



Committee and Date

South Planning Committee

28 August 2019

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2019

2.00 - 4.02 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 Andy Boddington, Simon Harris, Nigel Hartin, Richard Huffer, Madge Shingleton, David Turner and Tina Woodward

11 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cecilia Motley and Robert Tindall.

12 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the South Planning Committee held on 4 June 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

13 Public Question Time

There were no public questions or petitions received.

14 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 18/03093/FUL, 18/04662/FUL and 18/05739/FUL, Councillor David Turner declared that he was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Management Board. He confirmed that he had taken no part in any discussion relating to these applications.

**15 Meadowtown Farm, Meadowtown, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY5 0DZ
(18/03093/FUL)**

The Consultant Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

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

Mr B Payne, on behalf of local residents, 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) Councillor Heather Kidd had provided a written statement, which was read out at the meeting and also circulated prior to the meeting.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of the speaker, and it was,

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred to a future meeting to enable the applicant to reconsider the design and layout, provide clarity regarding the removal of construction/demolition waste from the site and confirmation regarding proposed equestrian operations, i.e. whether holiday makers would have use of applicant's horses or will they be bringing their own onto site.

**16 Proposed Dwelling To The North Of Stiperstones, Snailbeach, Shropshire
(18/04662/FUL)**

The Consultant Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

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

Mr P Middleton, the agent, spoke for 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) Councillor Heather Kidd had provided a written statement, which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of the speaker. Members raised objections regarding the proposal to site an open-market dwelling on the outskirts of the community and in open countryside, and it was

RESOLVED:

That, as per the Officer's recommendation, planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The site lies beyond the established built-up area of Stiperstones village, in open countryside where, in the absence of any exceptional circumstances or evidence that the settlement housing guideline is unlikely to be met, a new open-market dwelling would fundamentally conflict with Policies CS1, CS4, CS5 and CS11 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy and Policies MD1, MD3, MD7a and S2 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan. Whilst the scheme might deliver some economic and social benefits these would be very modest and equally applicable to other more sustainable and policy-compliant sites within the designated settlements, and hence would not outweigh the disadvantages.
2. On account of the site's physical and visual separation from the established housing to the south and east, and also its prominence in elevated views from the east, the proposed dwelling would detract from the essentially open, verdant character and scenic quality of the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy, and Policies MD2 and MD12 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan.

17 5 Cape Street, Broseley, Shropshire, TF12 5NQ (18/05657/FUL)

The Consultant Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

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

Cllr Ian West, representing Broseley Town 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) Councillor Simon Harris, 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:

- The walls of this area were built using Broseley Brick and were heritage assets;
- He drew Members' attention to the comments of the Shropshire Council's Conservation Officer, as set out in paragraph 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 of the report; and

- The front boundary wall was higher than the approved maximum height of 2.2m.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of the speakers. Members were in agreement that the proposal did nothing to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area and concurred with the views of the Conservation Officer.

RESOLVED:

That, contrary to the Officer's rec, planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- The front extension, by reason of its location forward of the front elevation, the linkage of the brick boundary wall to the dwelling by a high brick wall and timber clad form with a shallow dual pitch roof elements of the structure, would not be in keeping with the existing property and would detract from the character and appearance of the Broseley Conservation Area, contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS17, Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan policies MD2 and MD13, and paragraphs 192 and 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

18 Proposed Dwellings East Of Doddington, Shropshire (18/05739/FUL)

The Technical Specialist Planning Officer introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, she drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

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

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15) Councillor Madge Shingleton, 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 her statement, the following points were raised:

- She expressed concerns regarding this proposal which had started off as a local home for a local person but had now become two large intrusive buildings;
- She objected to the large bridges and the vast amount of hard landscaping that would be done given that the site lay on the edge of Doddington and in close proximity to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- The entrance had already been excessively widened and hardcore had been laid;
- The proposal would be overbearing and have an overwhelming impact on the small community.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of the speakers. To reduce any overlooking Members commented on the

need to use appropriate screening using mature native species'. Members expressed concern regarding the junction onto the A4117 especially given the siting of existing road signage and as a means of improving visibility some suggested the erection of a highway visibility mirror.

RESOLVED:

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

- The agreement of the structural design of the bridges;
- The conditions set out in Appendix 1; and
- Delegated authority be granted to the Area Planning Manager to add/amend conditions to require further details of the bridge construction if necessary.

19 Royal Oak Alveley Bridgnorth Shropshire WV15 6LL (19/01487/FUL)

The Consultant Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

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

Mr S Wigen, a local resident, 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) Councillor Tina Woodward, 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 her statement, the following points were raised:

- As the local Member making a decision on this application had been problematic. On the one hand she appreciated the role the Royal Oak played within the community and would not wish to see the Royal Oak close, but, on balance and based on the information before her and the reasons as set out in the Officer's report, she felt that she could not support this application;
- The pods had been relocated and there had been some planting of Leylandii. However, for the reasons as set out in the Officer's report she considered these changes to be ineffectual. The grouping of the pods did not improve the openness of the site and Leylandii was not a native species;
- The very nature of the pods, no matter where they were positioned, would cause concern; they are small and designed to be just a place to sleep. In warm and hot weather there appeared to be a natural tendency for people staying in the pods to migrate to the outside seating supplied by the public house. There had been reported concerns relating to noise and it was easy to see how this was taking place and could, even with a Management Plan, be problematic;

- There had been a number of mobile caravans permanently sited on the field and during the holiday periods the field had been full of caravans, caravan awnings, camper vans, cars and vans. The site had continued to operate and remained a cause for concern locally; and
- She supported the Officer's recommendation and urged the Committee to refuse the application as no very special circumstances had been demonstrated or existed that would be of sufficient weight to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The development would therefore be contrary to the adopted Shropshire Core Strategy Policy CS5, Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) policy MD6 and the guidance set out in part 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of the speakers. Members particularly noted that no substantial changes had been made to mitigate the impact on the visual quality of the area.

RESOLVED:

That, as per the Officer's recommendation, planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. It is acknowledged that the proposed development would contribute to the rural economy, assist in the viability of the Public House and contribute to the role of Shropshire as a tourist destination to stay. However these benefits are considered to be outweighed by the harm the openness of the Green Belt and be at odds with one of the five purposes of the Green Belt, namely safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated or exist that would be of sufficient weight to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The development would therefore be contrary to the adopted Core Strategy policy CS5, SAMDev policy MD6 and the guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework Part 13.
2. Notwithstanding the above, the benefits of proposed development are considered to be outweighed by the environmental harm. The introduction of the structures proposed would appear as incongruous additions to the area and as such would result in a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposed development is contrary to Local Plan policies CS5, CS6, CS16 & CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy and policies MD2, MD11, MD12 of the SAMDev and national guidance contained within the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 83 and 110.

20 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 30 July 2019 be noted.

21 Exclusion of Public and Press

RESOLVED:

That under Section 100(A)(A4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded during the consideration of the following item of business on the grounds that they might involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Schedule 12(A) of the Act.

22 Planning Enforcement Quarterly Report

RESOLVED: That:

- (i) The Planning Enforcement Quarterly Report at 30 July 2019 be noted; and
- (ii) In future, the report should include the progress and/or outcome of any Judicial Review cases.

23 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 Wednesday, 28 August 2019 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: