



Committee and Date

South Planning Committee

19 December 2017

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 24 October 2017

2.00 - 4.31 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 David Turner (Vice Chairman), Andy Boddington, Gwilym Butler, Simon Harris, Madge Shingleton, Robert Tindall, Tina Woodward and Vivienne Parry (Substitute) (substitute for Nigel Hartin)

52 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Nigel Hartin (Substitute: Vivienne Parry), Richard Huffer and William Parr.

53 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the South Planning Committee held on 26 September 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

54 Public Question Time

There were no public questions or petitions received.

55 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.

Councillor Madge Shingleton declared that she was a member of Shropshire Rural Housing Association.

56 Proposed Residential Development North Of Coronation Cottages, Lydham, Shropshire (16/03855/OUT)

The Team Manager, Development Management, introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location,

layout and elevations. He drew Members attention to objections made by individuals, which had been omitted from the report, as follows:

- The gift of land was not a significant factor;
- The proposed dwellings were not needed;
- Would devalue existing properties;
- Would have a detrimental impact on the views from existing properties;
- Planning policies were up-to-date. This was a sporadic location and the proposal would be unsustainable and contrary to existing agreed policies;
- The dwellings would not be affordable to local people;
- The proposal would result in additional traffic using what was already a dangerous road;
- Unlikely to benefit local facilities and existing businesses; and
- May lead to further development in the future.

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

Members noted the content of a statement from Councillors Heather Kidd and Jonny Keeley, which had been circulated to all Members prior to the meeting.

Ms D Humphreys, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In the ensuing debate, Members noted the comments of all speakers and considered the submitted plans. Members noted that the site fell outside the development boundary; there were adopted policies in place that restricted development in the countryside; a need for affordable housing had not been identified; and no community consultation had been undertaken by the applicant.

RESOLVED:

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

The application site occupies a countryside location, where open market housing provision is not supported in principle by adopted development plan policies. The development is not considered to represent sustainable development in accordance with the three dimensions of sustainable development as referred to in the National Planning Policy Framework (Economic, social and environmental). As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policies CS1, CS4, CS5, CS6, CS9, CS11, CS17 and CS18; Site Allocation and Management of Development (SAMDev), and the overall aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. Furthermore, notwithstanding the justification submitted with the application, there are not considered to be any material considerations that should be given sufficient weight to justify approval of the development as an exception to the adopted policies referred to.

57 9, 10 And 11 Lower Forge Cottages, Eardington, Bridgnorth, Shropshire, WV16 5LQ (17/00298/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings 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 had assessed the impact of a proposal on the surrounding area. He drew Members' attention to the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting and the completed European Protected Species Tests form that formed part of the Committee report.

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

Councillor Robert Tindall, on behalf of Eardington Parish Council, read out a statement 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 Robert Tindall, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement. He 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 raised no objections to these three cottages being "done-up" nor to there being some form of extension on the front east elevation. These cottages had been built in the late 1700s and were therefore pre industrial revolution cottages. The cottages were not listed but designated as heritage assets. As such the design of any extension should be done as sympathetically as possible;
- The use of a more modern design may be complementary on some buildings but the use of materials as used on the properties to the north-east would be far better suited on these cottages;
- The submitted drawings do not adequately reflect the effect on the neighbouring property (No. 8 Lower Forge Cottage);
- He disagreed with the comments made by the Case Officer in paragraphs 6.3.5, 6.3.6 and 7.1; and
- He requested deferral so that the applicant could reconsider and submit a more sympathetic, in-keeping and complementary proposal.

Mrs H Turner, the applicant, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees. She expressed her willingness to go with a more traditional and in-keeping design if required. However, she commented that the properties did not lend themselves to three dwellings as they stood; it was not possible to extend at the rear so any extension had to be at the front; and any works had to be financially viable.

In the ensuing debate, Members noted the comments of all speakers and considered the submitted plans. Members raised no issues with regard to the principle of development and refurbishment of the site. However, Members did express

concerns regarding the modern design; materials and the use of aluminium, glazing and timber cladding; and the impact on the neighbouring property (No. 8 Lower Forge Cottage). Members raised no concerns regarding the two-storey extension to No. 11 and the use of a flat roof to the single storey element. In acknowledging the applicant's willingness to reconsider the design, it was:

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred to a future meeting to enable the applicant to reconsider the design, materials and impact on the neighbouring property.

58 Proposed Residential Development Land North Of Victoria Road (40 High Street), Much Wenlock, Shropshire (17/00998/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings 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 had assessed the impact of a proposal on the surrounding area. .

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

Mrs V Bellamy, representing the Much Wenlock Civic Society, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Councillor M Whiteman, representing Much Wenlock Town Council, 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 David Turner, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement. He 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:

- For many years this property has remained unoccupied and uncared for and was now in a perilous state. Councillors have had to intervene many times to protect the safety of others from falling debris;
- It attracted intense public interest, particularly from those who walked past it daily and the potential detrimental impact on visitors to the Town;
- The previously proposed scheme was unsuitable in terms of scale and size and was unsympathetic to the neighbouring properties. This new proposal would provide three houses and would be sympathetic and in-keeping with the Town's design principles;
- He expressed some concerns regarding the access onto the A458 but acknowledged that it could have been used daily if the house had remained occupied;
- He was particularly concerned about the fine balance between the cost of the works to secure the fabric of the listed building and the profit that might be

exacted for the development. He was anxious that the development progress as soon as possible but not at the cost of Condition No. 3 which required certain works to be completed on the Listed Building before any occupation of the new dwellings;

- He expressed concerns regarding the removal of materials from the site and the consequential disruption but acknowledged the requirement and agreement of a Construction Management Plan and a Traffic Management Plan prior to any development taking place. He requested that fires on the site be forbidden given the impact of billowing smoke on drivers and nearby residents; and
- He urged approval of the proposal.

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

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 No. 12 being amended to ensure that a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste and timber resulting from demolition and construction works is submitted and approved by the local planning authority prior to any development taking place.

(At this juncture, the meeting adjourned at 3.50 pm and reconvened at 3.56 pm.)

59 Russells Caravan Park, Quatford, Bridgnorth, Shropshire, WV15 6QJ (17/03179/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and with reference to the drawings 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 had assessed the impact of a proposal on the surrounding area. He drew Members' attention to the additional information and amended recommendation as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting, and suggested that Planning Officers be granted delegated powers to attach any appropriate conditions arising from the Section 106 process.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15) Councillor Christian Lea, as local Ward Councillor, made a statement. He took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- An area of land on the site already had appropriate planning permission;
- An additional 20 caravans would have a detrimental impact on the residents of Hollins Park;
- A previous application had been refused and upheld on appeal;
- Proposal would encroach on the countryside and so would be contrary to SAMDev policy MD11;

- There was already noise nuisance and this would increase with additional visitors; and
- He urged refusal in order to protect Green Belt and the interests of residents on Hollins Park.

Ms M Seedhouse, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In the ensuing debate, Members noted the comments of all speakers and considered the submitted plans. In response to questions and comments by Members, the Principal Planner provided clarification on the areas on the site that had been granted planning permission and what was and/or was not covered by planning permission and a caravan site operating licence.

RESOLVED:

That, as per the amended Officer's recommendation as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters, planning permission be granted subject to:

- Completion of a Section 106 Agreement to ensure no stationing of caravans on the alternative site area and a rolling programme to ensure that the area retains and improves tree cover;
- That Planning Officers be granted delegated powers to attach any appropriate conditions arising from the Section 106 Agreement; and
- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1, subject to the amended Condition No. 10 as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters.

To aid the decision-making process, a Member reiterated his previous request that the sites for planning applications of an abstruse nature be marked and pegged-out accordingly prior to any site visit being made.

60 Woodcote Wood, Weston Heath, Shropshire, TF11 8RS (17/03661/EIA)

Deferred to a future meeting in order that any outstanding technical issues could be addressed prior to consideration.

61 Woodcote Wood, Weston Heath, Shropshire (SC/MB2005/0336/BR)

Deferred to a future meeting in order that any outstanding technical issues could be addressed prior to consideration.

62 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 24 October 2017 be noted.

63 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, 21 November 2017 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: