



Committee and Date

South Planning Committee

5 January 2016

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2015

2.00 - 5.47 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), Nigel Hartin, Richard Huffer, Cecilia Motley, Madge Shington, Robert Tindall, David Turner and Tina Woodward

85 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andy Boddington and John Hurst-Knight.

86 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the South Planning Committee held on 3 November 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

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 application 15/04792/PMBPA, Councillor Richard Huffer declared that he held a farm tenancy on this site and would make a statement and then leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

With reference to planning application 15/04281/FUL, Councillor Cecilia Motley declared that she was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership Management Board.

With reference to planning application 15/04792/PMBPA, Councillor Cecilia Motley declared that the owner of the agricultural building lived within her Ward and was known to her and, on balance, would leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

With reference to planning application 15/04281/FUL, Councillor Robert Tindall declared that he was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership.

With reference to planning application 15/04281/FUL, Councillor David Turner declared that he was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership Management Board.

With reference to planning application 15/04792/PMBPA, Councillor David Turner declared that he was acquainted with the applicant and would leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

89 Development Site Adjacent Stone Lee, Calcutts Road, Jackfield, Shropshire, TF8 7LG (14/03009/FUL)

The Principal 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 assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

Mr T Jenner, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Councillor S Harris, representing Broseley Town Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Jean Jones, as local Member, made a statement against the proposal, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- The design, layout and density would be detrimental and did not reflect the historic or semi-nature setting of the area;
- The site would be overcrowded and despite the loss of land the number of properties remained the same;
- No. 7 The Woodlands would be overlooked; and
- Wildlife should be protected.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. In response to concerns and questions, the Principal Planner provided clarification on the design, materials, layout and previous planning applications/permissions.

RESOLVED:

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

- The proposed development, by reason of the proportions and massing of the buildings in close proximity to the north-eastern and south-eastern site boundaries and the restricted garden sizes for the type of dwellings proposed, would have a cramped appearance that would detract from the character and appearance of the Severn Gorge Conservation Area and World Heritage Site. The proposal is therefore contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS17; policies DS1 and H3 of the Broseley Town Plan; and paragraphs 17; 56 to 58; 60; 61; 64 and 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework; and
- The form of and juxtaposition of the proposed development with No.7 The Woodlands would result in a loss of light and an overbearing impact upon that existing property, to the detriment of its residential amenities and contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policy CS6 and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

90 Overdale, Clive Avenue, Church Stretton, Shropshire, SY6 7BL (15/00561/FUL)

The Principal 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 assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

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

Councillor L Chapman, representing Church Stretton Town Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Mr S White, 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 15.1) Councillor David Evans, 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:

- Proposal would sit on what was the last part of a very beautiful garden;
- Would constitute overdevelopment;
- Would have a detrimental impact on the AONB and an area of special architectural and historic interest;
- Would be contrary to Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS17; and
- Could have an impact on Great Crested Newts.

At this juncture, the Vice Chairman took the Chair.

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

RESOLVED:

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

- The proposal, by reason of its design, proportion and massing, would not respect or complement the historic property of Overdale and its associated gardens and would have a detrimental impact upon the local environment and character of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS17; Church Stretton Town Design Statement and the National Planning Policy Framework.

(The Chairman returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair.)

91 Land Adjacent To The Apartment Block, The Woodlands, Jackfield, Shropshire (15/00614/FUL)

The Principal 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 assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area.

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

Councillor S Harris, representing Broseley Town Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Jean Jones, as local Member, made a statement against the proposal, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- Broseley welcomed and supported affordable and social housing but despite revisions this would still result in a cramped site;
- Parking would be inadequate with limited space to manoeuvre;
- Bus services were sporadic;
- If approved would result in a very disruptive time for the neighbouring properties and a Construction Management Plan should be approved and conditioned; and
- This was a difficult site - the site sat within the Ironbridge Gorge so land stability would be an issue and would necessitate piling; surface water

management should be conditioned; and archaeological interests should be safeguarded.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. In response to concerns and questions, the Principal Planner drew Members' attention to a nearby site which had been supported and deemed suitable for mixed-use housing and explained that the application met the parking standards as set out in the saved Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004.

RESOLVED:

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

- The proposal, by reason of the small size of the residential units which would be less than those specified at paragraph 4.38 of the Shropshire Type and Affordability of Housing SPD 2012, would result in cramped development which paragraphs 2.16 and 2.17 of that same document seeks to resist. In addition, the lack of private, useable amenity space which is also sought at paragraph 2.16 and 2.17, would not be appropriate in a social/affordable housing development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS11 which seek to ensure that housing is designed to adapt to changing lifestyle needs over the lifetime of the development and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to secure a good standard of amenity for occupants of land and buildings.

92 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 displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations and the minor amendments made by the applicant in response to the concerns raised by this Committee at a previous meeting.

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.

Councillor T Kirkby, representing Cleobury Mortimer Parish Council, 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.

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:

- There were outstanding permissions in the area which would all impact on the road network and the proposed highway contribution of £20,000 would not be sufficient enough to make a difference; and
- Would be contrary to the Parish and Place Plans and did not take account the community consultation and the desire for bungalows for a growing elderly population.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. In response to concerns and questions, the Principal Planner drew Members' attention to the comments of Shropshire Council's Highway Officers; and some Members expressed concern that there was no Highway Officer in attendance to respond to their questions.

RESOLVED:

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

- The proposal will be detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring residents by virtue of vehicle movements to and from the development through the existing narrow approach routes to the site and will result in an unacceptable incremental impact on the local road infrastructure. The applicant has not demonstrated that these impacts are capable of being adequately mitigated. The proposals therefore fail to comply with Core Strategy Policy CS3, CS6, CS7, CS8 and emerging Policies MD1, MD2 (particularly point 6), MD3, MD8 (particularly point 1) and S6 (particularly point 4) of the SAMDev Plan which has been found to be sound following an examination in public; and
- No specific local community need for this type of dwelling has been demonstrated by the applicant or identified in the emerging Cleobury Mortimer Place Plan. The proposals therefore fail to comply with Core Strategy Policy CS3, CS6, CS7 and emerging Policies MD2 (particularly point 1), MD3 (particularly point 1.i and 1.iii) of the SAMDev Plan which has been found to be sound following an examination in public.

93 Weavers Cottage, Buttonoak, Kinlet, Bewdley, Shropshire, DY12 3AG (15/03558/FUL)

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

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 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:

- This cottage had previously been a tiny stone building/workshop and a remnant of the past;
- She commented that eight small family homes had been built elsewhere in Kinlet parish and so acknowledged the need for family housing in this area of the parish; and
- In view of the close proximity and backdrop of the Wyre Forest she would prefer the use of more stone.

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

RESOLVED:

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

94 The Fish Shop, High Street, Broseley, Shropshire, TF12 5ET (15/03822/VAR)

The Principal 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 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.

Councillor S Harris, representing Broseley Town Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Jean Jones, as local Member, made a statement against the proposal, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- Expressed displeasure at the increasing number of retrospective applications;
- She welcomed some of the changes but needed reassurance that if it did not comply with DDA regulations any further compliance should involve internal changes and not external; given that the provision for waste storage had changed, would there be provision inside; and would the brick treatment achieve an acceptable finish; and
- Would have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties.

Mr A Sandhu, the applicant, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees and provided further clarification on the proposed treatment of the brickwork.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Members expressed their displeasure that conditions had previously been flouted and remained concerned about the height of the building, the proposed staining and treatment of the bricks and the shop frontage. Members noted that the shop front would be replaced, the applicant had worked with Planning Officers in an attempt to mitigate and address issues/concerns and the Conservation Officer had raised no objections.

RESOLVED:

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

95 Wheathill Touring Park Caravan Site, Wheathill, Shropshire, WV16 6QT (15/04281/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout, landscape plan, view points and visibility.

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

Councillor B Foster, representing Wheathill Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Mrs D Humphreys, 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 Madge Shineton, 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:

- She provided a brief history of the site;
- This site had previously been neglected but following negotiations with the applicant, retrospective planning applications and appropriate landscaping the site had improved; and
- The applicant had agreed to sign a Unilateral Undertaking to not make any further planning applications for touring caravan pitches on land wholly within their control at Wheathill.

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:

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to ensure that no extensions to the area of Wheathill Touring Park site be sought in the future;
- The conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report;
- Condition No. 8 to be amended to ensure that the use of the application site as a touring caravan and camping site shall not take place other than between 20th March to 31st October in any calendar year; and
- An additional condition to ensure that the touring park shall not be used as the sole, primary or permanent residence of any occupier.

96 Agricultural Building At Mill Farm, Bitterley (15/04792/PMBPA)

In accordance with their declaration at Minute No. 88, Councillors Cecilia Motley and David Turner 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, layout, proposed landscaping and flooding plan. In response to further comments/concerns received following publication of the Schedule of Additional Letters he confirmed that appropriate prior approval conditions attached to any permission would address flooding issues and provided clarification on the location and proximity of the nearest property.

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.

By virtue of his declaration at Minute No. 88 and 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 in support of the proposal and then left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application made under Part 3, Class Q of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, be granted as per the Officer's recommendation subject to:

- The submission of a satisfactory Flood Risk Assessment;

- No objections from the Environment Agency and Shropshire Council Drainage Officers; and
- The conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

97 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 1 December 2015 be noted.

98 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, 5 January 2016, in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: