



Committee and Date

South Planning Committee

1 December 2015

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2015

2.00 - 5.05 pm in the Shrewsbury/Oswestry Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Responsible Officer: Linda Jeavons

Email: linda.jeavons@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 257716

Present

Councillor David Evans (Chairman)

Councillors Stuart West (Vice Chairman), Andy Boddington, Nigel Hartin, Richard Huffer, Cecilia Motley, Madge Shinton, Robert Tindall, David Turner, Tina Woodward and Gwilym Butler (Substitute) (substitute for John Hurst-Knight)

74 Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor John Hurst-Knight (Sub: Gwilym Butler).

75 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the South Planning Committee held on 6 October 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the amendment as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters.

76 Public Question Time

There were no public questions, statements or petitions received.

77 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 15/01171/FUL, Councillor Nigel Hartin declared that he was a tenant of South Shropshire Housing Association and would take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

Councillor Cecilia Motley declared that she was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership Management Board.

Councillor David Turner declared that he was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership Management Board.

78 Land North West Of Meadowley Upton Cressett Bridgnorth WV16 6UQ (14/03933/FUL)

The Technical Specialist Planning Officer introduced the application and with reference to the drawings and photomontages displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout, elevations, bridleway diversion, landscape designations, heritage assets and access routes. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit the previous day and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. He further drew Members' attention to the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated the previous day and particularly drew attention to the Planning Officer's comments on page 3 of the Further Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting with regard to heritage assets, listed buildings and their settings pointing out the special regard to be had in relation to heritage assets.

Mr W Cash, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees and responded to questions from members of the Committee.

Mr S Newell, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees and responded to questions from members of the Committee.

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

- He had two potential concerns both of which he considered had been addressed. Firstly, with regard to the proximity of Upton Cressett Hall, he expressed his satisfaction with the view of Historic England that the Hall would not be affected by this proposal; and
- Secondly, he referred to the consequences of taking best and most versatile land out of production but acknowledged that the applicant had endeavoured to use only grade 3b land and drew the meeting's attention to paragraph 6.2.9 of the report.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. In response to questions from Members, the Technical Specialist Planning Officer clarified that the Tasley Farm application had been refused because of its impact on heritage assets and not on the use/loss of agricultural land; and, although a proportion of the Meadowley site comprised best and most versatile land, Planning Officers had been satisfied that the applicant had submitted sufficient evidence to justify the use of such land. Members acknowledged that there had been much support for this application, noted and had special regard to the heritage settings, and noted that there were unlikely to be other preferable sites within a 3km radius of the proposed connection point. In order to minimise the

impact on public rights of way, a Member requested that any gaps in the hedgerow be planted expeditiously and prior to any installation of solar panels.

RESOLVED:

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

79 Land north and east of Cwms Lane, Church Stretton, Shropshire (14/04374/OUT)

The Chairman informed the meeting that this item had been withdrawn by the applicant.

80 The Sidings, Snailbeach, Shrewsbury, SY5 0LT (14/05151/OUT)

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

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Heather Kidd, as local Member, made a statement in support of the proposal and reiterated that Worthen with Shelve Parish Council and the Shropshire Hills AONB had raised no objections. She took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

Mr P Middleton, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Members acknowledged that building on this site would be challenging; expressed concerns regarding the future maintenance and stability of the boundary wall; suggested that a timescale for the completion of the dwelling should be submitted and agreed upon; and reiterated that the scale, design and materials used should reflect and be in keeping with the street scene.

RESOLVED:

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

- Any subsequent application for reserved matters to be considered by this Committee; and
- That officers be given delegated authority to issue the outline decision with the following provisions to also be included on the decision notice:
 - i. A Construction Method Statement to be submitted prior to any works taking place setting out the timescale for the construction of the dwelling;

- ii. A stability report regarding the boundary wall to be submitted prior to any works taking place; and
- iii. An informative note be included advising on the need for the design of the proposed building to respect its setting in terms of scale and design.

(At this juncture, the meeting adjourned at 3:42 pm and reconvened at 3:58 pm.)

81 10 Clayton Close, Knowbury, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 3JA (15/01171/FUL)

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 77, Councillor Nigel Hartin took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

The Principal Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings and photographs displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location and the proposed and existing elevations. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit the previous day and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1) Councillor Richard Huffer, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, he commented that appropriate conditions attached to any permission would address concerns.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Members particularly expressed concern regarding the impact of the balcony on neighbouring properties and requested a condition be attached to any permission to restrict the use of the garage as habitable accommodation in the future.

RESOLVED:

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

- The conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report;
- An additional condition to ensure the garage shall not be used as additional habitable/living accommodation; and
- In order to preserve the privacy of neighbouring properties, Planning Officers be granted delegated authority to approve the materials and finishing of the balcony.

82 Land To The Rear Of 41 Furlongs Road, Cleobury Mortimer, Shropshire, DY14 8AR (15/01919/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings and photographs displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit the previous day and had viewed the site and assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding

area. He drew Members' attention to a recent communication from the Shropshire Council Highway Officer which set out in more detail a breakdown of the £20,000 highways contribution and confirmed that any works would be undertaken in consultation with the local Members.

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

Councillor Mrs B Davies, representing Cleobury Mortimer Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15.1) Councillor Madge Shingleton, 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 her statement, the following points were raised:

- The Parish Plan indicated that more affordable housing was required and smaller properties for the older generation who wished to downsize. Only 12% said more family housing was needed;
- The proposal would be contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS11 and CS10, would not be sustainable and would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring dwellings; and
- The development, along with outstanding planning permissions, would have a major incremental impact on the local road infrastructure and there was nothing that could be done to improve the footpath/pedestrian/cycle routes.

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

- He concurred with the comments of both Councillor Madge Shingleton and the Parish Council;
- The SAMDev Plan developed in consultation with the community had reached the same conclusion as the Parish Plan;
- Over 300 homes, including executive homes in Tenbury Road, had been permitted in the last 10 years;
- Many older people wanted to downsize and remain in Cleobury Mortimer; and
- A diversity of the type of homes was required.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Members particularly expressed concern with regard to the access, the incremental impact of the development on the road network; and the high number and type of dwellings proposed which would be contrary to the Parish Plan.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of this application be deferred to the next meeting, with Members minded to refuse the application on the basis that the proposal:

- Will be detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring residents;
- No such need for this type of dwelling has been identified; and
- The proposal will result in an unacceptable incremental impact on the local road infrastructure.

The proposals would therefore fail to comply with Core Strategy Policies CS3, CS6, CS7 and CS8 and Cleobury Mortimer Parish Plan. Given the position and weight that can now be afforded to the emerging SAMDev Plan, the development of the site will also be contrary to emerging Policies MD1, MD2 and MD3 of the SAMDev Plan.

(At this juncture, Councillor Nigel Hartin left the meeting and did not return.)

83 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 3 November 2015 be noted.

84 Date of the Next Meeting

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that the next meeting of the South Planning Committee will be held at 2.00 pm on Tuesday, 1 December 2015 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: