



Date: Thursday, 18 January 2018  
Time: 2.00 pm  
Venue: Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND  
Contact: Shelley Davies, Committee Officer  
Tel: 01743 257718  
Email: [shelley.davies@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto:shelley.davies@shropshire.gov.uk)

## **CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **AGENDA ITEM 2 - MINUTES TO FOLLOW**

### **SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

#### Minutes

Minutes of the Central Planning meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2017.

#### 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**



## Committee and Date

Central Planning Committee

18<sup>th</sup> January 2018

## **CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 21 December 2017**

**2.00 - 3.59 pm in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND**

**Responsible Officer:** Shelley Davies

Email: shelley.davies@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 257718

### **Present**

Councillor Ted Clarke (Chairman)

Councillors Dean Carroll, Nat Green (Vice Chairman), Nick Hignett, Pamela Moseley, Tony Parsons, Alexander Phillips, Ed Potter, Kevin Pardy, Keith Roberts and Roger Evans (substitute for David Vasmer)

### **82 Apologies for absence**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor David Vasmer (Substitute: Roger Evans).

### **83 Minutes**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Central Planning Committee held on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **84 Public Question Time**

There were no public questions or petitions received.

### **85 Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

Members were reminded that they must not participate in the discussion or voting on any matter in which they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and should leave the room prior to the commencement of the debate.

With reference to planning application 17/04319/REM Development East of Stoneycroft, Valeswood, Little Ness, Shrewsbury – Councillor Nat Green stated that he had had contact with applicant through his employment and therefore he would leave the room during consideration of the application.

With reference to planning application 17/04319/REM Development East of Stoneycroft, Valeswood, Little Ness, Shrewsbury – Councillor Kevin Pardy stated that the applicant was known to him and therefore he would leave the room during consideration of the application.

With reference to planning application 17/04319/REM Development East of Stoneycroft, Valeswood, Little Ness, Shrewsbury - Councillor Keith Roberts stated that the applicant was known to him but this would not affect his opinion when considering the application.

With reference to planning application 17/04319/REM Development East of Stoneycroft, Valeswood, Little Ness, Shrewsbury - Councillor Alex Phillips stated that the applicant was known to him but this would not affect his opinion when considering the application.

**86 Proposed Retail Unit East Of Unit 8, Meole Brace Retail Park, Shrewsbury - 17/00405/FUL**

*Councillor Ted Clarke as local ward Councillor vacated the Chair. Councillor Nat Green as Vice-Chairman presided as Chairman for this item.*

The Area Planning Manager introduced the application for the removal of existing structures and construction of an A1 (retail) unit; all associated works including car park alterations, access, servicing and landscaping and drew Members' attention to the Schedule of Additional Letters which included representations from NJL Consulting on behalf of the applicant.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1), Councillor Jane Mackenzie addressed the Committee as the local ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, a number of points were raised including the following:

- The application should be refused until there had been a review of the retail park access;
- Additional units on the retail park would have an adverse impact on the Town Centre;
- She supported the condition to restrict the end user of the unit to Sports Direct or to a bulky goods use; and
- A new access to the retail park was required and if this application was approved a potential access onto Oteley Road would be lost.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1), Councillor Tony Parsons addressed the Committee as the local ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, a number of points were raised including the following:

- He agreed with the points raised by Councillor Jane Mackenzie;
- The proposed internal road changes would not have a positive impact on the access issues;

- He welcomed the condition to restrict the end user of the unit to Sports Direct or to a bulky goods use; and
- He considered that sub-division of the unit would have an adverse impact on the Town Centre.

Mr Nick Pleasant, agent for the applicant spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In response to comments made by the speakers, the Area Planning Manager clarified that if the unit was sub-divided the condition to restrict the end user to Sports Direct or to a bulky goods use would still apply.

In the ensuing debate concern was raised by Members in relation to traffic issues on the site and the impact on access for emergency vehicles. Additionally Members questioned the timing of the traffic survey undertaken by the applicant and requested further information in regards to the estimated additional vehicle movements.

In response to a question from a Member, the Area Planning Manager explained that paragraph 4.1.1 of the Officers report referred to the improvements works within the retail park approved under a separate planning application.

Having considered the submitted plans for the proposal and noted the comments of all the speakers, the majority of Members expressed the view that the application should be deferred for further highways information.

**RESOLVED:**

That consideration of the application be deferred to a future meeting of this Committee for further information in relation to the following:

- The estimated additional vehicle movements;
- The timing of the traffic survey;
- Access of emergency vehicles; and
- The implementation of improvement works within the retail park approved under a separate planning application.

**87 Development East Of Stoneycroft, Valeswood, Little Ness, Shrewsbury - 17/04319/REM**

*In line with their declarations at Minute 85, Councillors Kevin Pardy and Nat Green left the room during consideration of this item, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.*

The Area Planning Manager introduced the application for the approval of reserved matters (access) pursuant to permission 15/00560/OUT for the erection of one dwelling and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit this morning to assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

Mrs Zia Robbins, on behalf of the Nescliffe Hills and District Bridleway Association spoke against the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1), Councillor Ed Potter addressed the Committee as the local ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement he explained that he had requested that the application be brought to Committee to allow Members the opportunity to consider the concerns in relation to the access as detailed by Mrs Zia Robbins.

Mr Oscar Baldry, Agent for the applicant spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Having considered the submitted plans and listened to the comments made by the speakers, Members unanimously expressed their support for the Officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation subject to the Conditions as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

**88 Proposed Caravan Storage, Land NW Of Whiston Farm, Cardeston, Ford - 17/05153/FUL**

The Area Planning Manager introduced the application under Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the change of use of agricultural land to secured compound area for storage of caravans and container storage. The Area Planning Manager drew Members' attention to the Schedule of Additional Letters which included a representation from the Nescliffe Hills and District Bridleway Association and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit this morning to assess the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding area.

Mrs Zia Robbins, on behalf of the Nescliffe Hills and District Bridleway Association spoke against the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1), Councillor Ed Potter addressed the Committee as the local ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement he requested that the Committee defer the application to allow the applicant the opportunity for a full visual impact survey to be undertaken to enable a successful business to continue.

Mr Peter Richards, Agent for the applicant spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with Shropshire Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Having considered the submitted plans and listened to the comments made by the speakers, the majority of Members expressed their support for the Officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be refused as per the Officer's recommendation for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal will have a significant detrimental visual and landscape impact on the surrounding countryside, which cannot be adequately mitigated by means of additional planting. It is considered that development on this site has a significant detrimental visual impact when viewed from the A458 public highway and surrounding public footpaths. As such the proposal is considered contrary to Policies CS5, CS6, and CS17 of the Shropshire Core Strategy, Policies MD2, MD7b and MD12 of the SAMDev and the overall aims and objectives of the NPPF in relationship to sustainable development.
- 2. The proposal does not constitute farm business diversification, and it is considered that the significant detrimental visual and landscape impacts do not outweigh any economic benefits as a result of the development. As such the proposal is considered contrary to Policies CS5, CS13 and CS17 of the Shropshire Core Strategy and Policies MD2, MD7b and MD12 of the SAMDev and the overall aims and objectives of the NPPF in relationship to sustainable development.

**89 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions**

**RESOLVED:**

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the Central area as at 21<sup>st</sup> December 2017 be noted.

**90 Date of the Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED:**

That it be noted that the next meeting of the Central Planning Committee be held at 2.00 p.m. on Thursday, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2018 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed ..... (Chairman)

Date: .....

**This page is intentionally left blank**

# Agenda Item 8

<b>CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS</b>		
<b>Date: 18 January 2018</b>		
<b>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</b>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	17/01612/OUT	Applicants' agent and residents
<p>The agent has submitted a letter (attached) which offers a further reduction in the number of dwellings served from a single point of access off Preston Street to 225; with no more than 250 properties under construction until the London Road link is available for public use. Officers note this offer and would recommend that the Committee accept this and recommend an amended condition as follows (amendments in <b>bold</b> and text deleted has been struck through):</p> <p>21. No more than <del>250</del> <b>225</b> dwellings shall be occupied on the development hereby approved <b>with no more than 250 dwellings under construction</b> unless and until the access to London Road as shown <b>on the approved plan</b> is completed and available to public traffic. No construction traffic access for the proposed development shall be from Preston Street once the proposed London Road access is open and available for public use.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to protect the amenity of residents in the vicinity of Preston Street.</p> <p>This condition needs to be read alongside a final construction environmental management plan which would control deliveries and construction activities.</p> <p>At the time of writing, 15 additional letters have been submitted covering the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site should not be developed as it is countryside. Other sites should be built on.</li> <li>• A hybrid application should not be approved as the site will mark edge of Shrewsbury.</li> <li>• The new park is in the floodplain – nothing special.</li> <li>• Traffic – there has been a rise in local traffic generated in recent years; the link road onto London Road must be built first (residents were promised this and developer can afford to pay for it); Preston Street/ Column roundabout could not cope with additional traffic; construction traffic would harm quality of life including extra dust and noise; extra traffic would affect residents (homes on new development get soundproofing whereas existing residents would not); traffic modelling flawed and did not take account of all local factors; short term and longer term impacts locally; no tracking information for access along Portland Crescent/ Belvidere Road and Belvidere Avenue.</li> <li>• 250 home occupation restriction before London Road access not fair as it would allow developer to build 400 homes. The developers have not made satisfactory concessions.</li> <li>• Impact on social infrastructure (GPs, local schools). Developer needs to fund this. No community infrastructure proposed on site. Query whether Mereside can support the educational needs of the children from the new proposed Weir Hill estate. This option will present a hazardous journey to school for many young children.</li> <li>• Failures in process – developers have not met with the community; officials have said</li> </ul>		

untrue things about the development, approving this would be a disgrace; councillors and officers should listen to the community; many residents cannot attend afternoon Planning Committee meetings as they are at work.

- Developer should avoid rising ground rents.

The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Weir Hill Action Group has also written to oppose the application. Their letter raises the following points:

- They support the decision to defer a decision on this application.
- The development will affect local amenity contrary to the development plan and the NPPF.
- There are discrepancies in the transport assessment (date/ time and period of count).
- There will be impacts on local residents – the application does not factor in other forms of traffic generated by the proposal.
- The construction environment management plan assumes vehicles will go up London Road which has a 7.5 tonne weight restriction.
- The proposal is remote from community facilities meaning that new residents would be likely to use the car contrary to CS Policy CS7.
- Construction traffic would exacerbate noise conditions for residents.
- The only solution is to bar all construction traffic from Preston Street and construct the link road from London Road first.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/04363/FUL	Local resident

A Heath Farm resident has written in to object to the application. She criticises the design and access statement, visual impact assessment and preliminary ecological assessment and considers there are inaccuracies in them. The views from the right of way are the best in Shrewsbury and the South Shropshire hills.

She considers the scheme too big and too intrusive, visible from the town centre and would generate more vehicles than the original winery application.

She queries why the public were not made aware of the application and why no notice of the application was displayed at the bottom of Hencote Lane.

Shropshire Council  
Planning - Central Team  
Shirehall  
Abbey Foregate  
Shrewsbury  
SY2 6ND

15<sup>th</sup> January 2018

**FAO Vincent Maher and Tim Rogers**

Dear Sirs

**HYBRID APPLICATION FOR A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 600 DWELLINGS, ACCESS, FOOTPATHS, CYCLEWAYS, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED DRAINAGE AND DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE  
LAND AT WEIR HILL, BETWEEN PRESTON STREET AND TO THE REAR OF EXISTING PROPERTIES FRONTING LONDON ROAD, SHREWSBURY  
APPLICATION ON BEHALF OF TAYLOR WIMPEY AND PERSIMMON HOMES  
APPLICATION REFERENCE 17/01612/OUT**

We have read your Report for this Thursday's Planning Committee Meeting (18<sup>th</sup> January) which re-presents the application back to Planning Committee following its deferral at the Planning Committee in November 2017. We note the additional information provided by Officers to address the points of clarification requested by Members and we support the recommendation to grant planning permission again reached by officers.

As you are aware the SAMDev makes reference to 150 dwellings being served off Preston Street, unless an alternative is justified through a detailed, site specific Transport Assessment (SHREW027).

We have, in support of the above planning application submitted a detailed Transport Assessment that uses appropriate traffic survey data to confirm there is currently no technical reason why the originally proposed trigger of 365 dwellings could, in fact, not be higher with the whole of the proposed 600 dwellings capable of being served off Preston Street.

However, my clients have listened to the concerns raised by Members and local people regarding the number of proposed dwellings being served off Preston Street and the level of associated construction traffic prior to delivery of the London Road link as a second access for the development. The evidence presented with the planning application sought to suggest an appropriate trigger point in line with the principles established within the Council's SAMDev Plan and we believe that the information provided to date is of sufficient detail to achieve this.

- - 2 - -

Through the application process you will recall that my clients have previously responded to member and resident feedback that the original trigger value of 365 dwellings was excessive and in the interests of responding to these concerns; offered a reduction in that number to 250 dwellings served off Preston Street, with no more than 290 properties being under construction until the London Road link was constructed and available for public use. This despite the lack of technical argument to justify that any reduction was required.

We understand that this initial reduction continues to be a sensitive matter and we are keen to move forward positively and to work alongside members and local residents in the delivery of this development. My clients wish to be seen as responding to local concerns and on that basis, notwithstanding the technical evidence supporting the application and without prejudicing their position should consent not be granted, they have evaluated matters further and are prepared to offer a further reduction in the number of dwellings served from a single point of access off Preston Street to 225; with no more than 250 properties under construction until the London Road link is available for public use.

I am sure you will highlight that the trigger sits alongside other measures included within the application such as the Construction Environmental Management Plan which already proposes to control deliveries and construction activities to minimise impacts on local residents.

I trust this is of further assistance.

Yours faithfully



**Jason M Tait - MRTPI, Director**  
**For and on behalf of Planning Prospects Ltd**