



### Committee and Date

South Planning Committee

24 June 2014

## **SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on 27 May 2014**

**2.03 - 4.34 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 252738

### **Present**

Councillors Andy Boddington, David Evans, Richard Huffer, John Hurst-Knight, Madge Shinton, Stuart West, Tina Woodward, Gwilym Butler (Substitute) (substitute for Cecilia Motley), Heather Kidd (Substitute) (substitute for Nigel Hartin) and David Turner (Substitute) (substitute for Robert Tindall)

### **1 Election of Chairman**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Councillor Stuart West be elected Chairman of the South Planning Committee for the ensuing municipal year.

### **2 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Nigel Hartin (Substitute: Heather Kidd), Cecilia Motley (Substitute: Gwilym Butler), William Parr and Robert Tindall (Substitute: David Turner).

### **3 Appointment of Vice-Chairman**

That Councillor David Evans be appointed Vice-Chairman of the South Planning Committee for the ensuing municipal year.

### **4 Minutes**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the Minutes of the South Planning Committee held on 29 April 2014, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **5 Public Question Time**

There were no public questions.

## 6 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.

## 7 Land off Corvedale Road, Craven Arms, Shropshire, SY7 9BT (13/01633/OUT)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and explained that the application was for outline permission with all matters reserved except for access. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, archaeological features and an amended indicative layout and explained that the built development would avoid linear archaeological features within the site.

The Principal Planner confirmed that no outstanding objections had been received from highways, drainage, policy, rights of way and archaeology. Ecology had initially objected and had requested a prior bat survey; however, the applicant had confirmed that no mature trees would be affected and an Arboricultural Method Statement would apply so this matter would be dealt with by a pre-commencement condition. Similarly, a holding objection from Shropshire Council Tree Officers was capable of being dealt with at the reserved matters stage given that the indicative layout had confirmed the avoidance of mature trees. Craven Arms Town Council had raised objections given that the site was Greenfield and was viewed as an important historic/leisure area by the general public which should be protected and they considered that the proposed development would not be seen as an enhancement to the gateway of Craven Arms but an extension of Halford which would impact on the rural nature of that countryside.

With reference to policy, the Principal Planner explained that the site had not been identified for development in the emerging Site Allocations and Management Development (SAMDev) plan. However, in the current sub-five year housing supply situation the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) required sustainable development to be approved and the proposal in relation to the sustainability tests identified by the NPPF had been assessed and detailed in the Officer's report. The site was within 200m of the existing built edge of Craven Arms which had been identified as a Key Centre in Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy. Hence, in terms of general location and proximity to services the site was considered to be sustainable. In terms of environmental sustainability, it had been concluded that there would be no unacceptably adverse impacts when available mitigation measures were taken into account, including recommended conditions. With respect to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) it had been considered that there would be a very limited impact which would be outweighed by the national need for housing and the associated economic and social benefits recognised by the NPPF. In terms of housing type, it was considered that there was a general shortage of this type of housing within the town's housing mix. Accordingly, it had been concluded, that whilst the site was not allocated in the emerging SAMDev it met relevant sustainability tests and there would be no unacceptable adverse impacts.

By virtue of the amendment made to Shropshire Council's Constitution, as agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, Councillor David Evans, as the local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. He commented that the site had been put forward and withdrawn during the SAMDev process and had never been proposed as a development site. There was much archaeological history associated with the area and it formed part of the AONB. The proposed houses would be very close to the River Onny and would constitute overdevelopment of the area. There was no mains sewer in the area, the mains water that fed Craven Arms and the surrounding villages ran between the B4368 and the edge of the site, and Severn Trent had experienced many problems in this area. The B4368 was a very fast road and the entrance to the site sat just under the brow of the hill on the Corvedale Road. The development would be unsustainable and would have a detrimental impact on the landscape (particularly with the close proximity of Stokesay Castle, Norton Camp and three Rights of Way) and amenity of the area. He urged refusal of the proposal.

Councillor R Conway, representing Craven Arms Town Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- This was a speculative application which was unacceptable;
- There was no demand for houses of this size and affordable houses were needed;
- Other sites in the Craven Arms area for up to 250 homes had been identified;
- The development would impact on the eastern approach to Craven Arms and the gateway to the area should be from the western side of the river;
- The development would be very close to the River Onny and no other development has been permitted so close and accordingly the proposal would adversely impact on the ecology, wildlife, trees and hedgerows;
- The proposal would be contrary to paragraph 116 of the NPPF by virtue of its impact on the landscape and encroachment on the AONB; and
- The Town Council had a vision for the future of the area and urged refusal.

Mr S Taylor, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- There would be little impact on the surrounding area, Planning Officers were recommending approval, the scheme had been amended and reduced, and some trees would be retained;
- The footpath on the eastern side of the site would be reinstated and routes along the Corvedale Road to the Discovery Centre would be enhanced to provide an improved walking route; and
- The proposal would provide higher value housing which would promote the economic development of the town.

Members noted the additional information received from Shropshire Council's Historic Environment Officers as detailed in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting.

In the ensuing debate Members noted that the site had not been put forward as a preferred site for development; land for 350 houses had been identified elsewhere; the access to the site would join a busy and fast stretch of road and be close to the brow of a hill; and acknowledged the concerns relating to drainage. They further commented that this was a speculative application and not driven by the needs of the town and Craven Arms Town Council had at no point been consulted. They particularly noted that the site was partially located within the Shropshire Hills AONB and commented that the development would severely impact on what was the gateway to the area; the building of houses would significantly impact on the rural nature and openness and would urbanise a rural area; and paragraph 115 of the NPPF suggested that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

In response to questions and comments from Members, the Planning Officer reiterated that the site had been put forward at the Preferred Options stage of the SAMDev process but had subsequently been withdrawn following the objections of Craven Arms Town Council. The Solicitor clarified that paragraph 116 of the NPPF suggested that planning permission should be refused for major developments in designated areas, ie Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, except in exceptional circumstances but clarified that this proposal could not be considered as being a major development, but confirmed that paragraph 115 of the NPPF was applicable.

**RESOLVED:**

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

- The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and in particular the approach to the eastern side of Craven Arms. Accordingly it is considered that the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the proposal is considered contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy Policies CS5, CS6 and CS17 and paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**8 Former Primary School Site Caynam Shropshire (13/03834/OUT)**

The Principal Planner introduced the application and explained that the application was for outline permission with all matters reserved and would be subject to an affordable housing payment and CIL contribution in line with Shropshire Council policies. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location and explained that a previous application for six dwellings on this site had been refused on the basis that the site was not within a proposed hub or cluster. This current application had initially been submitted for six dwellings but had subsequently been amended to four and the land had previously been leased to provide a playing field for the village school which had since merged and moved to a new site outside Caynam in 2011.

The Principal Planner confirmed that no objections had been received from ecology (subject to safeguards), Rights of Way (subject to protection of the footpath) and Highways Development Control. Caynham Parish Council had objected on the basis that the site was classed as countryside, had no allocation for market housing, there were no economic diversification reasons for development and would like the site to remain as open amenity/recreational land.

With reference to policy, the Principal Planner explained that Caynham did not form part of an identified community hub or cluster, there were no community facilities other than a village hall and limited bus services, and in the current sub five year housing supply situation the NPPF required sustainable housing proposals to be approved.

With reference to environmental effects, the Principal Planner explained that the indicative design and density was considered to be in keeping with adjoining housing. The site lay within the built curtilage of the village and there had been no highway, ecology or drainage objections. A public footpath would not be affected.

The Principal Planner further explained that it was considered that the loss of the playing field would have an adverse impact on the area. However, the site was in private ownership and there would be no public funds available to purchase the land for continued recreational use. Sport England had raised no objections. The applicant had offered the Parish Council a lease on land adjacent to the former school for the provision of car parking for the village hall and possible space for a play area to the rear of the school, conditional upon support for the proposal, but this had been rejected.

In conclusion, the Principal Planner explained that the site would increase market housing in a rural settlement and would provide financial benefits to the local community and affordable housing in the wider area. There had been no attempts to secure the future of the play area and reduced weight could be given to this factor as it was in private ownership with no available resources available for purchase and maintenance. Recent housing appeals would suggest that a refusal on the grounds that the proposal was contrary to Development Plan housing policy would be unlikely to be sustained upon appeal. Accordingly, it had been concluded that residential development on this site would be sustainable in accordance with the NPPF.

The Principal Planner drew Members' attention to the Schedule of Additional Letters, circulated prior to the meeting, which detailed further comments from the agent and which indicated that the applicant had reiterated a willingness to offer the adjacent land (the subject of a planning application also to be considered at this meeting [13/03835/OUT]) to the Parish Council for use for parking for the village hall and potentially for a play area on a long-term peppercorn rent basis if the current application was to be approved and not to appeal against any refusal of that application. Planning Officers were recommending refusal of the subsequent application and it was considered that this provision would add to the level of community benefit and overall sustainability being offered as part of the current proposals. Without prejudice, if the subsequent application [13/03855/OUT] was refused and the current application was approved it was requested that officers be

given delegated authority to add an appropriate legal clause securing this voluntary provision.

By virtue of the amendment made to Shropshire Council's Constitution, as agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, Councillor Richard Huffer, as the local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the room and took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. He welcomed the recommendation to refuse planning application 13/03835/OUT and urged refusal of this application. He expressed concerns relating to highway safety, the narrowness of the private access and minimal vehicle turning facilities. He had objected to the closure of the school which had had a negative impact on the structure of the village and commented that this was the last piece of amenity land which could be made available to the community for recreational/leisure use.

Mr P Chester, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The proposal would not be sustainable and contrary to the NPPF;
- Local Planning Authorities must apply sustainability on a case-by-case basis;
- Finance had always been available to purchase the land for community use;
- The proposal would be contrary to Core Strategies CS5, CS8, CS17; and
- SAMDev would become the over-reaching policy from July onwards.

Councillor Mrs B Ashford, representing Caynham Parish Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- There had been many objections from local residents and the Parish Council had unanimously objected to this application;
- SAMDev was now at an advanced stage and should be taken into account;
- Caynham was in the countryside and was not a settlement where additional housing for sale on the open market was considered to be appropriate or sustainable;
- More appropriate for development to take place in Clee Hill;
- Caynham Parish Council had been consulted and contributed to Shropshire Council policies; and
- The proposal would not be sustainable and would be contrary to the NPPF

Mr J Needham, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- No objections had been raised from technical consultees relating to drainage, ecology and highways, and Rights of Way had raised no objections subject to the footpath being legally diverted;
- No comments had been received from Sport England and Shropshire Council Archaeology Officers, and Shropshire Wildlife Trust had raised no objections;
- The proposal would result in affordable housing and CIL contributions;

- He expressed agreement with the refusal reason of the original planning application but commented that Shropshire Council could not currently demonstrate a five year land supply; and
- He drew Members' attention to the applicant's offer to make the land adjoining the school available on a 25 year lease.

In the ensuing debate Members commented that the proposal would not be sustainable, the dwellings and gardens proposed were too big, and would provide no economic benefits to the area. They expressed concerns relating to the narrow access road and minimal turning head facilities, and the negative impact the proposal would have on the ecology rich hedgerows. They further noted the minimal community facilities and the limited bus service. They acknowledged that the area had not been designated as a community hub or cluster and noted that nearby Clee Hill had been designated as a hub where land had been allocated for development in the SAMDev process.

**RESOLVED:**

That, contrary to the Planning Officer's recommendation, planning permission be refused because the proposed development is not considered to be sustainable because of the lack of and distance to and from services. Accordingly, it is considered that the lack of sustainability outweighs the need for new housing in the area and is considered to be contrary to the Shropshire Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS4 and CS5.

**9 Former Primary School Site, Caynham, Shropshire (13/03835/OUT)**

The Principal Planner introduced the application and explained that the application was for outline permission with all matters reserved. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location. He confirmed that no objections had been received from ecology and highways (subject to conditions), and drew Members' attention to the objections raised by Shropshire Council Conservation Officers, Caynham Parish Council and local residents.

With reference to policy, the Principal Planner reiterated that Caynham did not form part of an identified community hub or cluster, and the current sub five year housing supply situation applied. He confirmed that no objections had been raised by highways or ecology. However, it was considered that there would be an unacceptable impact on the listed school building which formed part of the social and cultural history of the village, due to the proximity of the proposed plots to this building. As a result, the proposal would be contrary to Part 12 of the NPPF and policy CS17 of the Core Strategy. A footpath diversion would also be required to accommodate the development and careful siting would be required to preserve residential amenities of adjoining properties.

The Principal Planner explained that the car park which previously served a useful purpose for the school and the village hall had been closed and objections had been made to the loss of this facility which Core Strategy Policy CS8 aimed to protect. The

car park could be important to the viability and future of the village hall and this would be a material consideration, but ultimately it would have to be brought into public ownership to be opened up again.

In conclusion, the Principal Planner explained that the site was located in a village where no further residential development had been advocated but Shropshire Council did not have the minimum five year land supply so the presumption in favour of sustainable residential development applied. The development would be located in the vicinity of existing residential properties and would not be prominent or impact adversely on drainage, highways or ecology. It would however lead to a cramped form of development in very close proximity to a Listed Building. In particular, the recently converted listed school building had no rear curtilage and the dwelling proposed on plot 1 would greatly detract from the setting and amenity of the listed building. This impact was considered sufficient to outweigh the benefits of the proposal and accordingly, refusal was being recommended.

By virtue of the amendment made to Shropshire Council's Constitution, as agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, Councillor Richard Huffer, as the local Ward Councillor, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

**RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be refused as per the Officer's recommendation.

**10 Development Land North East Of Stone Drive, Shifnal, Shropshire (14/00062/OUT)**

The Principal Planner introduced the application and explained that the application had been deferred at the previous meeting in order that a schematic plan and details on how the drainage from the development would work and be managed to a satisfactory standard could be provided. He drew Members' attention to two additional neighbour comments relating to concerns regarding drainage and the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting which detailed an amended recommendation as a consequence of the Highways Agency raising no objections to the proposal. He confirmed 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. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, indicative layout and SAMDev allocation area.

A schematic plan and drainage technical note outlining the measures proposed to the Silvermere and the surface water drainage strategy for the proposed development area had been provided by the applicant and had been circulated to all Members prior to the meeting.

By virtue of the amendment made to Shropshire Council's Constitution, as agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, Councillor Stuart West, as the local Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the room and took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. He drew Members' attention to the history of the issues relating to flooding and drainage in the area and reiterated his concerns in this regard.



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

The Floods and Water Manager summarised and provided clarification on the drainage and disposal of water and he considered that as a result of this development a betterment to the existing situation would be achieved. In conclusion, he confirmed that Shropshire Council would continue to investigate the problems associated with drainage and flooding in the area.

Mr G Phillips, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- He provided an overview and history of the culvert and continued to express his concerns with regard to drainage and flooding; and
- There were two riparian owners (Shropshire Council and one householder) and these riparian owners had a duty of care to maintain the culvert and should investigate and repair when necessary.

Ms K Ventham and Mr A Bennett, the agents, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- At the last meeting it had been noted that the site would be suitable for development and the proposal was deferred for further information relating to drainage and this had now been provided; and
- The development would not contribute towards any flood risk.

In the ensuing debate, Members noted the comments and concerns of all speakers and the majority of Members supported the proposal.

**RESOLVED:**

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

- Satisfactory agreement being reached on a Section 106 Agreement relating to affordable housing provision;
- Contributions to the Travel and Movement Strategy for Shifnal and off site drainage works;
- Maintenance of the town park/open space by an appropriate body; and
- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, subject to Condition No. 1 being amended to read as follows:

"Reason: The application is an outline application under the provisions of Article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 and no particulars have been submitted with respect to the matters reserved in this permission.

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

#### 11 **Land south of Woodbatch Road, Bishops Castle (14/00885/OUT)**

The Principal Planner introduced the application for outline permission with all matters reserved. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and assess the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, access and amended layout. He confirmed that two of the dwellings would be affordable with the remainder being for open market sale and the number of proposed dwellings had been reduced to nine dwellings to meet ecological requirements linked to the Clun catchment. He drew Members' attention to the objections which had been addressed in the report and explained that, in addition to an affordable housing contribution, a financial contribution from the applicant would fund a priority junction arrangement at the Kerry Lane/Woodbatch Road junction.

With reference to policy, the Principal Planner explained that Bishops Castle had been identified as a market town and Key Centre in the adopted Core Strategy and new housing would be developed through a combination of one allocated site (40 houses) and a windfall allowance. The proposed site had not been allocated in the Pre-Deposit Draft SAMDev Plan and was outside (to the immediate west of) the development boundary of the town. However, in the current sub-five year housing supply situation the NPPF required sustainable development to be approved.

The Principal Planner explained that the site was immediately adjacent to the existing built edge of Bishops Castle and within 500m of the geographic centre. Therefore, the general location was considered to be sustainable. In terms of traffic, Highway Officers had determined that a highway refusal could not be sustained and the applicant's offer to fund signage for a priority junction at the Kerry Lane/Woodbatch Road intersection would be welcomed. No objections had been received from Land Drainage Officers and interceptor ditches would be placed on the western and eastern boundaries and would help to address problems encountered by residents of the Novers to the immediate east. Mains sewerage had been proposed and a biodisc plant would provide an appropriate back-up plan. The site would not be visible from the AONB; however, because of its relatively elevated location the applicant had agreed, in principle, to specify less tall 1½ storey houses or bungalows and landscaping to integrate the site with its surroundings.

In conclusion, the Principal Planner drew Members' attention to the NPPF which stated that there was a national need for housing and emphasised the associated economic and social benefits. The type of housing would be capable of meeting a local need and it had therefore been concluded that, whilst the site was not allocated in the emerging SAMDev, it met relevant sustainability tests and there would be no unacceptable adverse impacts when available mitigation measures and conditions were taken into account. The proposal was therefore recommended for approval subject to the required affordable housing contribution.

Members noted the additional information detailed in the Schedule of Additional Letters which had been circulated prior to the meeting and detailed further comments from Bishops Castle Town Council, comments and an additional condition from

Shropshire Council Highways, and a further objection from a local resident relating to flooding.

Mr J Percy, a local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- He lived adjacent to the proposed development in the south-eastern section and had done so for 13 years and he, along with other residents, had constantly suffered from run-off water every year. He had experienced flooding underneath his property, which caused soil erosion;
- He had dug trenches to divert the water into a stream and this had alleviated but not solved the problem;
- The volume of water had not been factored into the developers Flood Risk Assessment (FRA); and
- In winter the land was waterlogged and the FRA should be based on winter conditions.

Councillor S Harris, representing Bishops Castle Town Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised;

- There was a need for starter homes in the area;
- The site fell outside the development boundary and adjacent to the AONB;
- 40 homes had already been agreed and included in SAMDev proposals;
- There had been a high number of objections;
- The highway network would not be able to accommodate the additional traffic that would be generated by this development;
- The proposed junction arrangements would require the use of land belonging to a private resident who had not been approached or expressed agreement to the proposal;
- He expressed concerns with regard to water run-off; and
- The Town Council was concerned that this would open up the door to build on other Greenfield sites.

Mr S Taylor, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised;

- Planning Officers had confirmed that all technical issues had been addressed;
- This development would provide an opportunity to solve the water run-off problems;
- The proposal was for outline and the form of development could be controlled by conditions;
- The number of houses proposed had been reduced to nine;
- An upgrade and contribution to the access and road network had been proposed; and
- This proposal would contribute to the shortfall of housing in Shropshire.

In response to comments from Members, the agent explained that the upgrades to the junction at Woodbatch Road and Kerry Lane had been agreed following discussions with the Planning and Highway Officers and no consultation had been undertaken in this regard with Bishops Castle Town Council.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Charlotte Barnes, as local Member, participated in the discussion and spoke against the proposal but did not vote. She expressed some concerns that Bishops Castle Town Council had not been consulted on the proposed junction arrangements and also that the landowner of the land required to improve the access had not been approached or agreed to such a proposition. She also expressed concerns with regard to the high volume of traffic using the road network especially during peak times, ie school drop-off and pick-up times, and flooding. She commented that local people would not be able to afford these homes; the proposal would impact on the character of the area and move the main focus to the side of the town; a more preferred location for residential development would be on the north western side; and, given the elevation of the site, any dwelling would adversely impact on the landscape.

In the ensuing debate, Members acknowledged the hard work of Bishops Castle Town Council and the local Member in identifying alternative sites for development and expressed serious concerns with regard to the drainage and particularly the access and highway arrangements. A Member commented and expressed her dismay that very little contact or consultation had been undertaken with the Town Council and local Member and suggested that, in future, contact between Highway Development Control Officers, the local Town and Parish Councils and the local Member should be vastly improved not just for this application but generally. Also, the local Member should also be involved and kept informed of any accidents or other major developments affecting the highway network in their respective areas outside of the planning process.

**RESOLVED:**

That this application be deferred in order for the applicant to review the impact and effect of the proposed development on the local road network and Conservation Area and review impact and effect re drainage and consult on and put forward mitigation measures identified as necessary.

**12 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions**

**RESOLVED:**

**That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 27 May 2014 be noted.**

**13 Date of the Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the South Planning Committee will be held at 2.00 pm on Tuesday, 24 June 2014 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall.

Signed ..... (Chairman)

Date: .....