



Committee and Date

South Planning Committee

10 January 2017

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2016

2.00 - 4.30 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, John Hurst-Knight, William Parr, Madge Shingleton, Tina Woodward and Cecilia Motley (Substitute) (substitute for Robert Tindall)

52 Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Robert Tindall (Substitute: Cecilia Motley).

At this juncture, the Chairman informed the meeting that Agenda item No. 11 (Hurst Barn, Clunton, Craven Arms, Shropshire, SY7 0JA – 16/03334/EIA) had been deferred and would be considered at a future meeting.

53 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Central Planning Committee held on 11 October 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to it being noted that at Minute No. 49, Councillor David Turner withdrew from the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on planning application 16/02910/FUL.

54 Public Question Time

- (i) Mr David Jones had submitted a question in accordance with Procedure Rule 14 (a copy of the question and the formal response is attached to the signed minutes).

Mr Jones asked the following supplementary question:

“Arising from the response to my question, **and** what is not contained in the Officer’s response. The response acknowledges that the word “however” in 6.3.2 of the recommendation is “not necessary” and inappropriate would be a better word. But the response does not point out that the analysis in 6.3 is

materially changed by this deletion. Nor does the response deal with two of the other paragraphs referred to in my question – 56 and 61 which heavily underlines the importance of good design and buildings, therefore I ask by “filling-in” have the Committee and the Parish Council considered in detail whether CS6 is compliant with Section 7 of the NPPF.”

It was subsequently agreed that a written response would be provided following the meeting.

- (ii) Ms Vivienne Baine had submitted a question in accordance with Procedure Rule 14 (a copy of the question and the formal response is attached to the signed minutes).

Ms Baine asked the following supplementary question:

“I have previously responded to the shortcomings in the Heritage report but am unclear from this response as to whether the Council consider the use of an experienced Conservation or Heritage Architect of relevance in the design of a building in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Conservation.”

In response, the Principal Planner replied as follows:

“Planning Officers look at all details submitted with a proposal, along with colleagues in various specialisms, and carry out site inspections in the consideration of applications in coming to a view. The use of an experienced Conservation or Heritage Architect is desirable, but cannot be insisted on and it is the content of what is provided which has to be considered rather than the author.”

- (iii) Mr John Lefley had submitted a question in accordance with Procedure Rule 14 (a copy of the question and the formal response is attached to the signed minutes).

Mr Lefley asked the following supplementary question:

“Whilst the Planning Officer’s response mentions information that is lacking or “does not address matters adequately” it does not seem to cover false or misleading information.”

In response, the Principal Planner replied as follows:

“All information and comments submitted with regard to planning applications are assessed and reviewed by experienced Officers/Technical Consultees; however there may be occasions when different parties may not agree with all the information submitted and this is something that would have to be assessed and a balanced judgement made.”

55 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 15/01850/FUL, Councillor David Turner declared that he was acquainted with the applicant and a principal objector and would leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

With reference to planning application 15/05096/FUL, Councillor David Turner declared that he was an associate of the applicant and would leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

With reference to planning applications to be considered at the meeting, Councillor Andy Boddington declared that he was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership.

With reference to planning applications to be considered at the meeting, Councillors Cecilia Motley and David Turner declared that they were members of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Transition Board.

56 Fox Studio, King Street, Much Wenlock (15/01850/FUL)

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 53, Councillor David Turner left the room during consideration of this item.

The Principal Planner introduced the application.

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.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in the minutes of the South Planning Committee meeting held on 11 August 2015 relating to materials, surface water drainage, programme of archaeological work, landscaping, Construction Method Statement and the removal of Permitted Development Rights.

57 Manor House Farm, Abdon, Craven Arms, SY7 9HZ (15/05096/FUL)

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 53, Councillor David Turner left the room during consideration of this item.

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 the previous day and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

Councillor D Brookes, representing Abdon and Heath 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 15.1) Councillor Cecilia Motley, 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 her statement, the following points were raised:

- The site sat within an extremely sensitive location and located within the higher reaches of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
- When viewed from above the proposal would be more visible within the landscape;
- Would not meet the affordable housing needs of the parish;
- There were already other outstanding extant permissions for barn conversions in the area; and
- With regard to the link block, she requested that further consideration should be given to the materials and design and suggested a reduction in the amount of glazing and the consideration of the use of local stone walling and slate tiling.

In the ensuing debate Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. In response to concerns expressed by Members, the Principal Planner suggested that an additional condition could be attached to prevent any vehicular access into the courtyard area.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation, subject:

- To the conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report;
- An additional condition to ensure the principal entrance to the property continues to be obtained from the western elevation and to prevent vehicular access within the courtyard area;
- An additional condition to ensure retention of the retaining wall; and
- An additional condition requiring submission of a scheme facilitating an amended and more sympathetic treatment for the link block with less fenestration and consideration of the use of stone walling and slate tiling.

58 Proposed Dwelling Adjacent 22 Park Lane, Shifnal, Shropshire, TF11 9HD (16/03128/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 that morning and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

In the ensuing debate Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be granted, as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

59 Parking Bays At Woodberry Close, Bridgnorth, Shropshire (16/03288/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 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.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1) Councillor John Hurst-Knight, 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:

- He expressed his support for the proposal;
- Further houses had been built on the sites of demolished garages and this parking scheme would be of benefit to all residents;
- It would reduce the obstruction of the highway and improve access for all users and emergency vehicles.

In the ensuing debate Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. The majority of Members expressed their disapproval of the scheme and commented that disabled people would prefer to park outside their own homes; residents would circumvent the bollards which would cause further damage to the grassed area; consideration should be given to a link-road or one-way system; and further consultation with residents, Bridgnorth Town Council and local Ward Councillors should be undertaken. Some Members expressed concern with regard to the impact on access for the emergency services. In response to comments, the Principal Planner explained that the installation of bollards could be done without planning permission and the location of them would be for the landowner to decide upon; as part of the demolition of the garages package it had been proposed that off-road parking would be provided; there would be no sustainable reason to refuse the proposal; and the proposal would constitute a neutral impact on emergency vehicles and residents.

RESOLVED:

That this application be deferred in order for the applicant, in consultation with residents, local Ward Councillors and Bridgnorth Town Council, to explore and consider alternative schemes.

(At this juncture, the meeting adjourned at 3:26 pm and reconvened at 3:32 pm.)

**60 Proposed Dwelling To The South Of Hopesay Farm Hopesay Shropshire
16/01597/FUL**

The Technical Specialist Planning 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 the previous day 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 N Allen, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Councillor Mrs C Clarke, representing Hopesay 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 15.1) Councillor David Evans, 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:

- This proposal had attracted lots of objections from the residents of Hopesay, the Parish Council and walkers who use the surrounding footpaths;
- The site fell within a Conservation Area and the AONB;
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the openness of the rural character of the settlement and would have a detrimental impact upon the natural beauty of the AONB;
- This was a corridor to wildlife; and the Woodland Trust had planted 400 trees within 150 yards of the site in a bid to attract wildlife; and
- A dwelling of red brick would have a significant impact upon the Conservation Area and the AONB.

At this juncture, the Chairman left the room and the Vice-Chairman took the chair for this item.

Mr N Williams, 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, and it was:

RESOLVED:

That, contrary to the Officer's recommendation, Planning Permission be refused, for the following reasons:

- Due to the siting, scale and design of the proposed dwelling, in particular the loss of the significant gap in the street scene and impact on views from the Shropshire Way; and the overbearing mass of the red brick built form, the proposed development would not make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness and would result in an adverse change, detracting from the character and appearance of the village, Conservation Area and its AONB setting. The proposal is therefore contrary to development plan policies CS6, CS17, MD2, MD12 and MD13 and paragraphs 58, 60, 64, 115 and 131 of the NPPF.

(The Chairman returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair.)

61 Wigley Farm, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 3DR (16/03014/EIA)

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 the previous day and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1) Councillor Andy Boddington, as local Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the proposal and then left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

In the ensuing debate Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be granted, as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

62 Hurst Barn, Clunton, Craven Arms, Shropshire, SY7 0JA (16/03334/EIA)

Deferred to a future meeting.

63 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 6 December 2016 be noted.

64 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, 10 January 2017 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: