



Committee and Date

Central Planning Committee

24 July 2014

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 26 June 2014

2.00 - 6.00 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, Kevin Pardy, David Roberts and Tim Barker (Substitute) (substitute for Tudor Bebb)

16 Apologies for absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Tudor Bebb (Substitute: Councillor Tim Barker).

17 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Central Planning Committee held on 29 May 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

18 Public Question Time

There were no public questions, statements or petitions received.

19 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 14/00701/FUL, Councillor Tim Barker stated that, for reasons of pre-determination, he would make a statement and then leave the room during consideration of this item and not vote.

With reference to planning application 14/01037/OUT, Councillor Tim Barker stated that, for reasons of pre-determination, he would make a statement and then leave the room during consideration of this item and not vote.

With reference to planning application 13/04967/OUT, Councillor David Roberts stated that he was acquainted with and knew the landowner and he would leave the room during consideration of this item and not vote.

With reference to planning application 14/01037/OUT, Councillor David Roberts stated that, for reasons of a prejudicial nature, he would leave the room prior to consideration of this item and not vote.

With reference to planning applications to be considered at this meeting, Councillors Andrew Bannerman, Jane MacKenzie and Peter Nutting 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.

20 Development West Of Caradoc View, Hanwood, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (13/04967/OUT)

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 19, Councillor David Roberts left the room during consideration of this item.

The Principal Planner introduced the application and explained that the recommendation should refer to both an off-site and on-site affordable housing provision/contribution and the conditions were as set out in Appendix 1 (and not Appendix 2). He confirmed Members had undertaken a site visit that morning and had viewed the site and 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.

Cllr M Roughan, representing Great Hanwood 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:

- He drew attention to paragraph 2.1 of the report and expressed concern that further development would take place on the remainder of the agricultural field;
- Drainage issues remain unresolved and prior to any works taking place on this site it should be demonstrated that development would be possible without increasing the problem. Any drainage issues should be dealt with at outline stage rather than at the reserved matters stage;
- Flooding – Shropshire Council should assess and ensure that any flood risk would be avoided;
- Speed limit was 40 mph and not 30 mph;
- The site would not be sustainable;
- The site had been rejected during the Site Allocations and Management Development Plan (SAMDev) process; and
- The footpath on the southern side of the A488 was narrow;
- Insufficient open/play areas proposed; and

- If approved the applicant should address any surface water run-off problems.

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:

- No technical issues had been raised which would prevent building on this site;
- Hanwood was a sustainable location;
- The site had been the subject of a previous planning application and as such access at this location had already been established;
- He provided confirmation that the applicant had agreed to a contribution of £25,000 towards the provision of a light controlled pedestrian crossing;
- Would be willing to agree to any additional appropriate conditions; and
- This site was a sustainable location.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Roger Evans, as local Member, participated in the discussion and spoke against the proposal but did not vote. During which he raised the following points:

- The SAMDev requirement in this area would be satisfied without developing this site;
- He expressed serious concerns with regard to highway safety and suggested that the provision of a light controlled pedestrian crossing should be investigated and conditioned as necessary;
- If approved, flooding issues should be addressed now and not at reserved matters stage;
- He reiterated the concerns of the Parish Council that development could take place on the remainder of the field;
- This site had been the subject of a previous application for a nursing home and had had been supported on-balance by the Parish Council. It had not been a pre-cursor exercise for development on this site.

The Principal Planner, Area Planning and Building Control Manager and Area Highways Development Control Manager (Central) provided clarification on drainage and confirmed appropriate conditions would be attached to any permission; the local infrastructure and highway network; agricultural land classification; and explained that the sub five year land supply issue was a County-wide issue.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans, noted the comments and concerns of all speakers and continued to express reservations with regard to highway safety.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to:

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement relating to the affordable housing element;
- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report; and

- That the Area Planning Manager be granted delegated authority to undertake negotiations with the applicant with regard to an appropriate contribution towards the provision of a light controlled crossing.

21 Land Opposite Ellesmere Drive, Ellesmere Road, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (13/05124/FUL)

With reference to Minute No. 8, the Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and explained that the application had been deferred at a previous meeting for the reasons as set out in the report. He confirmed 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. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, access, elevations and layout.

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 Dean Carroll, the local Ward Councillor, made a statement, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- This would not be a suitable location for 75 homes;
- He expressed concern regarding the knock-on effect on the road network. Ellesmere road and the junctions at Coton Hill and Chester Street were already at or beyond full capacity; and
- The scheme would be out of keeping with the area. The houses on the western side were linear with the exception of one cul-de-sac.

In response to questions and concerns of Members, the Area Highways Development Control Manager (Central) provided clarification on the implications of the development on the local infrastructure.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans, noted the comments and concerns of the local Ward Councillor and continued to express their own reservations with regard to impact on the road network. The majority of Members supported the proposal.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to:

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the developer contributions and provisions as outlined in paragraph 6.9 of the report; and
- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

22 The Fox Inn, Ryton, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY5 7LS (14/00701/FUL)

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and confirmed Members had undertaken a site visit that morning and had viewed the site

and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, revised site layout and elevations. He explained that a request for deferment had been received from local residents in order that they could obtain professional advice regarding the recent comments made by Shropshire Council's Flood and Water Manager. In response to this request, he explained that Shropshire Council Drainage Officers had deemed the drainage to be acceptable and a satisfactory solution had been provided by the applicant.

Members noted the additional information as detailed in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting, and which detailed additional conditions as suggested by the Shropshire Council's Flood and Water Manager.

By virtue of the amendment made to Shropshire Council's Constitution, as agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, and his declaration of interest as set out in Minute No. 19, Councillor Tim Barker, the local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the room and took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- This was a complex and controversial application and would be contrary to SAMDev.

Ms K Halstead, 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:

- The development could cause flooding and put additional pressure on existing drainage system;
- In heavy rain her property became saturated;
- An unsatisfactory drainage report had been submitted by the applicant; and
- There was a duty to ensure flood risk was not displaced elsewhere.

Cllr Ms S Mackay, 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 proposal would be contrary to SAMDev and Ryton had countryside status;
- It would be necessary to travel by car to access all services – so proposal would not be sustainable;
- She expressed concerns with regard to the disposal of both foul and sewage water. An unsatisfactory drainage plan had been submitted;
- Water had suddenly started flowing in a ditch that remained dry most of the year;
- There was no agreement in place to utilise parking at the local village hall during events and functions held at the public house;
- Roadside parking would not be an option in Ryton; and
- If planning permission granted the public house would close.

Mr J Owen, 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:

- There was a need for small affordable and open market houses not only in Ryton but countrywide;
- The proposal would be sustainable and would address the housing imbalance in village;
- It would not affect the viability of the public house;
- The provision of parking would be more than adequate;
- There was an agreement in place for any overspill parking that would be required during events and functions;
- He had submitted a comprehensive drainage scheme, which had been approved by Drainage Officers; and
- Watercourses had been filled in by local people.

In response to questions and comments from both speakers and Members, the Senior Drainage Engineer provided clarification on drainage and disposal of both surface water and foul water. The Area Planning and Building Control Manager drew Members' attention to paragraphs 6.6.5 and 6.6.6 of the report which indicated that the parking arrangements would be adequate and the proposal would ensure the protection and retention of an existing community facility.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments and concerns of all the speakers and expressed their own concerns with regard to the drainage. Members acknowledged the need for affordable housing in rural areas but questioned the sustainability of the proposal and held differing views with regard to the design and the appropriateness of the development.

RESOLVED:

That this application be deferred in order that further details can be provided detailing how the drainage and disposal of both surface water and foul water drainage will work and be managed to a satisfactory standard.

23 Development Land South Of Brook Cottages, Ford, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/01036/OUT)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and explained that the recommendation should refer to both an off-site and on-site affordable housing provision/contribution and the conditions were as set out in Appendix 1 (and not Appendix 2). He confirmed Members had undertaken a site visit that morning and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location and proposed access arrangements.

Members noted the additional representations as detailed in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting, and which detailed amendments to

the report and further comments and a commitment from the agent to develop the site at the earliest opportunity.

Mr S Jones, 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:

- The revised access plan did not demonstrate any improvements for pedestrians;
- The proposal would encourage speeding;
- There would be no improvement to traffic flows and an additional 30+ cars would be dangerous;
- The road was narrow and well used by agricultural vehicles;
- The lane floods and had been closed seven times during the winter;
- The access onto a busy trunk road would be dangerous;
- Butt Lane joins the A458 close to the school and the parking at the start and end of the school day causes chaos; and
- Although the school was not full it was at capacity with just enough space for children to exercise.

Cllr R Blyth, representing Ford 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:

- Following extensive consultation the Parish Council had chosen to be designated as open countryside and this had been accepted and included in the final draft of the emerging SAMDev plan, and in accordance with the NPPF consideration should be given to emerging plans;
- The proposal would be built on agricultural land;
- An extra 30 houses and associated service vehicles would impact negatively on the road network; and
- It would be necessary to travel to access employment, schools and other services; and
- In reality, people would not use the junction at the Cross Gates Public House, but opt to use Back Lane.

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

- Water attenuation scheme would provide a betterment; and
- This would be a sustainable site and an element of growth should be supported.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Roger Evans, as local Member, participated in the discussion and spoke against the proposal but did not vote. During which he raised the following points:

- Brook Cottage and sections of the road were prone to flooding and at times sections of the road were rendered impassable;
- Back Lane formed part of a bridleway and so was used by horse riders and the narrow lane was often used by walkers and children and additional traffic would make this dangerous;
- No footpath existed from the development along the narrow road other than that section to be built as part of this development. Access to the village would be over fields and across Parish Council land and no discussions had taken place with the Parish Council regarding the proposed pedestrian link to The Leasowes;
- The Parish Council had not commented on the amended proposal;
- A Housing Needs Survey had not identified a need for further housing in Ford. There were already a number of plots with planning permission attached that remained unsold and there were a number of houses that remained for sale;
- The bus service into Shrewsbury was very poor and cars would be the main form of transport;
- Increasing the width of Back Lane would encourage speeding and would make it dangerous for walkers and riders; and
- The development would not be sustainable.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments and concerns of all the speakers and the advice of Officers and it was

RESOLVED:

That consideration of this item be deferred, with Members minded to refuse the application in view of its lack of connectivity with the village for both pedestrians and motor vehicles. In conjunction with the Area Planning Manager, the applicant to explore the ownership and provision of the proposed footway across The Leasowes playing field and also any other possible links that would provide a direct and convenient connection to the village centre.

24 Development Land North Side Of Station Road, Dorrington, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/01037/OUT)

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 19, Councillor David Roberts left the meeting during consideration of this item.

At this juncture, Councillor Peter Nutting left the meeting and did not return.

The Principal Planner introduced the application and confirmed Members had undertaken a site visit that morning and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location and indicative site plan.

By virtue of the amendment made to Shropshire Council's Constitution, as agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, and his declaration at Minute No. 19, Councillor Tim Barker, as the local Ward Councillor, made a statement, took no part in the debate and did not vote. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- There were currently 180 houses in the village of Dorrington. If granted this proposal, along with those granted permission (contrary to SAMDev) and those envisaged on the identified site through SAMDev would equate to a 50% increase in housing stock. This would be socially unsustainable; and
- He expressed concerns regarding access.

Councillor Ms S Mackay, 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 Parish Council and villagers were against this application;
- There was no public footway to village amenities;
- Station Road was very narrow and there was no adequate line of site when accessing on to the A49;
- 38 further dwellings had also been approved contrary to local wishes;
- This was a greenfield site and used for arable farming and cropped annually;
- If approved a further application would be forthcoming;
- It would increase the size of the village to an unacceptable level; and
- Access to school, shops etc would have to be undertaken by car so would not be sustainable.

Ms C Denham, 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:

- Officers were recommending approval;
- No objections had been received from Shropshire Council's Highways Development Control Officers or Highways Agency;
- There was a public footpath providing a connection with the village;
- No environmental or drainage issues had been raised. A Flood Risk Assessment had not been required;
- Would address housing shortage; and
- The NPPF states that where there is a lack of a five year land supplies local policies relating to housing should be considered as being out-of-date.

In the ensuing debate, Members noted that Dorrington had been the subject of more applications than other areas; suitable sites had been ignored; this site formed part of a larger site and they were concerned that other applications would follow; HGVs used the lane constantly; the A49 was a dangerous road; all critical local services were situated on the opposite side of the A49; and local services would be outgrown and people would travel to Shrewsbury which would lead to a loss of services in Dorrington. Some Members commented that growth should happen in a controlled

manner and the proposal would not be sustainable and would be contrary to the NPPF.

RESOLVED:

That:

- Consideration of this item be deferred to the next meeting, with Members minded to refuse the application on the basis that the proposal would not constitute a controlled manner of development within the settlement, and the social and economic damage to the village of such a dramatic and sudden increase in housing stock leading to a significant adverse impact on services and infrastructure contrary to the requirements of Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS6 and CS8 of the Shropshire Core Strategy; and
- The Area Planning Manager to prepare an advisory report on the reasons for refusal.

25 Top Farm, Kinton, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY4 1AZ (14/01840/FUL)

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 David Roberts, as the local Ward Councillor, took no part in the debate and did not vote.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation.

26 Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the Central area as at 26 June 2014 be noted.

27 Date of the Next Meeting

RESOLVED:

It was noted that the next meeting of the Central Planning Committee would be held at 2.00 pm on Tuesday, 24 July 2014 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: