



Committee and Date

Central Planning Committee

12 March 2015

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2015

2.00 - 5.25 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)

85 Apologies for absence

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

86 Minutes

The Minutes of the Central Planning Committee held on 11 December 2014 would be submitted to the next meeting for confirmation.

87 Public Question Time

There were no public questions, statements or petitions received.

88 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 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.

With reference to planning application 15/00090/FUL, Councillor Tim Barker stated that as a Member of Cabinet he had been in attendance when the Shrewsbury Student Accommodation Policy had been considered. He would make a statement and leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

With reference to planning applications 14/02402/FUL and 14/03259/OUT, Councillor Vernon Bushell declared that he knew two of the speakers and declared a personal interest.

With reference to planning application 14/05115/FUL, Councillor Dean Carroll stated that he was employed by a company which had an interest with one of the principle objectors. He would leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

With reference to planning application 14/02402/FUL, Councillor Pam Moseley stated that she was a Shrewsbury Town Council representative on the Shropshire Playing Fields Association.

With reference to planning application 14/02402/FUL, Councillor Kevin Parry stated that he was a member of the Shropshire Playing Fields Association.

With reference to planning application 14/00467/OUT, Councillor David Roberts stated that his wife's family had an interest in this application. He would leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

With reference to planning application 14/01802/FUL, Councillor David Roberts stated that the applicants were his brother-in-law's stepchildren and a person employed by him lived in the area. He would make a statement then leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

89 Former Shelton Hospital, Somerby Drive, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY3 8DN (14/02402/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout, access and elevations. He confirmed that the revised proposals would provide for 15 on-site affordable dwellings, which would include provision for 3 No. 2-bed conversions and not 4 as stated in the report.

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.

Mr D Kilby, representing Shropshire Playing Fields Association (SPFA), 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 expressed support for the revised plans which had fully addressed Sport England's and the SPFA's objections;

- The relocation of the existing Bowling Green to the north of the cricket pitch and the removal of plots 51 and 52 were welcomed;
- It would create an asset for the community and would offer health and wellbeing benefits;
- He requested that consideration be given to the dedication of the sports field as a centenary field in honour of those who fell during WW1;
- Would be in accordance with paragraph 73 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); and
- As the area to the west of Shrewsbury did not currently have a robust and up-to-date local needs assessment in place he requested that consideration be given to the implementation of one.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. A Member advised that the dedication of the field was not a planning issue and should be referred to Shrewsbury Town Council.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to Officer's being given delegated authority to grant planning permission, planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to:

- A Section 106 legal agreement to secure:
 - Contribution towards education infrastructure.
 - On-site affordable dwellings (15) and a commuted sum towards off-site affordable dwellings (.6);
 - Contribution to provide, and agreement with Shropshire Council to let a contract for the construction of the replacement bowling green and lighting on a like-for-like basis prior to commencement of development on existing bowling green or cessation of right to use existing vehicular access and car park.
 - Agreement with applicant to convert the existing Estates Building to provide a replacement Bowling Pavilion in accordance with the timetable for the replacement bowling green.
 - Transfer of cricket ground to Shropshire Council, who will in turn transfer this on a long-term lease to Shelton Cricket Club; and
- Subject to the Conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

90 The Charles Darwin, Sutton Road, Shrewsbury, SY2 6HN (14/05115/FUL)

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 88, Councillor Dean Carroll left the room during consideration of this item.

The Principal Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, proposed site plan and elevations.

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

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting which detailed further public objections and comments of Shropshire Council's Public Protection (Specialist) in response to a request from the agent to allow greater flexibility in respect of the delivery times.

Mr G Heap, 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 proposal did not take into account the impact on the surrounding area;
- Would create on road parking which would be unsafe and dangerous;
- Highway Safety – The entrance gate to the site which was opposite his property was currently permanently locked to prevent large vehicles using this entrance;
- Traffic – A convenience store would result in increased traffic, which would include large/small delivery and collection vehicles;
- There was no turning facility in Tilstock Crescent, which would cause further congestion;
- Noise – Type of delivery vehicle would result in increased noise levels and, in addition, there would also be noise from industrial fridge/freezer motors and users of the store; and
- Would have a negative impact on the retail provision in the area.

Ms R Childs, 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 aim was to keep the public house open and for both businesses to work in conjunction with one another;
- Had undertaken a car parking survey and the car parking provision on the site would exceed the local saved policy requirements;
- There would be two deliveries per day and would be prepared to accept a condition regarding a Service Delivery Management Plan;
- Highways had raised no objections;
- The Co-op was satisfied that there was sufficient demand for a further store in this area;
- Would create employment; and
- Would be in accordance with policy and would be a beneficial development on an underdeveloped and used site.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1) Councillor Ted Clarke, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- Concerned about the increase in traffic that would be generated as a result of this development;
- This was a residential setting and the proposal would impact on the residents of Tilstock Crescent; and
- Concerned about over-provision of retail space and there was a vacant unit on the opposite side of the road.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1) Councillor Jane MacKenzie, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement and withdrew from the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- There had been 200 objections from local residents;
- The existing nearby Co-op store was struggling, several units in the Parade were empty and she questioned the need for a further store in the area;
- Traffic – delivery lorries would be turning into a residential road and next to a bus stop and there was a potential for deliveries to be unloaded at unacceptable times;
- She requested that the delivery hours as set out in Condition No. 7 in Appendix 1 to the report be adhered to; and
- Public Nuisance – there were already three off-licences within 100 yards of each other and this additional store could have a detrimental impact on the local community and anti-social behaviour.

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

- There had been a high number of objections to this proposal;
- This was a residential area and the residents would now be looking out at a brick wall;
- Would result in an increase in on road parking in a residential area;
- Noise – there was already noise from car boot sales and other events and extractor fans and delivery lorries would exacerbate this issue;
- There were empty units close-by;
- The proposed store would be in direct competition with an existing nearby store. Both stores would not be sustainable so would not create new employment;
- What would happen to the Post Office if the existing Co-op store closed;
- Would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS15; and
- If approved, would like to see reduced opening hours and delivery times and no deliveries on a Sunday.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. In response to concerns and in order to protect the amenity of the area and protect the health and wellbeing of nearby residents, Members expressed the view that delivery times should be kept to a minimum and delivery times should remain as set out at Condition 7 in Appendix 1 to the report (Monday to Saturday 07:00-19:00, Sunday 08:00-13:00) and not as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters.

In response to concerns, the Principal Planner clarified that the weekend car park usage survey had not been undertaken on a football match day; the site operator could enforce private parking restrictions to protect the 11 parking spaces linked to the convenience store as is the case at Meole Brace Retail Park; the public house would not require planning permission if it wished to convert to an A1 Retail outlet; and reiterated that the combined level of parking space provision exceeded policy requirements.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

91 Land At Longden, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/00467/OUT)

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 88, Councillor David Roberts left the room during consideration of this item.

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, drew Members' attention to the location, indicative layout and access. He reported a change to the recommendation and explained that Officers were now seeking to secure the provision and retention of the footpath running through Plealey Lane as part of a S106 Agreement. He also drew Members' attention to the following:

- Additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting which detailed further public objections and comments from Longden Parish Council;
- A further objection which had been received following publication of the Schedule of Additional Letters and which raised similar issues to those in the report; and
- A letter and photographs from the residents of the Severnside Longmynd View Flats which had been circulated via email prior to the meeting and circulated in paper form at the meeting.

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

Mr N Ingham, representing Longden Village Action Group, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Longden was a rural community with small scale facilities;
- Proposal would not be necessary to meet the 5 Year Land Supply;
- Would not be in keeping with the Village Design Statement – a smaller development would be less intrusive and retain the rural character of the village;
- The development would extend into the countryside and would fail to accord with H3 of the Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Plan and adopted Core Strategy Policies, CS4, CS5, CS6 and CS17 and MD1 and MD3 in the emerging Site Allocations and Management Development Plan (SAMDev);
- Delineation between the villages would be eroded and potential access points on this site would lead to expansion on this site in the future;
- Limited employment in the area would necessitate the need to travel to find employment;
- Suitability and safety of the proposed footpath between garages had raised concern;
- Approved applications in the area meant that Longden had achieved its housing requirements; and
- Highway Safety - local roads already suffered from speeding vehicles.

Councillor N Evans, representing Longden 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 undertaken consultation on three occasions to inform SAMDev, Village Design Statement and Parish Plan and the majority of residents had said no to development on the northern side of the area; and
- Requested that the S106 should include provision for the footpath through the garages and the footpath on the western side of the site should be removed.

Ms H Howie, 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:

- Proposed development would be in accordance with SAMDev and the Plan had identified Longden as a Community Cluster;
- The Plan indicated that no individual site should be no more than 10-15 houses – the application site would accommodate 14 homes so would be in accordance with the Plan;
- No highway or technical objections had been raised;
- Negotiations for the creation of a footpath link had been undertaken with Severnside Housing Association and SHA had also agreed to take on the affordable housing; and
- This was an outline application, would be sustainable and in accordance with SAMDev and the NPPF.

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

- Notification of this application had been sent to SHA residents in Severnside Longmynd View only three days prior to this meeting;
- He requested that a legal undertaking between the applicant and SHA be negotiated and agreed and included in a S106 Agreement to ensure a footpath is agreed in perpetuity before any planning application is agreed;
- In Longden Parish there was currently agreed planning permission for 44 dwellings;
- This was a sloping site and would be very visual and stand out in the landscape; and
- There was already concerns with regard to speeding in this area.

In response to comments and concerns, the Area Planning and Building Control Manager reiterated that this was an outline application; landscaping would be dealt with at the Reserved Matters stage; Members could request that any Reserved Matters application should be brought back to this Committee for determination; in order to maintain adequate privacy it would not be possible to develop the current application site for significantly more than the dwellings indicated in the report; the current application would be in accordance with the SAMDev submission of the Parish Council; the issue of the provision of the footpath would be adequately covered by the S106; and no highway objections had been raised with regard to this current application.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers.

RESOLVED:

That this application be deferred to a future meeting to enable the following:

- The tenants of the Longmynd View flats (Severnside Housing Association) to be consulted on the application;
- Legal clarification to be sought and provided on the footpath/access walking link to Plealey Lane through the adjacent housing association garages site; and
- For a Highways Development Control Officer to be in attendance.

(At this juncture, the meeting adjourned at 4.10 pm and reconvened at 4.18 pm.)

92 Proposed Residential Development East Of Wilcot Lane, Nesscliffe, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/03259/OUT)

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location and indicative layout.

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

Mrs Z Robins, representing Nesscliffe Hills & District Bridleway Association and Equestrians, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Development would generate a considerable amount of traffic;
- Would be outside the village boundary in open countryside;
- Would exit onto a single track lane used by horse riders, cyclists and walkers and there was no way for them to get out of the way of passing traffic other than by using private driveways;
- There were no passing places and no option for vehicles to reverse;
- Highways had acknowledged that Wilcott Lane was narrow;
- Delivery drivers would not travel all the way down the Nesscliffe Bypass to the south roundabout and then come back up the old A5;
- Would be contrary to CS4 and Parish Plan and would not be sustainable; and
- Wilcott Lane was the only link that horse riders and cyclists could use to access off road bridleways and the country park.

Mr T Mennell, 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:

- No vehicles were seen during the site visit;
- Officers had addressed objections in the report;
- Scale of the application had been reduced as per a request from the Parish Council and in accordance with the Village Plan;
- Would be sustainable and in accordance with SAMDev and the NPPF; and
- Would provide a mix of housing and affordable properties.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1) Councillor David Roberts, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- The proposal would be contrary to the Parish Council's aspirations as set out in their Parish Plan and SAMDev;
- The Parish had put forward an aspiration of 45 dwellings and to date 230 houses had been proposed.

In response to comments, the Area Planning and Building Control Manager confirmed that the site would be situated on the edge of the existing settlement; the inclusion of bungalows could be conditioned; and reiterated that the number of dwellings referred to by speakers had not all been for dwellings within Nesscliffe but across the cluster and there had been a number of planning applications refused.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Some Members acknowledged the close vicinity of the centre of the village; welcomed the inclusion of bungalows; noted this was an outline application. Some Members expressed concerns regarding the high number of dwellings that had been proposed and agreed in this area and the narrow and twisted nature of the access road.

RESOLVED:

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

- A Section 106 Agreement to secure affordable housing in accordance with the prevailing rate current at the time of submission of Reserved Matters;
- The Reserved Matters submission to include bungalows on the plots as shown on the illustrative site plan; and
- The conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

93 Mardol House, Shoplatch, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY1 1HS (15/00090/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application.

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 88, Councillor Tim Barker, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- He supported the proposal.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1) Councillor Andrew Bannerman, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement and withdrew from the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- He commented that discussions had taken place with Shrewsbury Town Council and an open evening had been held; and
- He urged approval.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

94 Hargreaves Farm, Halfway House, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY5 9DH (14/01802/FUL)

The Technical Specialist Planning Officer introduced the application and with reference to the drawings and photomontage displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location. He drew Members' attention to a further representation received from a resident following publication of the Schedule of Additional Letters and confirmed that the statutory notification procedures had been carried out and the site notice had been erected at the site as required.

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

Mr C Murphy, 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:

- Would introduce an industrial element into a rural area so would have a major detrimental visual impact on the surrounding area;
- Would be visible from the Stiperstones;
- There had been no consultation or engagement with the local community;
- Would have a detrimental impact on the nearby listed building;
- Government Planning Practice Guidance indicated that renewable energy should not override environmental protection or the planning concerns of the local community; and
- Contrary to the NPPF which indicated that applications should only be approved if the impact was deemed to be acceptable.

Mr P Hughes, 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:

- Family farm which had been in the family for years and diversification would ensure the farm remained viable;
- Would produce electricity for our own use and the National Grid;
- No objections had been raised by the Parish Council or technical consultees; and
- Would not be detrimental to tourism in the area.

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 88 and the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1) Councillor David Roberts, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- Would be in a prominent place and would be seen by people travelling along the A458;
- This would be the tenth turbine in the area so would have a detrimental cumulative impact on the landscape character of the area;

- Residents were concerned about the impact on their ability to sell their listed building; and
- The external colour of the turbine should be a matt off-white colour

(Councillor David Roberts did not return to the meeting.)

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer’s recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

95 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the Central area as at 12 February 2015 be noted.

96 Date of the Next Meeting

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that the next meeting of the Central Planning Committee would be held at 2.00 pm on Thursday, 12 March 2015 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: