



Date: Thursday, 10 September 2015

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Linda Jeavons, Committee Officer  
Tel: 01743 257716  
Email: [linda.jeavons@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto:linda.jeavons@shropshire.gov.uk)

## **CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting

**This page is intentionally left blank**

<b>CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS</b>		
<b>Date: Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> September 2015</b>		
<b>NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting</b>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9.	14/00254/FUL      Leylands, Bayston Hill	Case Officer
<p>Bullet point 3 of para 2.4 should state that the original application proposed one (not three affordable dwellings) and eight 4-bed open market dwellings totalling nine.</p>		
9.	14/00254/FUL	Bayston Hill Parish Council:
<p>Thank you for notification of the amendments to the above planning application. Bayston Hill Parish Council would like to take this opportunity to reiterate their OBJECTION to the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p><b>BAYSTON HILL DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY</b></p> <p>As previously mentioned Bayston Hill Parish Council has worked hard in conjunction with residents and Shropshire County Council in order to fulfil the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement to allocate sufficient land suitable for development. This work was included in the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan which was submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 1 August 2014 and no changes have been suggested to the Bayston Hill element of this document by the Inspector.</p> <p>The proposed site was not included in the SAMDev as a suitable site as it sits outside of the recognised development boundary and would involve building on a field that forms part of the gap between Bayston Hill and surrounding settlements, including Shrewsbury. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that planning should be “genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area.” This application is contrary to the SAMDEV Local Plan, the Shrewsbury and Atcham Local Plan and Bayston Hill Parish Plan and is one of several recently submitted that sit outside of the development boundary to take advantage of Shropshire County Council’s deficit in its five year housing land supply and submission of the SAMDev plan.</p> <p><b>ROAD SAFETY</b></p> <p>Bayston Hill Parish Council maintains that the proposed location for the vehicular access to this site is extremely unsafe, concerns that were shared by the majority of the Central Planning Committee when it considered this application. However, at the time it was approved Shropshire Council was under intense pressure to close the deficit in the five year housing land supply and the SAMDev plan was not considered to be in a strong enough position to offer any weight to the development boundary. Having now reached the five year supply and with the Inspector not having issued any modifications to the Bayston Hill element of the emerging SAMDev policy, this position has changed.</p>		

## HOUSING MIX

It is acknowledged that the developer has made an effort to address the Parish Council's concerns by reducing the number of four bedroom properties on this site so that the mix is now 5 four bedroom and 4 three bedroom properties. However this does not satisfy the local need for retirement and starter homes, which has been further reiterated during consultation for a central village location which is soon to be submitted for outline planning permission and will provide at least 60 additional properties.

## CONCLUSION

Bayston Hill Parish Council remains consistent with its policy of objecting to planning applications that sit outside of the development boundary and continues to consider each application it receives on its own merits, having already exceeded its SAMDev agreed commitment of 60 new properties with another 60 potential houses on the old Oakland's school site.

In light of the amendments yet to be approved by the Central Planning Committee the Parish Council was disappointed to see that the developer has already started work on the site and would like to reiterate their OBJECTION to planning application 14/00254/FUL. It is hoped that a re-appearance at the Central Planning Committee will enable further discussion about the very real safety issues related to this application. It is therefore requested that this planning application now be refused.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
12.	14/02239/OUT Land East Of Bicton Lane Bicton	Bicton PC

Bicton Parish Council strongly objects to this proposal.

1, There are 59 comments on the planning portal, 2 neutral, 1 support and 56 objections. All of the objections still apply to this amended application.

2, 204 people signed the petition against this proposal.

3, The decision to allow this development rode roughshod over these valid local objections.

4, In retrospect, the weight given to NPPF was wrong. SAMDev always was the correct planning policy for Shropshire.

5, SAMDev is now all but approved, it is not too late to correct this error that was caused by the failure of NPPF to understand the sustainable nature of Shropshire Council's SAMDev.

6, Other applications in Bicton have been refused, by the planning officers, with delegated powers, on the sole grounds that they were outside SAMDev.

7, One notable refusal is identical to this application. It is 14/03319/OUT, Land East of the Cottage, Calcott Lane, Bicton. A similar number of houses was applied for, on green fields. The Shropshire Council Planning Officer refused this application giving the following reasons. Every one of these reasons applies exactly to the present application under consideration. Except that SAMDev now has even more weight and NPPF has even less weight.

## 7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 Development of this site would be contrary to both adopted saved SABC policy and adopted Core strategy CS4, CS5 and CS6 and the emerging SAMDev proposals for

Bicton and Shrewsbury. The site is considered to be situated in open countryside and as the proposal does not fall within any of the exceptions set out in CS5 or any of the special circumstances set out within the NPPF the scheme would result in new housing in the countryside that would be in conflict with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF. It is accepted that limited weight can be given to SAMDev as it has not yet been subject to full examination and there are outstanding objections to site allocations. In addition there is a difference of opinion on whether the Council can demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and whether housing policies should be considered up to date. However regardless of the position on the supply of housing land, paragraph 49 of the NPPF is clear that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

7.2 Having regard to the three dimensions of sustainable development whilst it is considered that there would be some economic benefits these would be limited. It is not considered that there would be any significant social or environmental benefits but only harm due to the urbanising effect on the rural character of the area, the reliance of future residents on the private car, and conflict with the social role of sustainability to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities with accessible local services. Given that the 3 roles of sustainability are mutually dependent, it is considered that the proposal would not result in sustainable development for which the Framework indicates there is a presumption in favour.

13.	14/02964/OUT	NW of Montford Bridge	Case Officer
-----	--------------	-----------------------	--------------

The applicant is Mr James Wilcock and not Shropshire Homes Ltd as incorrectly stated in the report.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
14.	14/03259/OUT: Development East of Wilcot Lane.	Member of the public

The Central Planning Committee is required to revisit its decision to grant outline planning permission for the housing development, because of the need to give increased weight to SAMDEV guidance The Committee is asked to consider the following:

1. SAMDEV requires development to be restricted to the allocated site (Land West of Holyhead Road) and infill or groups of houses on suitable sites within the village.
2. This proposed development is neither infill nor within the village. It is an open countryside development that would extend the village, with the potential for further development beyond the existing village.
3. It is not a suitable site, as access to services is via an extremely narrow lane with a dangerous blind spot and no passing points. The anticipated extra vehicle movements will increase the risk of accidents to walkers, cyclists, and horse riders.

Reference: Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDEV) Plan Pre-Selection Draft (Final Plan): Council 27 February 2014 – Page 196

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
16.	14/03357/OUT Land opposite The Crescent, Nesscliffe	Member of the public
<p>At Central Planning Committee Meeting – 11 December 2014. The committee supported the Officer’s submission but did raise concerns over the size of the application (indicative housing 39 properties) which was clearly in contravention of the wishes of the community. The community views are evidenced in the Parish Plan, The Housing Survey 2011, and SAMDEV.</p> <p>The Planning Officer reminds the Central Planning Committee that when reconsidering their decision, much greater weight has to be given to SAMDEV. For Nesscliffe, SAMDEV provides the following guidance for housing development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is requirement for approximately 30 additional dwellings over the period to 2026.</li> <li>2. Individual developments should be restricted to a maximum of 10 houses.</li> <li>3. Housing development should be confined to the allocated site (land West of Holyhead Road), to be supplemented by infill or groups of houses within the village.</li> </ol> <p>This application is neither infill nor within the existing village and has single-handed exceeded the number of properties identified in SAMDEV.</p> <p>The committee is asked to change their decision of December 2014 to one of refusal. The committee is also requested to consider the cumulative effect of the other six applications currently being processed or already approved in outline form. Should all be granted permission to develop, Nesscliffe will see the current 150 households joined by 99 new households. Clearly, SAMDEV has another 11 years to run, with prospect of many more applications to develop and further detrimental change the character and appearance of the village.</p>		