

The Area Planning Manager drew Members' attention to the late representations that had been received on this application included in the schedule of late representations, including the officer update with additional recommended conditions; the late representations received by email; and a further late objection received from a local resident that had been circulated at the meeting. In introducing the application the Area Planning Manager confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

The Area Planning Manager confirmed that an application for the development of the site with the provision of fourteen dwellings and the demolition of Besford House was refused in September 2012. He emphasised that the current proposal included the retention of Besford House, with the removal of unsympathetic additions to the property which would be beneficial to the appearance of the building and its setting. He indicated that, in all, the scheme included the provision of eleven dwellings, comprising two dwellings converted from an existing building, eight two storey semi-detached properties (2x3 bed, and 6x4 bed units) plus one detached two storey four bedroom property, and provided for a total of 18 car parking spaces (2 for visitors) on site in addition to private driveways and garages for the two converted units and the single detached dwelling.

The Area Planning Manager indicated that significant objections to the scheme had been received, concerning the access to the site, increased parking pressure in the area, the density of the development and the appropriateness of the scheme in the conservation area.

Mrs. C. Kilgannon spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The area of the site was already densely populated and could not sustain the proposed development.
- The development of the site was welcomed but the proposed scheme was an overdevelopment of the site and the design of dwelling types was poor and not sympathetic to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- The new scheme was only slightly different from the previous proposal for the site and was an inappropriate development of Besford House.
- The proposed development was contrary to Policies CS6 and CS17.

Councillor J. M. Williams spoke on this item, during which the following points were raised:

- The presence of high density housing in the area should not mean that this site is developed to a high density.
- The proposed development does not respect the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- The reasons for the refusal of the previous scheme in September 2012 still apply to this scheme.
- The number of dwellings to be provided had only marginally reduced on the same footprint.

- The design and density of the scheme was inappropriate and would not enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Mr. C. Huntley, the Applicant's Agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Regard had been taken of the views and concerns of residents with the proposed development retaining the building and significant trees.
- A residential travel plan for the site was being developed in conjunction with the Council.
- Local resident parking on the site was being allowed by the Council while the premises was not in use and parking on site could not be provided to local residents once the site was developed.
- Visitor parking was provided on site.
- The appearance and setting of Besford House would be improved with the removal of the unsympathetic additions to the building.
- The scheme fully complied with planning policies, provided affordable housing and would provide a boost to the economy of the area.
- The substantial reduction in the number of objections to the scheme demonstrated increased acceptance of the proposals.
- A construction traffic management plan for the scheme had been prepared.

The Highways Development Control Area Manager (Central) commented on the impact of the scheme on the surrounding highway network and confirmed that he had no objection in principle to the proposed scheme. He indicated further that a draft construction traffic management plan had been submitted and was under consideration and discussion with the applicant and consultation with local members.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed development. Some Members commented on the narrowness of the streets with high volumes of car parking on the approaches to the site and the difficulties that would be caused along those streets by increased traffic to the development. In addition, Members exchanged views on the improvements that had been made to the proposed development of the site and the suitability and visual impact of the design of the proposed house types.

In respect of traffic issues in the vicinity of the site, the Area Planning Manager stated that the premises had an existing use as an office which could be recommenced immediately without recourse to the Local Planning Authority.

In response to a query from a Member, the Area Planning Manager indicated that outstanding officer concerns over the off street parking layout associated with dwellings 3 to 8 would be pursued with the applicant through the landscaping scheme for the development.

A Member commented that access to properties in the area for emergency vehicles was difficult and expressed concern that no comments on access to the site had been received from the emergency services. He considered that consideration of the application should be deferred for such comments to be sought.

In response to requests from Members, the Area Planning Manager accepted that should consideration of the application be deferred, on the grounds outlined above, it could be possible to pursue with the applicant the Members wishes for revisions to the scheme to be explored, whilst the emergency services comments were being obtained.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of the application be deferred to the next meeting for comments to be sought from the emergency services on access to the site for emergency vehicles.

29. PROPOSED FISHERMANS CABIN, BUILDWAS - 12/05157/FUL

The Area Planning Manager introduced the application and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed development which were displayed at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

30. LAND TO THE REAR OF 88 MEOLE CRESCENT, SHREWSBURY - 13/01081/FUL

The Area Planning Manager drew Members' attention to the late representations that had been received on this application included in the schedule of late representations and indications received from the applicant on the landscaping to be carried out at the site. In introducing the application the Area Planning Manager confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

Mrs. J. Pittaway spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The environmental impact of building on a Greenfield site which was formerly a private orchard, which supported a large variety of wildlife, until it was destroyed in preparation for the proposed development. The ecological survey had not been carried out until after the destruction of the habitat.
- The proposed development was too high density with poor site design. The scale of the development was totally inappropriate for the site and would lead to 42 existing families being directly overlooked and resulting in a loss of privacy and residential amenity that had been enjoyed for decades.
- The very long gravel drive access road would be noisy, dusty and dirty and severely impact on the pleasant use of existing gardens.

- Existing dwellings would suffer a significant deterioration in the security of their properties with residents exposed to the increased likelihood of intrusions on to their properties from the site.
- The proposed development would exacerbate existing traffic safety issues in Meole Crescent and additional traffic movements from the development would increase the risk of danger to residents.

Mr. O. Jones, the Applicant's Agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Each dwelling would have provision for two car parking spaces, with two visitor parking spaces provided on site, therefore the scheme would have a minimal impact on the traffic in the area.
- The remaining fruit trees on the site were in poor condition and replacements to be provided on site as part of the landscaping works would be locally sourced and the planting of native boundary hedges would increase the biodiversity of the site in the future.
- Shrewsbury Town Council had carefully scrutinised the scheme and had raised no objection.
- The distances of the proposed dwellings to existing properties were far greater than the minimum requirement of 21metres.
- The scheme complied with all relevant planning policies and there had been no objections from statutory consultees.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed development with the majority of Members expressing the view that the proposed development could be adequately accommodated on the site and indicating their support for the officer's recommendation.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

31. THE ORCHARDS, SHEPHERDS LANE, BICTON HEATH, SHREWSBURY - 13/00841/OUT

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the proposal was an outline application with all matters reserved.

The Principal Planning Officer indicated that the proposed development would be surrounded by the Shrewsbury West Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) and complied with policy for the emerging SUE. He further indicated that the National Planning Policy Framework required appropriate weight to be given to emerging policies.

Mr. K. Steele spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The proposed development was not within the catchment of the SUE and the site was classed as open countryside and would lead to over development of Shepherds Lane.
- The proximity of the proposed dwellings will cause overlooking and loss of privacy to existing dwellings and unacceptable noise nuisance.
- Insufficient space on site for the parking of vehicles and lack of space for service vehicles to manoeuvre.
- The proposed development would result in a loss of protected trees and have a detrimental impact on the woodland.
- The proposed development would result in a loss of ecological habitats at the site and have a detrimental effect on wildlife in the area.
- Access to the site off Shepherds Lane was narrow and hazardous.

Councillor P. Adams spoke on this item, during which the following points were raised:

- The site is situated in open countryside and as such the proposal is contrary to Policy CS5.
- The site is outside of the SUE area and needs to be retained to provide green space.
- The proposed Oxon Link road will have a roundabout connection with Shepherds Lane, therefore the indicative plan supplied by the applicant for access to the site is erroneous.

Mr. C. Huntley, the Applicant's Agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- It is accepted that the site is adjacent to the SUE.
- Care has been taken with the density of the site for good use of the land.
- The proposed development is low density with dwellings carefully arranged to avoid overlooking.
- All ecological and highway concerns have been addressed.
- The site is in a sustainable location for development.
- Trees will be retained to preserve the area's character.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed development. The majority of Members acknowledged the changing nature of the area with the Council's acceptance of the Shrewsbury West Sustainable Urban Extension which would encompass the site.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

32. STADCO LIMITED, HARLESCOTT LANE, SHREWSBURY – 13/01549/FUL

The Area Planning Manager drew Members' attention to the late representations that had been received on this application included in the schedule of late representations. In introducing the application the Area Planning Manager confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

The Area Planning Manager confirmed that the existing access to the site would be permanently stopped up with new hedgerow planting and an indicative masterplan for the site had been received showing a car showroom on the area of the site to be served off the new access road.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed development and it was suggested that the design of the new access should be agreed with the local member.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation, with authority delegated to the Area Planning Manager to finalise the design of the new access in consultation with the Local Member.

33. DOVECOTE BARN, HALSTON, PONTESFORD – 13/00786/FUL

The Area Planning Manager introduced the application and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

The Area Planning Manager indicated that the originally proposed continuous row of roof lights had been amended to the present scheme for the provision of three rooflights to the rear roofline of the property and the Conservation Officer was satisfied with the revised proposals.

Mr. A. Hodges, representing Pontesbury Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The parish council was strongly against the proposed barn conversion.
- The number of changes to the barn had occurred incrementally and continued.
- English Heritage advice was that rooflights should be a last resort and used sparingly.
- The Conservation Officers report indicated that the number of rooflights at Dovecote Barn could eventually reach up to eight in total. Why should three more rooflights be accepted contrary to advice.

Mr. G. Moss, the Applicant's Agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- It was not unusual for the conversion of barns to occur in an ad hoc manner.
- Ventilation needed to be provided to the bedrooms at the property and for health and safety reasons the provision of rooflights was the solution.
- Each barn conversion and adaption is considered on its own merits.
- The proposal was no different to other rooflight arrangements on other barns in the area.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed development and some Members expressed concern that window and ventilation requirements should have been determined in the original scheme for the barn conversion when it was approved. The majority of Members indicated their support for the officer's recommendation.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

34. DOVECOTE BARN, HALSTON, PONTESFORD – 13/00787/LBC

The Area Planning Manager introduced the application and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on the Grade II listed building and the surrounding area.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed alterations to the Grade II listed building and indicated their support for the officer's recommendation.

RESOLVED:

That Listed Building Consent be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

35. 55 TRINITY STREET, SHREWSBURY – 12/05105/FUL

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and drew Members' attention to a late objection received by email. He confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

The Principal Planning Officer indicated that a previous proposal for the provision of three 3 storey dwellings at the site had been refused on appeal: access to the new proposed new property at the rear of 55 Trinity Street would be through that part of the plot on which the garage to no. 55 Trinity Street was currently sited; and the conifer hedge that was to be removed as part of the former refused scheme would be retained in the current scheme.

Councillor J. M. Williams spoke on this item, during which the following points were raised:

- The area is characterised by densely developed urban streets which already suffer from a range of traffic related issues. Another property introduces yet more traffic movements, adding to the problems already experienced by residents.

- The proposed entrance to the new property will be very tight and arguably diminishes the setting of No 55 itself, which is a significant house in the Trinity Street scene and the Conservation area.
- I am concerned about the precedent of allowing this backland development, which infills a large area of green space, which diminishes the open character of the back garden vista.
- It will create a precedent, and encourage people with relatively large back gardens to submit similar applications, which will have a detrimental effect, diminishing the open/garden character of the area.
- Belle Vue was originally developed as an area of gardens, orchards and summer-houses; some of the area's open backland character still remains and should be retained undeveloped. This helps to retain a balance between the needs of wildlife environment and the needs of or other forms of built environment, especially in tightly built-up urban environments.

Mr. J. Shirra, the Applicant's Agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The revised scheme for the site had been developed to the satisfaction of planning officers and addressed all issues raised in the appeal decision for the previous scheme.
- The revised scheme for the provision of a single dwelling provided much amenity space around the property.
- The proposed access to the new dwelling posed no turning or parking problems for the existing dwelling.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed development. Some Members expressed concern that the proposal was backland development that was likely to have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. In addition, Members expressed concern about the width of the access to the site and safety issues, with the side door of no. 55 Trinity Street opening directly on to the proposed access to the plot, needing to be addressed.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of the application be deferred to the next meeting for confirmation to be sought that the part of the access to the plot, on which the garage to no. 55 Trinity Street was currently sited, would be of sufficient width and to enable safety concerns, relating to the side door of no. 55 Trinity Street opening directly on to the proposed access to the plot, to be addressed.

36. 77-77A MARDOL, SHREWSBURY – 13/01767/COU

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and confirmed that the Committee had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

Members considered the submitted plans for the proposed development which were displayed at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

37. APPEALS AND APPEAL DECISIONS

Members considered the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the Central area as at 20th June 2013.

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the Central area as at 20th June 2013 be noted.

38. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED:

That in accordance with the provisions of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 and paragraph 10.4(5) of the Council's Access to Information Procedure Rules, the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item.

39. LAND AT HEREFORD ROAD, SHREWSBURY – 12/02498/OUT

The Committee considered an exempt report by the Area Planning Manager on Counsel's advice received following the consideration of application 12/02498/OUT on 23rd May 2013.

RESOLVED:

That application 12/02498/OUT be referred back to the next meeting of this Committee on 17th July 2013.

40. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that the next meeting of the Central Planning Committee be held at 2.00 p.m. on Wednesday 17th July 2013 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury.

CHAIRMAN:.....

DATE:.....