

Date: Tuesday, 24 September 2019

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Shrewsbury/Oswestry Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Contact: Linda Jeavons, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257716
Email: linda.jeavons@shropshire.gov.uk

SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE

TO FOLLOW REPORT (S)

4 Minutes (Pages 1 - 10)

To confirm the minutes of the South Planning Committee meeting held on 28 August 2019. **TO FOLLOW**

Contact Linda Jeavons (01743) 257716.

This page is intentionally left blank



Committee and Date

Southern Planning Committee

24 September 2019

SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 28 August 2019

2.00 - 5.30 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 Andy Boddington, Simon Harris, Nigel Hartin, Richard Huffer, Cecilia Motley, Madge Shington, David Turner and Tina Woodward

24 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence was received from Councillor Robert Tindall.

25 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That subject to Councillor Evans being listed as Chairman in the list of those present and Minute No. 24 being amended as follows:

RESOLVED: That,

- (i) The Planning Enforcement Quarterly Report at 30 July 2019 be noted; and
- (ii) In future, the report should include the progress and/or outcome of any Judicial Review cases.

The minutes of the meeting of the South Planning Committee held on 28th July 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

26 Public Question Time

There were no public questions or petitions received.

27 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 applications 17/04221/FUL, 18/02529/FUL, 18/03093/FUL and 19/02201/FUL, Councillor David Turner declared that he was a member of The

Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Management Board. He confirmed that he had taken no part in any discussions relating to these applications.

With reference to planning application 17/04221/FUL Councillor Cecilia Motley declared that she was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Management Board. With reference to planning applications 18/02529/FUL and 19/02201/FUL, Councillor Motley declared that as Ward Members she would make a statement and leave the room during consideration of these applications.

28 Land East Of The School House, Hopton Cangeford, Shropshire (17/04421/FUL)

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

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

Mrs H Nash, local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Councillor B Norgrove, representing Stoke St Milborough 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 Cecilia Motley, local Ward Councillor, made a statement and left the table and took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- The proposed development was out of scale for the area, was obtrusive and would negatively impact on the existing community;
- This was not a genuine infill site;
- Access to the site was poorly positioned and obtrusive for neighbouring properties;
- Surrounding access roads were unsuitable for increased traffic usage;
- Concerns regarding water supply and drainage; and
- Lack of facilities within the existing settlement to support additional dwellings.

Mr T Ralphs, 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 the speakers. Members particularly noted:

- the positioning of the proposed dwellings on the site and the impact of this on the amenity of neighbouring properties;

- the lack of sustainable energy sources;
- the impact of further development on the existing community;
- the lack of identified housing need in the Hopton Cangeford;
- the design merits of the development;
- Positioning of access; and
- Definition of clusters set out in SAMDev and its flexibility.

A Member proposed deferral of the application to enable Officers to resolve the issues of the position of the access drive.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred to a future meeting to enable the applicant to reconsider the position of the access and relocation of the dwelling on plot 2.

29 Proposed Residential Development Land East Of Upper House Farm, Hopton Cangeford, Shropshire (18/02529/FUL)

The Consultant Planner introduced the application with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations. Members noted that this was an alternative proposal following the withdrawal of the previous application [17/04427/FUL] which was sited on the opposite side of the road following discussions with the Conservation Officer and Parish Council.

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

In response to a Member's question the Consultant Planner confirmed that although it was the developers stated intention to use the dwellings to provide accommodation for estate staff, no Section 106 agreement to this effect had been agreed.

Mr J Hallett, local resident, 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, local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table and took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- Recognised need for affordable homes in Parish;
- The proposed dwellings situated in open countryside;
- Improvement on previous application;
- Concerns over small proposed room size;
- Impact on number of residents on existing community; and
- Site concerns over elevations and position of nearby stream

Mr T Ralphs, 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 the speakers. Members expressed sympathy for the intention of the estate to provide homes for essential estate workers and reduce their travel time but expressed concern that this was not to be enforced with a Section 106 agreement preventing sale of the dwellings on the open market. Concerns were also raised regarding the small size of the dwellings.

RESOLVED:

Deferred to a future meetings to enable the applicant to review the proposed size of the dwellings and to consider entering into a Section 106 agreement to ensure that the dwellings are only occupied by essential workers on the applicant's estate.

30 Meadowtown Farm, Meadowtown, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY5 0DZ (18/03093/FUL)

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

Members noted that this application had previously been considered at the meeting on 30th July 2019, but deferred determination pending clarification and/or amendments to aspects of the application as set out in the minute of that meeting.

A site visit had been undertaken prior to the previous consideration of the application, where they had viewed the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

Ms N Harris, local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committee.

Councillor J Soper, representing Worthern with Shelve 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 Heather Kidd, local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table and took no part in the debate. During her statement the following points were made:

- Welcomed revised application showing proposed demolition of central barn;
- Concerns over impact of increase traffic on narrow local lanes and the access of large construction vehicles bringing and taking material from site; and
- Potential drainage and flooding issues not resolved.

Mr T Ralphs, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In the ensuing debate, Members consider the submitted plans and noted the comments of the speakers. Members expressed concern over the viability of the proposed development due to the amount of investment required to bring it forward. The lack of easy access to the site by occupiers of the development was noted and that there were not facilities within walking distance so all journeys to and from the site would have to be done using a vehicle which would lead to a significant increase in traffic on lanes with limited capacity, negatively impacting on the amenity of the local residents.

RESOLVED:

That, contrary to the Officer's recommendation, planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1) It is acknowledged that Meadowtown is part of a Community Cluster in the adopted Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan where open market housing development by infilling by no more than two dwellings per site and conversions may be acceptable on suitable sites. However, with regard to this proposal for four holiday let units and associated stables, Shropshire Core Strategy policy CS16 requires holiday accommodation to be in accessible locations served by a range of services and facilities. There are no such services and facilities in Meadowtown or within reasonable walking distance of the site. The roads between the site and other nearby settlements are generally narrow, have no pavement and are unlit. As such, they do not present an attractive route, particularly when it is dark. Consequently, this would not be a sustainable for the proposed holiday letting units, as occupants of the holiday let units would be highly reliant on the use of the private car to access services and facilities. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Core Strategy policy CS16, SAMDev Plan policy MD11 and the objective of achieving sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2) The proposed development would be likely to generate additional traffic movements over the local road network which exhibits narrowness, lack of passing places, and convoluted routing. As a consequence, the scale of the proposed development is likely to result in conditions that would be detrimental to highway safety for all road users, contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policy CS6 and paragraph 108 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

31 Proposed Development Land East Of Meadowbrook Close, Alveley, Shropshire (18/03172/FUL)

The Consultant Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displays, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations. Members attention was drawn to additional information presented in Late Representations.

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

Ms S Voysey, representing local residents and Alveley Green Belt Preservation Group, 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, local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took not part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement the following points were raised:

- Amendments to the original design and improve landscaping were welcomed;
- Concerns over the proposed orchard and potential issues with tree roots;
- Additional screening required to reduce stray lighting and disturbance to wildlife;
- Concerns regarding the future retention of the hedge forming the rear boundary of the dwellings; and
- Disturbance to local residents during construction of the site from delivery vehicles.

Mr H Pitt, the applicant, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In the ensuing debate, Members consider the submitted plans and the noted the comments of the speakers. Members welcomed the revised site layout and proposed landscaping and the provision of affordable housing. In answer to a Member's question, the applicant confirmed that he would retain responsibility for maintaining the culvert.

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
- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the properties as affordable dwellings.
- Delegated authority be granted to Officers to vary the wording of conditions 7 and 8 relating to drainage and landscaping.

32 Gutter Farm Wall Under Heywood, Church Stretton, Shropshire, SY6 7JA (19/02201/FUL)

The Planning Consultant introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

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

Mr C Varley, neighbouring resident, 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, 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 her statement, the following points were raised:

- Surprise at the amount of existing development on the site;
- Precarious access to the building, a different location could improve this;
- Intention to garage lorries was unusual;
- Proposed site would be exposed in winter;
- Proposed stabling seemed large for three horses;
- Identified Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, further confirmation required that development complies with Planning Policies CS5 and MD7B; and
- Confirmation that development complies with NPPF7.

Mr D Harthill, the applicant, 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 the speakers. Members debated the location of the application within the site and its impact on the surroundings and neighbouring properties, and access by vehicles using the building.

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.

33 13 Upper Linney Ludlow SY8 1EF19/02495/FUL

The Planning Consultant 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 had assessed the impact of a proposal on the surrounding area and neighbouring property.

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

Councillor R Pote, representing Ludlow 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 Andy Boddington, 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:

- Proposed development intrusive to neighbouring property;
- Concerns over 50mm gap between wall belonging to neighbouring property and proposed development leading possible weakening of back wall of property;
- Significant impact on amenity of neighbour to maintain an ancient and fragile wall;
- Planning Policies CS6 and MD2 contravened; and
- Negative impact on privacy enjoyed by neighbouring property.

Mr M Cawley, applicant, 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 the speakers. Members noted the severe impact of the proposal on the neighbouring property both in terms of reduced privacy, security and potential damage.

RESOLVED:

That, contrary to the Officer's recommendation, planning permission be refused for the following reason:

The proposed extension, by reason of the juxtaposition of the proposed rooflights and the first floor windows of the adjacent property immediately above, would result in mutual overlooking, harming the privacy of the properties. In addition, the location of the proposed extension would prejudice the proper maintenance of the rear wall of the immediately adjacent non – designated heritage asset due to the inaccessible narrow gap which would be formed. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS17; Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan policies MD2 and MD 13; and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

34 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 28 August 2019 be noted.

35 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, 24th September 2019, in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank