



Committee and Date

South Planning Committee

9 April 2019

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2019

2.00 - 5.43 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, Simon Harris, Nigel Hartin, Richard Huffer, Cecilia Motley, Madge Shingleton, Robert Tindall, Michael Wood and Tina Woodward

76 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

77 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the South Planning Committee held on 12 February 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

78 Public Question Time

There were no public questions or petitions received.

79 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 18/05492/FUL and 19/00121/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.

With reference to planning applications 18/05492/FUL and 19/00121/FUL, 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 applications 18/05492/FUL and 19/00121/FUL, Councillor Cecilia Motley declared that she was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Management Board.

80 Astbury Hall, Astbury, Bridgnorth, Shropshire ,WV16 6AT (18/05052/FUL)

The Chairman explained that it had been decided that the first four planning applications for Astbury Hall, being items 5, 6, 7 and 8 on the agenda, would be dealt with together but voted on separately.

In accordance with the Council's practice on public speaking at regulatory committees, the Chairman had used his discretion and allowed each objector, supporter and Parish Council to speak for up to six minutes, the Local Ward Councillor up to 10 minutes and the applicant up to 12 minutes.

In response to a comment from a Member, the Principal Planner explained that the applicant had chosen to submit four separate planning applications, hence the duplication of material before Members and the reason why there was a need for four separate votes to be taken at the meeting.

The Principal Planner 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 the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting and a further objection that had been received following the publication of the Schedule of Additional Letters but which had raised no new additional grounds. He identified the areas that were covered by extant planning permissions.

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 T Allison, representing The Ramblers' Association, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Mr J King, a local business man and resident, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

Councillor R Woods, representing Chelmarsh Parish Council, made a statement in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees. The Parish Council expressed support for the sympathetic design, employment opportunities and investment it would bring to the area but raised serious concerns regarding the scale of the development, pollution and the road access both during construction and later operation of the site.

Councillor J Hodgkins, representing Eardington 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 Robert Tindall, 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:

- **Transport** – The B4555 Bridgnorth to Highley and beyond was in a very poor state of repair - the sub-structure and the base of the road was falling apart;
- If given the go ahead responsibility for the reconstruction of the B4555 must be met by the company;
- People would travel from the West Midlands and would need to cross the River Severn – there were only two places to do this – the ancient Low Town bridge over the River Severn, left by the gym, left at Oldbury then through Knowle Sands and Eardington, or via the by-pass, turn left on B4356 to Ludlow, then Halfway House Lane;
- A development of this scale would cause the infrastructure to become even worse;
- **Density** – This would be overdevelopment. The original scheme was acceptable but this scheme would mean every space would be occupied, the chalets would ruin the countryside and it would have a detrimental impact on the lovely Mor Brook valley and the flora and fauna;
- **Layout** - It was not family-friendly and there were no play areas. He questioned what market this proposal was aimed at;
- **Severn Valley Railway** – It was illegal to stop a passenger train for passengers to alight on board – you would need Rail and Road Board consent. There were no plans to re-open the halt - if opened there would have to be a safety management system and would require the permission of the Rail and Road Board. It was fanciful to think that holiday makers would arrive by train.
- **Finally** - If Members were minded to approve, he requested that Members approve only a scale of development matching the existing previously approved applications.

Mr J Steven, Mr S Rickards and Mr J Wooldridge spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees. In response to questions from Members responded as follows:

- There was already a bus service running past the site and the bus company had been approached to see if it would install an additional bus stop near to the site entrance.
- This was a rural location – expansion of a bus service to include Sundays would depend on viability. This development could support and maintain an improved bus service.
- Lodges would be delivered to the site by experienced companies. Each lodge would be delivered in two parts and because of the size of each load no escort vehicle would be required but the police would have to be notified. It was envisaged that there would be two lorries per day on a planned basis avoiding peak travel times. All access routes had been considered and they were aware of any constraints.
- Provided clarification on construction phases and times; ownership of the site now and in the future; and target market.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Members expressed concerns regarding the cumulative impact of the numerous caravan parks in the area; the detrimental impact it could have on the Mor Brook corridor; the effectiveness of the design to maintain wildlife; impact on the footpaths and the users of the footpaths; impact on road network; cyclist safety; capacity and infrastructure of Bridgnorth and surrounding areas to cope with an increase of visitors; and the proposed high number of chalets which would result in a cramped site. On the plus side, Members acknowledged that the scheme would benefit the local economy and provide employment. If granted, Members requested improved road signage, a less reflective glazing to be installed on the leisure and spa building and low-level lighting be used on the site.

RESOLVED:

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

- Confirmation from the Shropshire Council (SC) Legal Services that the submitted Unilateral Undertaking would secure the non-implementation of any extant planning permissions relating to the application sites (including but not limited to the unbuilt elements of planning permission BR/98/0829) should planning permission be granted for this development; delivery of the proposed apprenticeship schemes; and the development and management of the site (holiday lodges and leisure facilities) as a single entity as a tourism and leisure resort;
- The conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report, subject to Condition No. 4 being amended as follows:

Prior to the above ground works commencing on each building/structure hereby approved, samples and/or details of the external materials to be used in the construction of that building/structure, and in the case of the leisure and spa building details of the glazing to be installed, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory.

- That the Area Planning Manager be granted delegated authority to negotiate any adjustments to the unilateral undertaking sought by SC Head of Legal Services and to make any associated adjustments needed to planning conditions.

81 Astbury Hall, Astbury, Bridgnorth, Shropshire, WV16 6AT (18/05078/FUL)

RESOLVED:

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

- Confirmation from the Shropshire Council (SC) Legal Services that the submitted Unilateral Undertaking would secure the non-implementation of any extant planning permissions relating to the application sites (including but not limited to the unbuilt elements of planning permission BR/98/0829) should planning permission be granted for this development; delivery of the proposed apprenticeship schemes; and the development and management of the site (holiday lodges and leisure facilities) as a single entity as a tourism and leisure resort;
- The conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report, subject to Condition No. 7 being amended as follows:

Before the holiday lodges are first installed on the land details of their external finishes and any associated access decking/steps/ramps shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained for the lifetime of the holiday lodges.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory, in the interests of visual amenity.

- That the Area Planning Manager be granted delegated authority to negotiate any adjustments to the unilateral undertaking sought by SC Head of Legal Services and to make any associated adjustments needed to planning conditions.

82 Astbury Hall, Astbury, Bridgnorth, Shropshire, WV16 6AT (18/05079/FUL)

RESOLVED:

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

- Confirmation from the Shropshire Council (SC) Legal Services that the submitted Unilateral Undertaking would secure the non-implementation of any extant planning permissions relating to the application sites (including but not limited to the unbuilt elements of planning permission BR/98/0829) should planning permission be granted for this development; delivery of the proposed apprenticeship schemes; and the development and management of the site (holiday lodges and leisure facilities) as a single entity as a tourism and leisure resort;

- The conditions set out in Appendix 1, subject to Condition No. 7 being amended as follows:

Before the holiday lodges are first installed on the land details of their external finishes and any associated access decking/steps/ramps shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained for the lifetime of the holiday lodges.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory, in the interests of visual amenity.

- That the Area Planning Manager be granted delegated authority to negotiate any adjustments to the unilateral undertaking sought by SC Head of Legal Services and to make any associated adjustments needed to planning conditions.

83 Astbury Hall, Astbury, Bridgnorth, Shropshire, WV16 6AT (18/05159/FUL)

RESOLVED:

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

- Confirmation from the Shropshire Council (SC) Legal Services that the submitted Unilateral Undertaking would secure the non-implementation of any extant planning permissions relating to the application sites (including but not limited to the unbuilt elements of planning permission BR/98/0829) should planning permission be granted for this development; delivery of the proposed apprenticeship schemes; and the development and management of the site (holiday lodges and leisure facilities) as a single entity as a tourism and leisure resort;
- The conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report; and
- That the Area Planning Manager be granted delegated authority to negotiate any adjustments to the unilateral undertaking sought by SC Head of Legal Services and to make any associated adjustments needed to planning conditions.

(At this juncture the meeting adjourned at 04:26 pm and reconvened at 04:31 pm.)

84 Land To The East Of Woodlands Close, Broseley, Shropshire (15/02877/OUT)

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 had assessed the impact of a 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 I West, on behalf of 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:

- Facts and figures indicate that this development was not needed in Broseley;
- The site was outside the Broseley Town development boundary; and
- Woodlands Close was and should remain the boundary line for development in Broseley.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. A Member commented that the proposed development was located outside of the development boundary.

RESOLVED:

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

1. The proposed development is located outside of any development boundary and within open countryside, and therefore is in a location which is considered inappropriate for new housing development; as such the proposal fails to comply with adopted policies CS3, CS5, CS6, and CS17 of the Core Strategy; Policies MD1, and MD7a of the Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Council has a robust five-year housing land supply within settlements designated for development and so the housing policies of the Development Plan must be attached full weight, and whilst the proposed scheme would deliver modest economic and social benefits there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify a departure from the Development Plan. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aforementioned policies.
2. The proposed site is within a 'Local Green Space' as designated on the Broseley Town Plan Map where under Policy ENV.1 of the Broseley Town Plan 2013-2026 proposals for development of any kind in relation to these valued green spaces are not supported. The benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the loss of this valued area which serves as a protective buffer zone preventing physical and visual encroachment between Broseley and the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and is an unacceptable amenity loss contrary to Policy H.7 of the Broseley Town Plan 2013-2026. The adverse impact of the loss of this 'Local Green Space' on the adjacent historic

environment is contrary to the Shropshire Council Local Development Framework Policies CS6 and CS17, and Site Allocations & Management Of Development Plan Policy MD13 in addition to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

85 Proposed Affordable Dwelling North Of Balls Lane, Broseley, Shropshire (18/03001/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 had assessed the impact of a proposal on the surrounding area.

Councillor I West, on behalf of Broseley Town Council, spoke on the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees. He indicated that Broseley Town Council was not opposed to the principle of a dwelling on this site, subject to an appropriate design, but would prefer the access to be off Balls Lane and not the proposed Woodlands Close.

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 room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- The applicant had a proven local connection;
- Similar properties within the County had been granted permission;
- The dwelling would not be seen from Woodlands Close; and
- He would prefer the access to be from Balls Lane.

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 considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Members commented on the need for affordable housing in the area, considered the impact of this proposal on the Conservation Area to be minimal and noted that this was a Single Plot Exception Site application. Members indicated that they would prefer the access to be from Balls Lane as opposed to Woodlands Close, and suggested a deferral in order for the applicant to consider this suggestion. In response to comments from Members, the Principal Planner explained that before a change to the access could be agreed, ownership of the strip of land onto Balls Lane would have to be determined, and a change of access would represent a significant change that would warrant further consultation.

RESOLVED:

That this application be deferred to a future meeting to enable the applicants to consider access being from Balls Lane rather than the currently proposed location of Woodlands Close.

86 Proposed Camping Site And Amenity Block Adj The Old Vicarage, Knowlesands, Bridgnorth, Shropshire (18/03509/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 had assessed the impact of a proposal on the surrounding area.

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

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15) Councillor Robert Tindall, 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 expressed concerns regarding the close proximity of the shower/amenity blocks to the River Severn; and
- He further worried that this was the right development but in the wrong place.

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:

It is acknowledged that the proposed development would make a make a small contribution to the economic and social objectives of sustainable development in providing a form of tourist accommodation close to the market town of Bridgnorth. However these benefits are outweighed by the harm to the character and appearance to this section of the River Severn Valley that would be caused by a row of tents in this prominent, elevated position relative to the river bank footpaths and the distant views of the development from the east. In addition the occupants of the tents would experience noise and traffic fumes from the B4555 road immediately to the east, and would be at risk of falling into the fast flowing river, which is a natural hazard, due to the location of the shower/amenity block. The proposal would therefore detract from the visual amenities of the area and would not be a safe development, contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policies CS6; CS16 and CS17; Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan policies MD2 and MD11; and paragraphs 95; 127 and 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

87 The Patch, 39A Shrewsbury Road, Church Stretton, Shropshire, SY6 6JD (18/05492/FUL)

(At this juncture, the Vice Chairman, Councillor David Turner, took the Chair.)

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 that morning 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 David Evans, 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:

- He was in agreement with the view of both Church Stretton Town Council and the Civic Society in that he too objected to the proposed metal roof covering which would be totally out of keeping with the surrounding area; and
- He supported the application subject to a tiled roof.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. A Member suggested deferral in order that consideration could be given to the use of traditional tiles, but it was noted that the use of traditional tiles would mean a steeper roof. Members acknowledged that this was a Conservation Area and that the immediate surrounding dwellings were mainly Edwardian style with traditional tiled roofs but acknowledged that there were many different styles in Church Stretton and a steel roof would mean a lower roofline and so be less intrusive in the landscape.

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.

(At this juncture, the Chairman, Councillor David Evans, returned and took the Chair.)

88 2 North Sutton, Great Sutton, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 2AJ (19/00121/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 that morning and had viewed the site and had assessed the impact of a proposal on the surrounding area.

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

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 room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- Diddlebury Parish Council supported the proposal and was keen to keep farmers with young children in the Parish;
- Many homes in the area had been and had to be brought up to a decent standard;
- This would provide a slightly larger home for a growing family; and
- Would have little impact on the Shropshire Hills AONB. There were not many places where you could look downwards on North Sutton and the dwelling would hardly be seen from the road; and
- She acknowledged that it was contrary to policy but considered that this proposal would enhance rather than detract.

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

RESOLVED:

That, contrary to the Officer’s recommendation, planning permission be granted for the following reasons:

- The proposal would be an enhancement and be in-keeping with the local area; and
- The proposal was distinctive, but would have no impact on the landscape and/or scenic beauty of this part of the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

89 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 12 March 2019 be noted.

90 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, 9 April 2019 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: