



CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 3 April 2014

2.00 - 5.58 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 252738

Present

Councillor Vernon Bushell (Chairman)

Councillors Ted Clarke (Vice Chairman), Andrew Bannerman, Dean Carroll, Miles Kenny, Jane MacKenzie, Pamela Moseley, Peter Nutting (up to and including Minute No. 157) and Kevin Parry

148 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors T Bebb and D Roberts.

149 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Central Planning Committee held on 6 March 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to it being noted that Councillor Dean Carroll had submitted his apologies.

150 Public Question Time

There were no public questions.

151 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 to be considered at this meeting, Councillors A Bannerman, P Nutting and Mrs J MacKenzie stated that they were members of the Planning Committee of Shrewsbury Town Council. They indicated that their views on any proposals when considered by the Town Council had been based on the information presented at that time and they 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 14/00190/OUT, Councillor P Nutting stated that a member of his family lived in close vicinity to the application site and, for reasons of bias, he would leave the room during consideration of this item and not vote.

152 Residential Development Site Land Off Falkland Road, Dorrington, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (13/02776/OUT)

With reference to Minute Nos. 128 and 140, the Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that this application had been refused on 6 February 2014 (Minute No. 128) for the reasons set out at paragraph 2.1 of the report. A report setting out the risks of refusing the scheme was put to the subsequent meeting on 6 March 2014 (Minute No. 140) but was deferred in order that a reconsultation exercise could be undertaken with all properties with a boundary adjoining the revised site boundary. The report presented to Members at this meeting provided guidance in respect of the likely implications of refusing the application for the reasons set out at paragraph 2.1 of the report. The report also set out further additional representations received from Condover Parish Council and Shropshire Council's Public Protection Officers in respect of sewage treatment works. The Planning Officer continued to recommend approval of the proposal.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting.

Members had undertaken a site visit on two previous occasions and had assessed the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

Mr M Pritchard, on behalf of local residents, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The proposed route of the new footpath would take people further away from amenities and pedestrians, including children, would prefer to take the shortcut along the pavement that ran alongside the A49;
- The proposed new footpath would put people in conflict with vehicles where it enters the Lower Fold. The Lower Fold was used by residents and breakdown vehicles and was barely wide enough for vehicles and had no footpath;
- There was potential danger to children owing to the close proximity of the sewage treatment plant and a report from DEFRA stated that the planning of new residential housing should take in to consideration the location of sewage treatments plants; and
- The access to and from the A49 was notoriously dangerous and many fatal accidents had occurred.

Councillor E Marvin, representing Condover Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The proposed new footpath connects to Lower Fold via a narrow lane and constituted a serious danger, especially with an increased footfall which the new development would generate;
- The access along the A49 was dangerous and the proposed new footpath did little to alleviate the dangers for school children going to and from school;
- Consultation had not been achieved with people living on The Fold and the proposed footpath would cut through a resident's property; and
- The proposal would be contrary to the robust Dorrington Village Design Statement.

Councillor T Barker, the local Ward Councillor, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- He supported the previous concerns regarding the proposed new footpath;
- This was an outline planning application and there would be no guarantee that it would increase the housing land supply but would only serve to increase the value of the land. However, he acknowledged that Shropshire Council was overdue with its five year land supply. He commented that any benefits made from the building of homes to create a stimulus to the economy would be short-term;
- Because of the limited employment opportunities in the area people would look elsewhere for jobs. This would mean that people would have to drive to and from the area to Telford, Shrewsbury etc; and
- He urged refusal of the proposal until the footpath issue and concerns had been resolved.

Mr P Fenwick, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Following the comments made by Members of this Committee at a previous meeting the applicant had agreed to provide a separate footpath which would avoid the need for pedestrians to use the footpath running alongside the A49, and agreement for this had been reached with appropriate landowners;
- The proposed dwellings would be in easy reach of all services and approximately 45% of the village of Dorrington lay on the eastern side of the A49;;
- The road to Lower Fold serviced very few dwellings;
- Severn Trent Water had confirmed that the number of vehicles needing access to the sewage treatment plant on a weekly basis was minimal and the plant was and would continue to be securely fenced off;
- There had been no objections from Shropshire Council Highway Officers and other consultees.

In the ensuing debate, Members continued to express their concerns with regard to highway safety along the A49, commented that the size and speed of vehicles using

the road had never been monitored and suggested that many vehicles were breaking the speed limit. They commented that the proposal was opportunistic and contrary to the Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev) and acknowledged the hard work of Condover Parish Council in producing a robust Design Statement and the lack of a five year land supply.

In response to comments from speakers and Members, the Planning Officer explained that the issue of the footpath, as raised by Members of this Committee, had now been addressed and the pedestrian access through Lower Fold would provide an alternative means of access; Shropshire Council's Public Protection Officers, Highway Officers and the Highway Agency had raised no objections; the original proposal had been for 28 properties; as the A49 came under the jurisdiction of the Highways Agency no guarantee could be given as to when the pedestrian crossing would be installed, however, it had been planned for and included in the programming schedule; a condition attached to any permission would ensure that the footway would be maintained and lit to a good standard at all times; whilst the section at the end of The Fold referred to as Brookfield did not form part of the adopted highway it was registered on the National Street Gazetteer; and drew Members' attention to "Connecting Shropshire" and the planned rollout of Broadband throughout the County.

In response to comments from Members, the Area Planning Manager reiterated that refusal would be extremely difficult to defend at appeal; the applicant had now provided an alternative route to that of crossing the A49; and at some stage a crossing across the A49 would be provided

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation, subject to:

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution;
- A public footway across 'Lower Fold';
- The Area Planning Manager be granted delegated authority to ensure the footway across 'Lower Fold' be lit and maintained to a good standard at all times; and
- The conditions set out in Appendix 2 to the report.

153 Land Between Mousecroft Lane and Longden Road, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (13/03920/OUT)

With reference to Minute No. 118, the Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that this application had been deferred at the 9 January 2014 meeting for further negotiations in respect of the number of dwellings, the provision of recreation and leisure facilities and highway improvement works. Subsequently, the agent had confirmed that the scheme would now deliver up to a maximum of 175 dwellings. The location and amount of open space would be considered at the Reserved Matters stage, and Shrewsbury Town Council had expressed an interest in

developing the play and open space facilities subject to further negotiations with themselves and the developer.

With reference to the drawings displayed, the Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the Highway improvement works. These works included the installation of a mini island in place of a T-junction along with the installation of a traffic signal controlled crossroads with push-button controlled pedestrian/cycle Toucan crossings at the Longden Road/Roman Road island. The results of the Transport Assessment by Mouchel had shown that the traffic signal junction would operate more efficiently than the current roundabout and was considered to be the best option when balancing out the needs of all road users, particularly students walking and cycling to the adjacent schools. This scheme would contribute approximately £525k towards the local highway network along this corridor. However, he explained that this was a Shropshire Council responsibility which would be required irrespective of this development. Local residents and Members had expressed concerns relating to the timing of the traffic surveys, particularly as it had been carried out in July 2013 at a time when all Year 6 students had left. Accordingly, the developer had conducted a new survey in February 2014 and had compared the data collected in recent surveys carried out by Shropshire Council, which had shown that the new survey had been in-line with the original. Further consideration had been given to the potential for increased traffic movements along Stanley Lane and Meole Village. However, the local Highway Authority had maintained the opinion that there would be no noticeable increase in vehicular movements for the following reasons:

- A traffic calming scheme and 20 mph zone, including speed cushions, had been installed during the summer holidays outside Meole Brace School on Stanley Lane;
- The existing constraints at Upper Road/Roman Road at peak times made this route unattractive as a 'rat-run'. Longden Road, whilst experiencing peak time delays, offered reliable journey times and, even if traffic signals were installed on the Upper Road junction only, the reliability of turning movements on to Roman Road would be improved. Therefore, Longden Road would be the desired route; and
- While it was accepted that some traffic would travel along Mousecroft Lane to access the A5 it was not considered to be as attractive due to the narrow rural nature of the lane. However, in acknowledgement of concerns raised, it was proposed to introduce a 30 mph speed limit or a 'Quiet Lane' scheme.

In response to the concerns expressed from the Meole Brace and Priory schools regarding blue light emergency responses from the ambulance hub, the Planning Officer explained that the introduction of 175 houses would have no impact on vehicle speeds nor should it impact on student safety. It was acknowledged that it would not be desirable for blue light response vehicles to be travelling past the school at peak times but the drivers were fully trained professionals. A meeting with the schools to discuss and explore the potential to deliver a school zone had been agreed.

In conclusion, the Planning Officer explained that a request to travel down Nobold Lane during the site visit had not been possible.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting.

Mrs G Kelsey, on behalf of many local residents and organisations, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- She expressed concern that the mini-roundabout would not address the issue of the high volume of traffic already using what was already a busy road; traffic assessment data had not been shared; and the hazard of ambulances responding to emergencies had been justified by virtue of the drivers being fully trained professionals;
- There were other Brownfield sites available;
- 175 dwellings would generate over 300 vehicle movements;
- Due to the height of the water table the site had been flooded and waterlogged for months and this occurred every year; and
- She urged refusal until improvements had been made to the highway infrastructure.

Councillor M Owen, local Ward Councillor, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The planning reforms were putting pressure on councils to disregard democracy, and Councillors were being forced to approve planning applications that they would have previously refused;
- The Planning Authority should look to use Brownfield sites rather than Greenfield sites;
- No mention had been made with regard to Nobold Lane;
- The alterations to the cemetery island would not be sufficient to cope with the current volume of traffic let alone an increase in traffic that this proposed development would generate; and
- The report did not fully address the many issues raised and congestion and grid lock was already there.

Councillor R Evans, Ward Councillor for the adjoining Longden Ward, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- He drew attention to the concerns of the Parish Council and reiterated his own concerns with regard to highway safety;
- He considered that the proposals would do little to address highway concerns. There had been no mention of Nobold Lane which was narrow and he considered that the use of this lane would increase; and
- Other applications for 80-100 homes were in the offing for this area

Mr I Trew, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The concerns expressed by Members at a previous meeting had now been reviewed and addressed;
- The Planning Officer was recommending approval;
- A planning balance should be taken weighing any benefits against any harm; and
- Highway Officers and Consultees had raised no objections.

In response to comments, the Senior Specialist – Planning Policy explained that this was one of Shropshire Council's approved sites and was now at the next stage of the SAMDev process; Brownfield sites were being prioritised but Greenfield sites were also required to help deliver the number of homes; and Shropshire Council had never put forward a proposal for the adjoining land nor a direct link to the by-pass.

In response to comments, the Planning Officer explained that the amount and location of open space provision would be determined at a later date when the exact housing numbers were known. In the absence of the Area Highways Development Control Manager (Central), who had submitted his apologies and was unable to attend the meeting because of prior commitments, the Planning Officer further explained that 'quiet lanes' were rural roads or networks of minor rural roads appropriate for shared use by a range of users, including walkers, cyclists, horse riders and other vehicles, and, where necessary, appropriate signage should be erected and traffic calming measures suitable for the size and character of the road installed.

In the ensuing debate, Members noted the comments of all speakers and continued to express their own concerns relating to highway safety, particularly with regard to the close proximity of the two schools to the site. They acknowledged that the site had been included in the final draft of the SAMDev process; and appropriate drainage conditions would be determined at the reserved matters stage. A Member requested that consideration be given to the provision of a footpath/cycleway along Longden Road.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the developer contributions as set out in the Shropshire Council Policy response detailed in the report and to the conditions as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, the Area Planning Manager be given delegated authority to grant planning permission in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

154 Development Land Opposite The Crescent, Nesscliffe, Shrewsbury (13/04757/OUT)

The Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that this was an outline application with all matters, excluding access, reserved for later approval.

The site was located in an area of open countryside on the edge of Nesscliffe, had been promoted as a Community Hub and had been allocated under SAMDev as a suitable site for 15 dwellings. The aspiration of Nesscliffe Parish Council had been for 30 dwellings in total with developments being up to a maximum of 10 two-three bedroomed houses on any one site. He further explained that the proposal was considered to be sustainable and at this point in time a five year land supply could not be demonstrated. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, indicative layout and proposed access arrangements.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting, which detailed further comments from the agent.

In the ensuing debate, Members acknowledged that the site had been allocated under SAMDev, but expressed concerns with regard to the junction to The Crescent and objected to the design and particularly the straight lines and sharp 90° bends. Members noted that the lack of Broadband was not a material planning consideration.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure affordable housing and to the conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

155 Bicton Hall, Bicton Lane, Bicton, Shrewsbury SY3 8EU (13/04790/FUL)

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. He suggested an amendment to the wording of Condition No. 6 to ensure that a schedule of work relating to the repair of the wall should be approved prior to the occupancy of any dwelling. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

Mr P Anderson, Clerk to Bicton Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The development would not be sustainable;
- The proposal would be contrary to Bicton Parish Council's SAMDev Plan;
- He was concerned that a further application for two further dwellings would follow;
- Approval of the proposal would set a precedent;
- He acknowledged the constraints Members were currently under due to the lack of a five year land supply but commented that Bicton Parish Council had worked extremely hard to produce its SAMDev policy. He urged Members to

send a strongly worded letter of complaint with regard to the five year land supply to the Secretary of State.

Mr R Mills, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The proposal had been amended to take account of concerns;
- The number of dwellings had been reduced from four to two and drew Members' attention to the comments of the Shropshire Council's Conservation Officer as detailed in the report;
- All external buildings, including the proposed carports had been removed, which would mean minimal change to the appearance of the external wall;
- The access point into the wall would be handed from west to the east so as to take activity away from third parties. The point of access from the public highway however could not be closed as it was an existing access and served other land uses. Shropshire Council's Highways Development Control had noted the betterment of widening the existing access;
- The proposal constituted sustainable development as detailed in the report at 6.1.7 to 6.1.10;
- This form of development had long been widely used to fund the retention and repair of significant heritage assets through the United Kingdom;
- The dwellings would not be taller than the existing walls, so there would be virtually no visual difference to the setting of the walled garden within the adjacent landscape, thus ensuring that this aspect of its heritage value was not compromised;
- The contemporary design had been achieved following consultation with appropriate Shropshire Council Officers; and
- Significant funding would be made available through CIL and the affordable housing contribution to the benefit of other development plan objectives.

In response to questions from Members, the Area Planning and Building Control Manager explained that the design would be of a modern design, the applicant intended to use modern materials and as a minimum would have to meet Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, and confirmed that a condition removing permitted development rights would be attached to any permission.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation, subject to:

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the relevant affordable housing contribution; and
- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, subject to Condition No. 6 being amended to read:

"A schedule of work relating to the repair and alteration of the walled garden shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to

the works commencing. Work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule prior to the occupancy of any dwelling hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory preservation of the wall.”

156 Dorset House, Dorset Street, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY1 2JB (14/00092/OUT)

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and explained that this was an outline application with all matters reserved for later approval. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, indicative layout, access and parking arrangements.

Councillor A Mosley, local Ward Councillor, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Both he and Shrewsbury Town Council opposed the proposal;
- The proposal would be detrimental to the Conservation Area and would impact on the visual amenities of the area;
- Car parking was already a big problem in the area; and
- The proposal would breach a wall of great significance in Donkey Alley.

Mr Biddlecombe, applicant, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- He was aware that this was a Conservation Area and would use appropriate materials; and
- Hedging would be erected between the two properties and the proposal would not impact on the view for people walking across the Castle Walk,

In response to comments and questions, the Area Planning and Building Control Manager explained that this was a Conservation Area and any development should preserve or enhance the nature of the area; content drawings could not be requested at this stage but Members could request that any matters reserved for later approval be determined by Committee rather than be delegated to Officers; and if permission was granted any purchaser would be aware of the limited parking.

In the ensuing debate, Members expressed differing views. Some commented and expressed concerns that the proposal would be to the detriment of the area; it was already a high density area; parking was already a problem; and at times emergency vehicles would have problems accessing the area. Other Members supported the proposal and considered that the site would lend itself to a small property and there would be no sustainable defensible reason for refusal.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation, subject to:

- That any matters reserved for later approval be determined by this Committee.

(The meeting adjourned at 4.31 pm and reconvened at 4.36 pm.)

157 Land At Jubilee Farm, Church Road, Dorrington, Shrewsbury, SY5 7JL (13/00188 OUT)

With reference to Minute No. 144, the Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that this application had been deferred at the previous meeting in order that the implications of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) released on the 6 March 2014 could be assessed prior to any decision being made. The PPG provided a streamlined version of other Government guidance, which had now been cancelled; however, this had not changed the status of the NPPF. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location of the site. He confirmed that the site was located outside of the Dorrington village boundary.

Members had undertaken a site visit prior to the previous meeting and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

Councillor E Marvin, representing Condover Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Condover Parish Council continued to oppose the proposal on sustainability grounds;
- He expressed concerns with the access road which was narrow and in places only one car width and used by farm vehicles and horse boxes;
- Equestrian events attracted up to 100 vehicles per week;
- Users of the road did not conform to the speed limit;
- The Primary school was in close proximity to the site;
- There was no pavement to the site;
- The site was currently agricultural land; and
- Condover Parish Council had produced a robust SAMDev Plan following consultation and other sites had been identified

Councillor T Barker, the local Ward Councillor, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Other sites had been identified in the SAMDev process and none of these had come forward for planning approval;
- The SAMDev process had been robust and based on localism;
- The development was speculative; and
- The proposal would not be sustainable.

At the request of the Committee, Councillor E Marvin provided clarification on the location of the proposed access.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure an off-site affordable housing contribution and to the conditions as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

158 Proposed Residential Development Land Off Limes Paddock, Dorrington, Shrewsbury (14/00190/OUT)

Councillor P Nutting left the room in accordance with his declaration in Minute No. 151 above and did not return to the meeting.

With reference to Minute No. 143, the Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that this application had been deferred at the previous meeting in order that the implications of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) released on the 6 March 2014 could be assessed prior to any decision being made. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location and indicative layout of the site and confirmed that the application site had been put forward by the landowner for inclusion in the SAMDev process but had been deemed to be unacceptable. He confirmed that the Highways Agency had raised no objections.

Members had undertaken a site visit prior to the previous meeting and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

Mr P Smith, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- He expressed his disillusionment with the planning process and urged refusal of the application; and
- How can planning applications outside development boundaries be approved.

Councillor E Marvin, representing Condober Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- This would be the third application to be considered in Dorrington, which undermined their design statement and credibility;
- This site was originally considered by the Parish Council but rejected on the advice of Planning Officers on the grounds that visibility would be limited;
- This application undermined the Parish Council, Shropshire Council and localism;
- The land was agricultural land and would be lost for ever;
- To grant permission would open up the flood gates for further applications;

- The proposal would not be in line with the wishes of the residents who had requested a mix of dwellings;
- Two other sites had been identified;
- Would create a ribboning effect; and
- Urged refusal on the grounds of difficult access, topography, loss of agricultural land and it had not been supported by Condover Parish Council.

Councillor T Barker, the local Ward Councillor, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- If there was such a need for housing the sites put forward in the SAMDev process would have been put forward for planning approval;
- This was an exploratory application;
- It would be an unsustainable development and would extend the village in such a visible way that would be detrimental to the area; and
- This was grade 3 agricultural land.

In the ensuing debate, some Members expressed concerns with regard to the route/track passing through the estate to the Sewage Treatment Plant; poor visibility off the access onto the A49; the screening boundaries between the dwellings would be too close and would consequently impact on the ability to maintain the boundary treatments in the future; the site was in open countryside and visible from some distance away; it would be contrary to SAMDev and the Parish Plan; it was grade 3 agricultural land; and would not be sustainable.

In response to the comments, the Planning Officer referred Members to the comments made by Severn Trent regarding the number of traffic movements on the application for Falkland Road and confirmed that the boundaries and boundary treatments would be approved at a later date.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution, the conditions as set out in Appendix 2 to the report and subject to no new material considerations being raised as a result of the proposal being advertised as a Departure, the Area Planning Manager be given delegated authority to grant planning permission in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

159 Development Land Adj Leylands, Pulley Lane, Bayston Hill, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/00254/ FUL)

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and explained that the site was located outside of the Bayston Hill Village Development Boundary. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, indicative layout, access and parking arrangements.

By virtue of the amendment made to Shropshire Council's Constitution, as agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, Councillor T Clarke, as the local Ward Councillor, made a statement, took no part in the debate and did not vote. He commented that the proposal would be contrary to SAMDev and the site was outside the development boundary. He expressed concerns with regard to the site access and commented that the road was already inadequate and further dwellings would increase the number of traffic movements along this stretch of road. The proposal would also impact significantly on Spring Cottage.

By virtue of the amendment made to Shropshire Council's Constitution, as agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, Councillor Mrs J MacKenzie as the local Ward Councillor, took no part in the debate and did not vote.

Mrs E Kay, Clerk to Bayston Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The Parish Council had worked hard to identify sites during the SAMDev process;
- As the main access to Bayston Hill Pulley Lane was very busy and especially so at rush hour. Visibility was very poor, the banks were very high and heavily covered in foliage. The road narrowed along Pulley Lane and there were very few opportunities to park;
- The size of the properties suggested that children would live there and this gave rise to concerns for their safety;
- There was already a high proportion of three-bedroomed or more properties in Bayston Hill. Smaller and affordable housing was needed; and
- She urged refusal on the grounds of highway and access issues, there was no requirement for this type of housing and it was outside the development boundary.

In response to concerns that Officers were advising Members to determine the application "quickly", the Area Planning and Building Control Manager explained that he was not encouraging Members to determine the application in a speedy manner but purely advising Members that if the Committee was quorate there was a duty on Councillors to discuss the proposal.

Mr A Sheldon, the applicant, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- He explained that this was a small scale development;
- The application site was not a field or an extension into the countryside and no precedent for future extensions beyond Bayston Hill would be set;
- The proposed access was off an existing adopted highway;
- Shropshire Council could not demonstrate a five year land supply and there was a need for this type of housing; and
- An area of land would be gifted to the occupiers of Spring Cottage.

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager explained that although the site had not been taken forward in the SAMDev process as a preferred site it did not necessarily mean that it had been rejected as not being suitable for development. At the time of the SAMDev process other sites had come forward that had been seen as being more preferable.

In the ensuing debate, some Members expressed serious concerns with regard to highway safety, the access arrangements and the steep incline of the road. They commented that some of the properties would be significantly lower than the properties on the opposite side and the number of dwellings would result in an overcrowded development. Members acknowledged the issue regarding the lack of a five year land supply and noted that Highways had raised no objections. The majority of Members reluctantly supported the proposal.

In respect of the access, the Area Planning and Building Control Manager drew Members' attention to the comments of Highway Officers who had raised no objections. In terms of need, he explained that the need did not have to be specific to this area and Shropshire Council had a requirement to provide a specific number of homes across the County.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure affordable housing provision / contribution and the conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

160 Land to rear 110-112 London Road, Shrewsbury (13/02781/FUL) - (To Follow)

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and explained that he had received a request asking if consideration could be given to deferring the application in order that all parties could be represented and present during determination of the proposal. Councillor Jon Tandy, the local Ward Councillor, was currently unavailable and he had been given an undertaking that he would be informed when, or if, the application would be presented to Committee for determination.

By virtue of the amendment made to Shropshire Council's Constitution, as agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, Councillors T Clarke and Mrs J MacKenzie as the local Ward Councillor, took no part in the debate and did not vote.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of this application be deferred to the next meeting in order that all parties could be represented and present during determination.

161 Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the Central area as at 3 April 2014 be noted.

162 Date of the Next Meeting

Members requested that the following be minuted:

- A Member expressed his displeasure that some Councillors had referred to the Chairman by his Christian name during the meeting.
- A Member expressed his displeasure that Members of this Committee had left the meeting prior to all applications being considered and determined.

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that the next meeting of the Central Planning Committee be held at 2.00 pm on Thursday, 1 May 2014 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: