



Committee and Date

Central Planning Committee

26 June 2014

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 29 May 2014

2.00 - 5.14 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 Andrew Bannerman, Tudor Bebb, Vernon Bushell, Dean Carroll, Ted Clarke, Miles Kenny, Jane MacKenzie, Pamela Moseley, Peter Nutting, Kevin Pardy and Tim Barker (Substitute) (substitute for David Roberts)

1 Election of Chairman

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Vernon Bushell be elected Chairman of the Central Planning Committee for the ensuing municipal year.

2 Apologies for absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor D Roberts (Substitute: Councillor T Barker).

3 Appointment of Vice-Chairman

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Ted Clarke be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Central Planning Committee for the ensuing municipal year.

4 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Central Planning Committee held on 1st May 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5 Public Question Time

There were no public questions, statements or petitions received.

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.

With reference to planning applications to be considered at this meeting, Councillors A Bannerman and P Nutting stated that they were members of the Planning Committee of Shrewsbury Town Council. They indicated that their views on any proposals when considered by the Town Council had been based on the information presented at that time and they would now be considering all proposals afresh with an open mind and the information as it stood at this time.

With reference to planning application 14/00899/FUL, Councillor Tim Barker stated that he was a Board Member on a subsidiary committee of the Wrekin Housing Trust and, for reasons of bias, he would make a statement and then leave the room during consideration of this item and not vote.

7 **Poultry Broiler Units, Great Ness, Montford Bridge, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (13/04305/EIA)**

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and explained that the proposal sought permission for the extension of an existing poultry development. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, indicative layout, topography, site plan, elevations, drainage, elevations of proposed feed bins, drainage and landscaping. He confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. He confirmed that the environmental impact had been assessed by relevant Shropshire Council Officers and objections relating to the impact on the highways, health, odour, visual, noise pollution and ecology had been addressed in the report.

In the ensuing debate, Members acknowledged and welcomed the Screening Matrix and expressed concerns relating to the high number of tractor and trailer movements that could potentially travel through the village.

In response to questions and comments from Members, the Area Planning and Building Control Manager explained that a species-rich hedgerow would contain as many native plants as possible, would encourage wildlife and be beneficial to the ecology; and issues with odour control would be dealt with under other legislation and not through the planning process. With regard to the dedicated access route, he explained that an appropriate condition would ensure that all construction traffic would access and egress the site via this dedicated route, and all HGV movements would continue to be controlled through a Section 106 Agreement. The Area Highways Development Control Manager (Central) explained that a Transport Assessment had been submitted by the applicant and provided clarification on the number of traffic movements.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to:

- The variation of the Section 106 Legal Agreement (in line with the submitted draft) to include the following matters:
 - To secure the routing of traffic associated with the development via the access road between Rodefern Lane and the old A5; and
 - To provide for the regular review of the use of the approved route;
- Officers to seek confirmation from the applicants that all tractor/trailer movements associated with the business is routed down the dedicated access wherever practicable.

8 Land Opposite Ellesmere Drive, Ellesmere Road, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (13/05124/FUL)

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location and proposed layout.

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 Dean Carroll as the local Ward Councillor, made a statement, took no part in the debate and did not vote. He drew attention to the high number of objections and commented that the development would severely impact on the local road network and the Chester Street/Castle Street gyratory. The development would not be sustainable and there was no regular bus service.

In the ensuing debate, Members expressed concerns relating to the cumulative impact this development and the adjacent committed site would have on the local road network and particularly at rush hour and school pick-up and drop-off times. A Member questioned why gas monitoring was currently taking place on the site.

The Area Highways Development Control Manager (Central) provided clarification on the implications of the development on the local infrastructure and the recent improvements to road network in the area.

In response to questions and comments of Members, the Area Planning and Building Control Manager drew Members' attention to paragraph 4.1.6 of the report which indicated that no issues of land contamination had been identified. He further explained that the pond and provision of open space accorded with the Interim Planning Guidance. Shrewsbury Town Council had been consulted and shown a willingness to adopt the public open space and play area and any concerns with regard to the proximity of the pond would have been raised during discussions. The

provision, maintenance and management of the on-site play area would be covered via the Section 106 Agreement.

RESOLVED:

That this application be deferred to enable the applicant to provide information on the reason for the gas monitoring on site together with any information they have with regard to the nature and extent of any contamination on the site.

9 Development Land Adjacent Oaklands, Holyhead Road, Montford Bridge, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/00518/OUT)

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, proposed layout and proposed street scene.

Mr D Kilby, 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 development would not be sustainable;
- The current situation with regard to the sub-five year land supply meant villages were currently in a state of chaos;
- The Local Planning Authority should maintain and ensure protection of the green belt; and
- Sustainable development should mean change for the better

Mr I Hutchinson, clerk to Montford 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:

- He expressed serious concerns relating to the cumulative impact this development would have on the area;
- The proposal would be contrary to Montford PCs Housing Strategy;
- He commented that the Parish Council had no objections to the development of five homes on any one plot, but objected to 34;
- If any development was approved it should be built on the opposite side of the road; and
- He expressed sympathy with the difficulties this Committee was currently experiencing with regard to the sub-five year land supply, but 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:

- He drew Members' attention to the current situation with regard to the sub-five year land supply;

- The increase in provision from 10 to 34 would be in accordance with the NPPF to bring forward sustainable development; and
- The development would support local facilities and services and Montford Bridge would become more sustainable as a result.

In the ensuing debate Members expressed concern that the development would take out of production a substantial amount of high quality agricultural land and 34 dwellings would seriously and irrevocably impact upon the character of the area. They noted that services and facilities were limited and there was no Post Office, shop or village hall and commented that the proposal would be contrary to the SAMDev Plan and the Parish Council's Housing Strategy.

RESOLVED:

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

- The development would have an adverse impact upon the economic viability of the local area by taking high grade agricultural land out of production (contrary to paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework); and
- Would severely impact upon the social sustainability of the settlement by systematically and immediately increasing the size of the settlement by an unacceptable amount which would irrevocably and permanently adversely impact upon the small settlement, which has very limited services and which will then become incapable of providing its population without the need to rely on services outside of the area and travel extensively so to do.

10 Proposed Dwelling Adjacent Lower Wigmore Farm, Wigmore Lane, Wattlesborough Heath, Shrewsbury (14/00629/OUT)

The Technical Specialist Planning Officer introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location.

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

In response to comments and questions, the Technical Specialist Planning Officer and Area Planning and Building Control Manager explained that the principle of affordable housing on this site had already been determined via a previous extant permission; appropriate Rights of Way Officers would investigate any obstructions of public footpaths; and, as this was an outline application, legal advice would be sought with regard to adding a condition to ensure development took place before the expiration of two years from the date of approval.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation, subject to:

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure a financial contribution towards local needs affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS11;
- An additional condition as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters; and
- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

**11 The Anchor Inn, Gloucester Road, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY1 3PR
(14/00899/FUL)**

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, proposed floor plans and elevations. He drew Members' attention to the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting.

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager explained that the application site fell within the current urban development boundary of Shrewsbury and the proposal would involve the demolition and loss of a public house. Objections with regard to the loss of a local community facility had been received. He advised Members that the fundamental issue would be for them to determine whether the public house would be viable over the long term and its loss acceptable.

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 Vernon Bushell, as the local Ward Councillor, made a statement against the proposal, took no part in the debate and did not vote. He commented that he avidly supported affordable housing but acknowledged that community facilities were essential. The Anchor Inn was a popular location right in the heart of the estate, within walking distance of many and used by active darts, pool, dominoes and football teams. The demolition of such a facility would have an adverse impact on the quality of life of the surrounding area and as such would be contrary to Shropshire Core Strategies CS6 and CS8.

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

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 6, Councillor Tim Barker made a statement against the proposal and then left the room and did not vote. He drew Members' attention to further objections from the Chairman of Shrewsbury and West Shropshire CAMRA to the viability report submitted by the applicant and commented that he could see no reason why the Anchor Inn would not be a viable concern.

Mr G Brown, 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 Anchor Inn was a suitable long-term viable public house;
- It had a strong customer base and was used by many teams, ie darts, football;
- Was within walking distance of approximately 500 people;
- The infrastructure, schools, dentists etc could not accommodate more housing; and
- A covenant stated that the land must be used for community use; and
- A thriving community had provision for people of all ages to come together.

Cllr I Jones, representing Shrewsbury 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:

- The Town Council objected to the building of nine apartments which would be out of keeping with the historic area;
- Considered that two-storey family homes would be more suitable;
- The area already suffered with anti-social behaviour and this would exacerbate the problem; and
- He expressed concerns regarding the loss of this facility.

Mr R Henderson, 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:

- The proposal would deliver homes which would meet a specific need;
- Had worked with Planning Officers to ensure the proposal met constraints;
- There were other three-storey homes in the area;
- Appropriate accredited security would be implemented;
- Performance and sales had fallen over the last few years; and
- A CAMRA assessment had been undertaken.

In the ensuing debate, Members noted the comments of all speakers and commented that the Anchor Inn was in a good, clean condition and well used by the local community. With reference to policy, they commented that there was a general presumption against the loss of public houses and also referred to paragraph 37 of the NPPF which stated that planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses and should encourage minimal journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.

RESOLVED:

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

- The Anchor Inn is an important local asset which plays an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating a healthy and inclusive community; and

- It has not been adequately demonstrated that the existing facility would not be viable over the long term;

accordingly, the proposal would result in the unjustified loss of an important community facility for the local area contrary to the aims and requirements of Shropshire Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS8 and contrary to relevant paragraphs of the NPPF (including paragraph 37).

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

12 **Land Adjacent Ingleby Way, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/01014/FUL)**

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site, had noted the access and stream, and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. He explained that the site had previously been allocated for the North West Relief Road but was no longer being pursued in this location and was the subject of an extant planning permission for 25 dwellings. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, proposed floor plans and elevations. He drew Members' attention to the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting, the 15 objections from members of the public as set out in the report, and the objection of Shrewsbury Town Council relating to the loss of green space.

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 Peter Nutting, as the local Ward Councillor, made a statement, took no part in the debate and did not vote. He commented that the buffer zone should be protected, the developer should contribute to play facilities and there should be more space for children to play.

In the ensuing debate, Members noted the comments of all speakers and considered the submitted plans. In response to comments and questions from Members, the Area Planning and Building Control Manager explained that a condition to protect the buffer would be attached to any permission; there was no requirement for open space on a development of this size; and trees would be planted to provide a community area and would enhance the design of the existing development. The Area Highways Development Control Manager (Central) explained that the pedestrian link with The Mount formulated an existing link to the benefit of the wider-community and, with reference to the concerns regarding anti social behaviour along this link, indicated that surveillance of the area was good.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and that delegated authority be granted to the Area Planning Manager/Principal Planning Officer to issue permission subject to:

- Satisfactory information being received to ensure that no unacceptable ecological impact would arise as a result of the development;

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure affordable housing in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document on the Type and Affordability of Housing;
- An additional condition to ensure a Construction Management Plan is agreed prior to any building works taking place;
- An additional condition to ensure development takes place before the expiration of two years from the date of approval. This condition only to be added following the approval of Shropshire Council's Legal Officers;
- To undertake discussions with the applicant with regard to the acceptability of the footpath of the pedestrian link onto the Mount; and
- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

13 **Land East Of Holgate Drive, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/01147/FUL)**

The Area Planning and Building Control Manager introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning to view the site and had assessed the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, proposed floor plans and elevations. He drew Members' attention to the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and it was

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted in accordance with the Officer's recommendation, subject to:

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the on-site affordable housing and an affordable housing contribution;
- An additional condition to ensure a Construction Management Plan is agreed prior to any building works taking place;
- An additional condition to ensure that no first floor windows can be added to the side elevations of plots 1, 4, 14 and 15 that would overlook 35 and 23 Whittington Close, 7 Holgate Drive and 11 Northside Close respectively;
- An additional condition to ensure development takes place before the expiration of two years from the date of approval. This condition only to be added following the approval of Shropshire Council's Legal Officers; and
- The conditions as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

14 **Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions**

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the central area as at 29 May 2014 be noted.

15 Date of the Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting of the Central Planning Committee would be held at 2.00 pm on Tuesday, 26 June 2014 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: