

**Committee and Date**

South Planning Committee

4 April 2017

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**Minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2017**

2.00 - 3.38 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), Gwilym Butler, Nigel Hartin, Richard Huffer, John Hurst-Knight, William Parr, Madge Shingleton, Robert Tindall and Tina Woodward

82 Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Andy Boddington.

83 Minutes**RESOLVED:**

That the Minutes of the meeting of the South Planning Committee held on 7 February 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 16/02739/FUL, Councillor John Hurst-Knight declared that due to a perception of bias he would leave the room during consideration of this item.

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.

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

By virtue of their declaration of interest at Minute No. 85, Councillors John Hurst-Knight and 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, proposed layout and elevations, existing layout and previous consent layout.

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

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

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.

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 was not supported by Bridgnorth residents; it would not enhance the local retail experience; there was already a wide variety of independent shops in the Town; and this proposal could have a detrimental impact on up to 20 independent retailers;
- He reiterated his concerns regarding the loss of parking spaces. It was already difficult to park and if there was less parking as a result of this proposal being granted shoppers would vote with their feet and go elsewhere. Local traders may not always be able to afford to contribute to the current park and ride scheme;
- Along with a possible increase in Business Rates and Brexit, this would exacerbate the pressures existing retailers already faced; and
- Bridgnorth had recently been successful and had won an award in the Great British High Street competition based on what was there at this point in time. Granting this proposal would do nothing to enhance the economic viability of the Town Centre.

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. 6840 persons had signed a petition against this development and the loss of parking spaces;
- These units would generate the need for more parking. There would also be a further impact on parking in the Town arising from any extra house building and loss of the Westgate car park;
- Innage Lane Car Park – He questioned where HGVs would park if the HGV parking spaces were used for car parking on a Saturday. Recycling was on the increase and the loss of the waste recycling facilities would impact on those who regularly used them; and
- He urged refusal of the proposal.

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.

In the ensuing debate Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. If granted, some Members stressed the importance of displaying appropriate signage directing cars and pedestrians to and from Smithfield, Innage Lane and the Town Centre.

In response to questions, the Solicitor provided clarification relating to the existing Car Parking Management Agreement and reiterated that as the Management Agreement was not a lease or tenancy, forfeiture would not apply. The Principal Planner drew Members' attention to the extant planning permission and what could be built, and commented that the proposal would provide more link-shopping. She drew Members' attention to the suggested conditions which would ensure appropriate landscaping/tree planting and prevent the individual units being sub-divided and reduced in size.

RESOLVED:

That, as per the Officer's recommendation, delegated authority be granted to the Planning Services Manager to grant planning permission subject to:

- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report; and
- A Legal Agreement to secure a financial contribution towards increasing car parking capacity at Innage Lane and providing signage at Smithfield and Innage Lane to direct cars and pedestrians.

87 Buildings To The North Of Small Heath Farmhouse, Ashford Bank, Claverley, Wolverhampton (16/03673/COU)

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

Members had undertaken a site visit and had viewed the site, noted the infrastructure and surrounding road network, had approached the site via Danford Lane and exited via Aston Lane and assessed the impact of the proposals on the surrounding area.

The Principal Planner drew Members' attention to the additional information and the amendment to the recommended Conditions No. 8 and 9 relating to the operation hours and delivery and despatch times and as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting.

Mr R Cotham, representing Claverley Parish 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 Tina Woodward, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- As it was difficult to be precise as to what businesses would potentially be attracted to this rural location, it was difficult to predict the traffic levels which would be generated. The traffic generated by the potential businesses would funnel traffic movement through the residential area nearest to the site, with a knock-on effect on the narrow lanes, and in sections very narrow lanes, due to the nature of the sandstone cuttings in the lanes network, where there are limited passing places and no footways. The most direct routes from the B4176 and A458 into the village both had tight sandstone cuttings as one entered the village – there were other routes but they still involved the narrow lanes network. Both B1 and B8 activity on this site operating all year round would result in a cumulative effect on Claverley's rural roads network, which was coming under pressure from the increased size of cars, vans, waste collection vehicles and farm vehicles;
- Claverley had no shop and no bus service so the community was reliant on car journeys and items being delivered, including domestic heating oil and gas in many cases;
- The site occupied a relatively isolated, prominent location and as a result any industrial noise would be noticeable;
- This was not small-scale nor suitably located and so not appropriate for B1 and B8 use and would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS5; and
- If approved, appropriateness of the location to be given consideration -
 - highway improvements to the entrance to the site and the creation of a footway along the lane nearest to the entrance to the site would be welcomed;
 - appropriate planting scheme sympathetic to the rural landscape and to help screen the buildings;
 - car parking and a security system which had to be responded to in the event of a break-in or false alarms;
 - restrictions on the B8 use which would limit the access to items stored on site in line with paragraph 4.6 of the applicant's statement; and
 - if approved should be granted on a temporary basis.

Mrs A-M Brettell, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. In response to questions from Members, the Principal Planner and the Area Highways Development Control Officer (South) provided clarification on drainage, landscaping and traffic management.

RESOLVED:

That, as per the Officer's recommendation, planning permission be granted subject to:

- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report and as amended and set out in the Schedule of Additional Representations;
- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure an appropriate traffic management and HGV routing plan.
Reason: To protect and safeguard residential amenities; and
- Delegated authority be granted to Planning Officers to undertake discussions with the applicant regarding any additional appropriate landscaping/planting.

88 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 7 March 2017 be noted.

89 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, 4 April 2017 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: