

Committee and Date

South Planning Committee

1 August 2017

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2017 2.00 - 3.12 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 Andy Boddington, Gwilym Butler, Simon Harris, Nigel Hartin, Richard Huffer, William Parr, Madge Shineton, Robert Tindall, Tina Woodward and Cecilia Motley (Substitute) (substitute for David Turner)

13 Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor David Turner (Substitute: Cecilia Motley).

14 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the South Planning Committee held on 6 June 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following additional bullet point being added to the resolution at Minute No. 10:

• To aid the decision-making process, any sites for abstruse applications be marked and pegged-out accordingly prior to any site visit being made.

15 **Public Question Time**

There were no public questions or petitions received.

16 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 16/03628/FUL, Councillor David Evans declared that he had previously rented this site and was well-acquainted with the applicant.

17 Former Poultry Unit Site, Corfton, Shropshire, SY7 9LD (16/03628/FUL)

By virtue of his declaration at Minute No. 16, Councillor David Evans left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

It was **RESOLVED:** That Councillor Gwilym Butler be elected as Chairman for 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 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 which detailed an amendment to the recommended condition No. 2 and an additional condition.

Members noted the statement from Diddlebury Parish Council circulated prior to the meeting.

Mr S Davies, representing local residents, 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 Cecilia Motley, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement. She 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:

- An application for this site first came before Diddlebury Parish Council in 2016. Since then the applicant's agent had attended Parish Council meetings to present the plans and by withdrawing and resubmitting revised plans had clearly sought to meet and mitigate the concerns of residents and the Parish Council. The final iteration of this application had not come before the Parish Council for determination, although a previous iteration for eight rather than seven houses had been turned down on the chair's casting vote;
- The principal concern of the Parish Council and residents had arisen over the fact that Corfton, as part of a wider cluster, would exceed its stated limit of 10 houses, bearing in mind that five permissions had already been granted for individual dwellings. Officers had no problem with the extra houses proposed, bearing in mind that Shropshire had to sustain the five year housing supply. However, she suggested that Members may wish to consider this in terms of impact on the settlement of Corfton along with the points raised by Planning Policy in the final paragraph of their submission as set out in paragraph 4.1.9 of the report;
- Infilling The boundary hedge-line was very clearly designated and it was actually a much larger site than would appear when looking down on it from the main road;

- Drainage Concerns had been raised by those who knew the site well. She suggested that Members might want to consider the introduction of semi-permeable surfaces rather than hard standing;
- Design and materials It could be argued that the scheme had been designed to complement the settlement of Corfton. She drew attention to the views of the Conservation Officer who had indicated that the setting would not be harmed and the dwelling designs were traditional and would reflect the local vernacular and rural character of the site;
- Affordable housing A previous application had made provision for one affordable dwelling and this had not been replicated in further iterations, presumably because the proposal would bring a brownfield site into housing use. There is demand for more affordable housing in all divisions but the Corvedale had achieved a considerable number of consents on single plot affordable exception site dwellings because they went to local people. It was easier to get support for exception site dwellings rather than housing association affordables; and
- This site was an eyesore and the application proposed a solution it could be argued that housing was more acceptable than other potential uses for a brownfield site, eg industrial units or modern poultry units.

Mr J Stevenson, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In the ensuing debate, Members noted the comments of all speakers and considered the submitted plans. Members noted that the use of semi-permeable surfaces rather than hard-standing could be covered by the additional condition as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters; and expressed their disappointment regarding the lack of affordable housing provision. In response to questions from Members, the Principal Planner provided clarification insofar as he could regarding CIL and affordable housing contributions/policy.

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
- The amended condition No. 2 and the additional condition as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters.

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

18 The Glen Cottage, 6 Worthen, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY5 9JH (17/00448/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 noted the comments of all speakers and considered the submitted plans.

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
- The following informative:

"The Committee noted on the site visit ash trees on the site whose root systems will be assisting with stabilising the land where there is a drop to the stream. They wish to make the observation that these trees need to be managed carefully so that the ability of the roots to continue with this stability function is not compromised by the trees becoming too big."

19 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 4 July 2017 be noted.

20 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, 1 August 2017 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: