



Committee and Date

South Planning Committee

7 February 2017

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2017

2.00 - 4.48 pm in the Shrewsbury/Oswestry Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Responsible Officer: Linda Jeavons

Email: linda.jeavons@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 257716

Present

Councillor David Evans (Chairman)

Councillors David Turner (Vice Chairman), Andy Boddington, Gwilym Butler, Nigel Hartin, Richard Huffer, William Parr, Madge Shineton, Robert Tindall and Tina Woodward

65 Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor John Hurst-Knight.

66 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the South Planning Committee held on 6 December 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

67 Public Question Time

There were no public questions or petitions received.

68 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 16/02739/FUL, Councillor David Turner declared that the speaker for the developer was someone with whom he had had a business relationship many years ago and the developer's Transport Consultant was well known to him and for reasons that there may be a perception of bias he would leave the room during consideration of this item.

With reference to planning application 16/03878/FUL, Councillor David Turner declared that he was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Transition Board and one of the objectors was a personal friend. As local Ward Councillor he would make a statement and then leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

69 Land Adjacent To Sainsbury's Supermarket, Old Smithfield, Bridgnorth (16/02739/FUL)

By virtue of his declaration of interest at Minute No. 68, Councillor David Turner left the room during consideration of this item.

The Principal Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, she drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

Members had undertaken a site visit and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting.

Mr S Robbins, representing Bridgnorth Chamber of Commerce, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Mr M Cooksey, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Councillor David Cooper, representing Bridgnorth Town Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the 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) Councillor Christian Lea, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- The proposal would mean the end and demise of Bridgnorth High Street and side streets. Bridgnorth had a wealth of traders and businesses that were popular with local people and liked by those that regularly visited the town;
- With regard to paragraph 4.1.2 of the report, he questioned whether the £2.0m figure quoted was actually realistic and considered it optimistic to expect that much clawback of trade leakage could be achieved as Bridgnorth could not be expected to compete with places such as Telford and Merry Hill;
- He expressed concerns regarding the reduction in car parking spaces. It was already difficult to park and more so on a Saturday. Local traders may not always be able to afford to contribute to the current park and ride scheme; and
- The scheme would cause congestion and pollution created by additional vehicle movements and delivery vehicles. This could have a detrimental impact on the accessibility of emergency vehicles.

With the permission of the Chairman and due to the fact that additional speakers had been allowed to speak against the proposal, the developer was permitted to speak for up to six minutes. Mr J Liggins, the developer, spoke for the proposal in

accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees and responded to questions from Members. In response to questions from Members of the Committee, Mr Liggins provided clarification on the potential impact on the Town, current parking agreement held between Shropshire Council and Sainsbury's and why the DIY store covered by an extant planning permission had not been developed.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15) Councillor William Parr, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- Residents, Bridgnorth Chamber of Commerce and Bridgnorth Town Council did not support the proposal;
- Would have an impact on the viability of the Town; there was already sufficient shops on the high street;
- Tourism footfall would fall;
- Bridgnorth had recently become the winner of the 2016 Large Market Town award based on its current character; and
- Would result in the loss of valuable car parking spaces and the retail units would generate further vehicle movements.

In the ensuing debate and having considered the submitted plans and noting the comments of all speakers, Members expressed differing views. Some Members expressed concerns regarding the loss of car parking and considered the developer's estimate that only 4.7% of trade would be lost from Bridgnorth town centre as being no more than guesswork with some suggesting that the impact could be higher. Some Members acknowledged that the site fell within the development boundary for Bridgnorth and supported the proposal and suggested that it would provide increased retail choice and help to claw-back expenditure/trade lost elsewhere.

In response to comments and questions, the Principal Planner, Solicitor, Principal Policy Specialist Officer and Area Highways Development Control Manager (South) provided clarification on parking arrangements, the existing parking agreement, extant planning permission, the submitted Retail Assessment, the methodology for conducting retail assessments, national and local policy on retail development, future parking strategies and the Local Plan review. Officers advised that the proposed reduction of parking spaces and a total trade diversion of 4.7% could not be considered as one that would have a significant adverse impact and significant enough to warrant refusal. Prior to being put to the vote, the Solicitor advised Members that if the Committee determine and wish to refuse an application contrary to the Officer recommendation, it may not continue to determine that application if the reasons to refuse might not be considered to be defensible if challenged and should be a "minded to refuse" decision.

RESOLVED:

That, in accordance with Shropshire Council's Constitution, consideration of this planning application be deferred to a future meeting with Members minded to refuse the application for the following reasons:

The Committee acknowledges that the proposal would provide additional retail choice in Bridgnorth Town Centre, but the loss of car parking spaces and the uncertainty of the impact on independent traders in the Town Centre would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS15 and paragraph 27 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(At this juncture, the meeting adjourned at 15:50 and reconvened at 15:54.)

**70 Walkhamwood Farm, Faintree, Bridgnorth, Shropshire, WV16 6RQ
(15/05330/EIA)**

The Technical Specialist Planning Officer introduced the application and drew Members' attention to the further representations received as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters.

Members had undertaken a site visit that morning and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That this item be deferred to a future meeting to enable further consideration to be given to additional representations.

(As local Ward Member, Councillor Robert Tindall did not vote on this item.)

71 Withies Campsite, Stretton Road, Much Wenlock, Shropshire (16/03878/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

Members had undertaken a site visit and had viewed the site, the location of the proposed access, facilities building and shepherds huts accommodation, the land where tents and touring caravans could pitch, and the existing vehicular access that would be closed. Members also walked the route available across the adjacent paddock which pedestrians would take to reach Blakeway Hollow and assessed the impact of the proposals on the surrounding area.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting.

Mr R Dower, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Mr R Marcar, a local resident, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Councillor Mrs M Hill, representing Much Wenlock Town Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Mrs M Holt, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the 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) Councillor David Turner, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- On a positive front, the site operated under an Exemption Certificate and provided it operated within the constraints of the Freedom Camping Club's rules he believed that it could continue to do so. This application could be capable of making a positive contribution to Much Wenlock's tourism offer and visitor economy and offer a welcome contrast to the normal camping and caravanning experience offered around the Town;
- Unfortunately, the application had paid scant regard to the local community's aspirations and had not embraced the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan in setting out its case;
- Neighbour amenity - objectors contend that this was not a tranquil site;
- Highways – He drew attention to the repeated concerns expressed with regard to highway safety. The B4371 was governed by the national speed limit and many who were familiar with it drove their vehicles to this limit and some maybe in excess of this limit. The road was used by farm traffic and articulated and other HGVs and access and egress off the site would require the utmost care and more so if unfamiliar with the road and towing a caravan;
- Pedestrians – In bad weather Blakeway Hollow was muddy and slippery and in the dark its uneven surface was hazardous and this may lead to pedestrians defaulting to walking the highway;
- Landscape – He shared the concerns expressed by the National Trust;
- Flooding – Any hard surfaces would contribute to flood risk in the Town and should be avoided; and
- He urged the Committee to refuse the application in its current form; however, if granted he suggested that conditions should be attached to address flooding, impact (huts should be freestanding and mobile without decking and pitches and shepherds huts should have a limited period of occupancy and site conditions should limit occupation to the holidays season) and neighbour amenity.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance

of an appropriate and reasonable standard of landscape, Members requested that appropriate deciduous/rural planting should be undertaken and the existing conifers should be removed.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the decision not being called-in by the Secretary of State, Planning Permission be granted as per the amended Officer’s recommendation as set out in the Schedule of Additional Representations, subject to:

- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, subject to:
 - (i) Condition 3 being amended as set out in the Schedule of Additional Representations and to read, “No more than 4 shepherds huts, 5 touring caravans and 16 tent pitches shall be provided/sited within the application site at any one time.”;
 - (ii) Appropriate conditions being amended/added to ensure that the external surfaces of the roof area of the facilities and storage building and the shepherds huts be BS18B29; and
 - (iii) Improved signage directing walkers/pedestrians to Blakeway Hollow.

72 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 10 January 2017 be noted.

73 Date of the Next Meeting

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that the next meeting of the South Planning Committee will be held at 2.00 pm on Tuesday, 7 February 2017 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: