



**Committee and Date**

Central Planning Committee

1 March 2016

**CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2016**

**2.00 - 4.26 pm in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND**

**Responsible Officer:** Linda Jeavons

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

**Present**

Councillor Vernon Bushell (Chairman)

Councillors Ted Clarke (Vice Chairman), Andrew Bannerman, Tudor Bebb, Dean Carroll, Roger Evans, Amy Liebich, Pamela Moseley and Kevin Pardy

**79 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Peter Nutting and David Roberts.

**80 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:**

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Central Planning Committee held on 3 December 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**81 Public Question Time**

There were no public questions, statements or petitions received.

**82 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 15/04910/OUT, Councillor Andrew Bannerman stated that he was a member of the Planning Committee of Shrewsbury Town Council. He indicated that his views on any proposals when considered by the Town Council had been based on the information presented at that time and he would now be considering all proposals afresh with an open mind and the information as it stood at this time.

With reference to planning application 15/04917/FUL, Councillor Roger Evans stated that he may have commented on this application when it had been considered by Longden Parish Council. As local Ward Member he would make a statement and then leave the table and not vote.

**83 Land at Great Ryton, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (15/03259/REM)**

The Team Manager – Development Management introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations. He confirmed that the only matters for consideration were the appearance, scale and landscaping.

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.

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

Councillor Mrs S Mackay, representing Ryton Parish Council, spoke against 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. Members acknowledged that the principle of development had been agreed but expressed concern with regard to the scale, design and elevations of both the dwellings and garages. The area had not been designated as being part of a Hub or Community Cluster so was in open countryside and the original application had been granted when Shropshire Council could not demonstrate a five-year land supply. If granted, it was suggested that Permitted Development Rights should be withdrawn and planting/landscaping and working hours should be conditioned.

In response to questions and comments, the Team Manager – Development Management reiterated that being designated as being in open countryside in SAMDev could not be used as a reason for refusal; scale could be addressed but would be difficult to defend on appeal; conditions attached to any permission would ensure the landscaping would be done strictly in accordance with approved plans; and working hours on site could be conditioned.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application be deferred to a future meeting to enable further consideration to be given by the applicants to the design, scale and elevations of both the dwellings and garages and further information to be submitted with regard to the proposed planting and landscaping.

**84 Proposed Residential Development Land South of Christ Church, Harley Road, Cressage, Shrewsbury (15/04580/FUL)**

The Team Manager – Development Management 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 that morning and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

Councillor R Tipper, representing Cressage Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees and Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Claire Wild spoke on the proposal but did not vote. During which she raised the following points:

- Original application had been for 15 parking spaces and three houses and this new application would be for eight dwellings and six parking spaces, so would see a reduction in the number of community parking spaces available for those attending the Church. If granted she requested that consideration be given to securing parking provision for churchgoers; and
- This current application constituted overdevelopment of the site and would have a detrimental impact on the quality of life for the residents of the village.

Mr O De Weijer, 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, the Team Manager – Development Management explained that the report had acknowledged that this would be a departure from the recently adopted SAMDev but there were other considerations that would outweigh the primacy of the Development Plan; there was an extant permission for this site; the proposal would sit within the heart of the village and be contained within the surrounding built form so would not extend out into open countryside; although there was no requirement to provide community parking six parking spaces would be provided; Cressage had been identified as a place for development so the principle of development had already been established; would constitute an over provision of affordable housing and meet an identified need; and to help stave off development in open countryside Shropshire Council would have to maintain and demonstrate a supply and delivery of housing.

**RESOLVED:**

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

- A S106 Legal Agreement to secure Plots 7 and 8 as affordable rent units; and
- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

**85 Land South of Calverton Way, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (15/04910/OUT)**

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer 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 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.

Mr C Burge, representing Radbrook Community Centre, School and Surgery, spoke against 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. Members noted that landscaping would be dealt with at the Reserved Matters stage.

**RESOLVED:**

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

- A S106 Legal Agreement to secure an appropriate affordable housing contribution;
- An additional condition to ensure the adequate provision of car parking spaces to serve the apartments in perpetuity; and
- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, subject to the Construction Method Statement being amended to include the construction and/or demolition working hours on site.

Reason: to protect the health and wellbeing of residents in the area.

**86 Little Vinnals Bungalow, Long Lane End Of To The Cottage Junction, Longden, Shrewsbury, SY5 8HF (15/04917/FUL)**

The Team Manager – Development Management 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 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.

Councillor P Carter, representing Longden Parish Council, spoke against the recommendation to refuse in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

By virtue of his declaration at Minute No. 82 and in accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1) Councillor Roger Evans, as 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, the following points were raised:

- The proposal would represent small scale development and would be in keeping with the surrounding area;
- Would enable the applicant to remain in their home and care for her husband;
- There was a large house being built adjacent to this site and there were a further two planning applications in the area;
- There were two businesses in the area, which, up until recent times, had a thriving income from tourism;
- Policies were there for guidance only; and
- Would be in accordance with paragraph 28 of the NPPF and Core Strategy policy CS5 and would support sustainable rural tourism.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Some Members suggested deferral in order that the applicant could give consideration to the use of a caravan. Some Members expressed concern with regard to the design, although others considered that given other buildings in the area, this proposal would not be too egregiously hostile in the landscape and the comments of Shropshire Fire & Rescue Service.

In response to questions/comments from Members, the Team Manager – Development Management drew Members' attention to paragraph 6 of the report (Principle of Development); provided clarification on the definition of a caravan; and reiterated that this was an isolated location in open countryside.

**RESOLVED:**

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

- The principle of a holiday let in an isolated open countryside location accessed via a shared private shared lane is not considered to be acceptable. This proposed development would not be related to any existing tourism business at the site, would not involve the conversion of any existing suitable

building, and would be in an isolated location within open countryside away from any settlements. The scheme is considered to represent a sporadic and unsustainable form of development which is detrimental to the character and setting of the surrounding open countryside. As such it is considered that the development is contrary to policies CS5, CS6, CS13,CS16 and CS17 of the Shropshire Core Strategy and policy MD11 of the adopted SAMDev (Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management) Development Plan as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.

**87 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions**

**RESOLVED:**

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the Central area as at 4 February 2016 be noted.

**88 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, 3 March 2016 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed ..... (Chairman)

Date: .....