Committee and Date
Southern Planning Committee
10 March 2020

SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2020
2.00 - 4.30 pm in the Shrewsbury/Oswestry Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Responsible Officer: Tim Ward
Email: tim.ward@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 257713

Present
Councillors David Evans (Chairman), David Turner (Vice-Chair), Simon Harris, Nick Hignett, Richard Huffer, Cecilia Motley, Tony Parsons, Madge Shineton, Robert Tindall, Tina Woodward and Vivienne Parry (Substitute) (substitute for Andy Boddington)

79 **Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Andy Boddington (Substitute: Councillor Vivienne Parry)

80 **Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Southern Planning Committee held on 17 December 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

81 **Public Question Time**

There were no public questions or statements received

82 **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 19/04680/OUT, Councillor Cecilia Motley declared that she was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Strategy and Performance Committee. She confirmed that she had taken no part in any discussion relating to this application.

With reference to planning application 19/04680/OUT, Councillor Robert Tindall declared that he was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership. He confirmed that he had taken no part in any discussion relating to this application.

With reference to planning application 19/04680/OUT, Councillor David Turner declared that he was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Strategy and Performance Committee. He confirmed that he had taken no part in any discussion relating to this application.

With reference to planning application 18/03355/FUL Councillor David Turner declared that for reasons of perceived bias, he would leave the room and take no part in the consideration of this item.

Councillor Simon Harris asked that it be noted that he was the Chair of STAR Housing.

83 **Longville Arms Longville in the Dale, Much Wenlock, Shropshire, TF13 6DT 18/03355/FUL**

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 82, Councillor David Turner left the room during consideration of this item.

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 G Hurst, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Councillor Dr C Stephenson, representing Rushbury 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) Councillor Cecilia Motley, 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:

- The Longville Arms is a valuable community asset which in the past had provided a meeting place for the community.
- The full potential of the site had not been exploited by the current owner.
- No effort had been put into marketing the site

The Consultant Planner drew Members attention to the letter from the Applicant which was included in the late representations. Members confirmed that they read it.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Members commented that it was important that

community facilities were kept open and expressed concern that no apparent effort had been made to market the property.

RESOLVED:

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

The proposal would result in the permanent loss of a local community facility to the detriment of the social and economic vitality and quality of life of the community in Longville in the Dale.

Whilst is acknowledged that the applicant made a trading loss in all of the years that it operated the Longville Arms and that this may be indicative of the fact that the Longville Arms, like many rural pubs is not likely to be viably maintained solely on the basis of reliance on the trade of the small locally resident population in and around Longville in the Dale, this does not itself demonstrate that it cannot still operate as viable business by developing a wider market appeal. There has been no attempt to demonstrate why this would not work.

In addition, no independent valuation has been provided and inadequate and inconsistent information has been submitted to demonstrate that the purchase price of the Longville Arms being requested by the applicant is realistic or justified when it is being argued that the building is beyond economic repair and the business not viable. There is in addition no evidence to indicate that the applicant has sought to test the market through any amendment or reduction in the asking price over the four years that Longville Arms has been on the market.

For this reason, the applicant has failed to demonstrate or justify the claim that there is no evidence of market demand for retaining the Longville Arms in its existing use as a pub or an alternative economic use and therefore that allowing the proposed change of use is justified.

For this reason, the application cannot be considered to have demonstrated that allowing the proposed change in use would maintain and enhance countryside vitality and improve the sustainability of Longville in the Dale as a rural community in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS5. It also does not justify approval of the application contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS8 and Policy CS15 and paragraphs 83 and 92 of the NPPF which seek to ensure the retention and guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs and are retained for the benefit of the community.

84 Land To The East Of Garridge Close Albrighton Shropshire 19/02785/REM

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

RESOLVED:

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

85 **Proposed Development Land At Former Bus Depot Minsterley Shrewsbury Shropshire 19/03734/OUT**

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

Mr D Jones, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Councillor S Lockwood, representing Minsterley 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) Councillor Nick Hignett, local Ward Councillor, left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

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

Members confirmed that they had received and read the late representation from the agent acting for Mullers.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Members commented that the concerns expressed at the previous meeting had been addressed and the amended layout was much better.

RESOLVED:

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

- Condition 9 being amended to read "Prior to the commencement of any other operations, the proposed vehicular access and visibility splays shall be provided and constructed to base course level and shall be completed to adoptable standard as shown on the application drawings before the development is fully occupied and thereafter maintained. The area in advance of the sight lines shall be kept permanently clear of all obstructions"; and

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to ensure the dwellings remain affordable dwellings in perpetuity and that Officers be given delegated powers to agree the details of the agreement.

86 **Boars Head Hotel Church Street Bishops Castle SY9 5AE 19/03996/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 G Rippon (Town Clerk), representing Bishops Castle 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 Ruth Houghton, 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:

- Approval would mean the loss of a valuable community asset with associated loss of employment and loss to the local economy.
- Proven housing need in area but for affordable and social housing
- Request for deferral to enable the local community to apply to register the pub as an asset of community value

Mr D Price, the applicant, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees

The Consultant Planner advised Members that the HRA had been updated to take account of changes to Shropshire Council's guidance on development in the River Clun Catchment but that the final conclusions had not changed.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Comments expressed by Members included:

- The construction of the new property in the car park constituted overdevelopment of the site especially within the curtilage of the listed building
- The use of the wood cladding was out of keeping with the other buildings in the area.
- Closure of community assets should be avoided

RESOLVED:

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

1) The applicant has not adequately demonstrated that Boars Head cannot operate as viable business and the proposal would result in the permanent loss of a local community facility to the detriment of the social and economic vitality and quality of

life of the community in Bishops Castle contrary to the aims of Core Strategy Policies CS8 and Policy CS15, and paragraphs 83 and 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). These policies seek to ensure the retention of, and guard against the unnecessary loss of, valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs, and to ensure that they are retained for the benefit of the community.

2) The proposal represents overdevelopment of the site giving rise to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, (the Boars Head, a Grade II Listed Building), as well as being out of character in terms of density and design with the nature of development in the locality and providing inadequate elements of residential amenity/open space to the potential occupiers of the properties. As such the proposal would be contrary to the Core Strategy, Policy CS6 and Policy CS17, the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan, Policy MD2 and Policy MD13 and paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These negative impacts are not outweighed by any public benefits of the proposal

87 **Boars Head Hotel Church Street Bishops Castle SY9 5AE 19/03997/LBC**

RESOLVED:

That, contrary to the Officer's recommendation, planning permission be refused for the following reason:

The proposed conversion works, by reason of the number of residential units that would be created, would be an over-development of the site and the introduction of inconsistent exterior material finishes, through the use of horizontal timber boarding on the curtilage building(s) and fencing, detracting from the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. There are no public benefits to outweigh the less than substantial harm in this case. The proposal is therefore contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS17, Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan polices MD2 and MD13, and paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

88 **Proposed Dwelling, Bromlow, Minsterley Shropshire 19/04680/OUT**

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

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.

Members confirmed that they had read the email representation from Cllr Kidd (Ward Councillor)

RESOLVED:

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

89 **Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions**

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 11 February 2020 be noted.

90 **Exclusion of Press and Public**

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 it might involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Schedule 12(A) of the Act.

91 **Planning Enforcement Quarterly Report**

RESOLVED:

That the Planning Enforcement Quarterly Report as at 11 February 2020 be noted.

92 **Date of the Next Meeting**

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that the next meeting of the South Planning Committee will be held at 2.00pm on Tuesday, 10 March 2020, in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall.

Signed ..... (Chairman)

Date: .....