

AGENDA ITEM



Committee and date

Development Management Report

Responsible Officer: Tracy Darke, Assistant Director of Economy & Place

Summary of Application

Application Number: 23/04167/FUL	Parish:	Pontesbury
Proposal: Cross Subsidy Housing Scheme comprising of 4 No terraced affordable dwellings, a pair of semi-detached affordable dwellings, and 4 No detached open market dwellings with double garages.		
Site Address: Hare And Hounds Cruckton Shrewsbury Shropshire SY5 8PW		
Applicant: Mr Andy Rutter		
Case Officer: Sara Jones	email: sara.jones@shropshire.gov.uk	

Grid Ref: 343243 - 310768



© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Shropshire Council 100049049. 2023 For reference purposes only. No further copies may be made.

Recommendation:- Refuse

Recommended reason for refusal

1. The site is not an allocated site for residential development and is contrary to the policies of the Core Strategy and the Council's SAMDev Plan as a whole. The site is not located within Cruckton and the development would be in open countryside where new open market housing is usually resisted. The scheme, which has been put forward as an exception site on the grounds of it being a cross-subsidy scheme, does not meet the guidelines as set out in the Council's adopted SPD - Type and Affordability of Housing, in respect of tenure and cross-subsidy. No material considerations have been identified that would overcome this non-compliance with the Adopted Local Plan which is up to date and should be given full weight. Furthermore the proposed development would unacceptably extend the built form into the undeveloped land to the rear of the site which cumulatively with the development running parallel to the highway and the garage ranges proposed currently under a separate application (23/04274/FUL) associated with the conversion scheme would have an urbanising impact which would harm the visual amenity and rural character of the area and the setting of the former Hare and Hounds PH, which represents a non-designated heritage asset. The public benefits of boosting of the supply of housing, the provision of discounted open market dwellings and the employment associated with the construction phase, would be modest and insufficient

to outweigh the adverse impact of the development on the undeveloped character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS1, CS4, CS5, CS6, CS11, CS17, MD1, MD2, MD3, MD7a and MD13 of the Local Plan, the Councils Type and Affordability of Housing SPD, as well as the overall aims and objectives in relationship to sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.

REPORT

1.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This application seeks permission for the erection of 10 dwellings on land adjacent the former Public House, which was known as the Hare & Hounds, which is in the process of being converted into 4 dwellings under planning permission 22/03783/VAR (which varied 21/017556/FUL).
- 1.2 The proposal is being put forward as a “cross subsidy scheme” comprising the erection of 4 detached open market houses with garages and 6 discounted sale homes (4 terraced dwellings and a pair of semi-detached dwellings).
- 1.3 The proposed 6 “affordable housing units” are proposed to be discounted market sale houses as defined in the NPPF Annex 2: Glossary c) i.e., sold at a discount of at least 20% below local market value. The “affordable housing units” are proposed to be discounted against market value in perpetuity and secured via a Section 106 agreement.
- 1.4 The scheme proposes the 4 detached dwellings to be sited on the roughly triangular shaped field to the rear of the site and for the remaining 6 affordable dwellings to be positioned parallel to the public highway set back behind their rear gardens.

2.0 SITE LOCATION/DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The site lies in the open countryside to the north and adjacent to the former Hare and Hounds PH which is situated to the north side of the B4386. The former Hare and Hounds PH is not listed but has been identified as of heritage value.

3.0 REASON FOR COMMITTEE DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION

- 3.1 The Parish Council has submitted a view which is contrary to the Officer recommendation. The Area Planning Manager in consultation with the Chairman has concluded that the application raises issues which warrant determination by the Planning Committee under the terms of Part 8 of the Council Constitution.

4.0 Community Representations

Consultee Comment

- 4.1 SC Affordable Housing – Not supported
Fails to meet the spatial policy requirements, given its isolation and lack of relationship with a settlement.
There is no evidence to support this proposal as a subsidised exception site scheme. There would be an expectation that the affordable dwellings being subsidised would be affordable rented and not discounted sale as proposed in this instance.
- 4.2 SC Conservation – Comments:
Note the conclusions in the submitted up-dated HIA however it is not considered that the information supplied with this application demonstrates that the estate vernacular design of the introduced new buildings in the general position of the lost outbuilding ranges west of the former public house (and beyond to the rear) are particularly appropriate within this context or would relate well and not dominate the original buildings being adaptively reused for residential purposes. Suggests that contextual street scene type drawings may assist in better understanding these visual relationships, however the very close proximity of the proposed buildings and potential overdevelopment of the area given that there are also now garage ranges proposed associated with the conversion scheme are noted.
- 4.3 SC Trees – No objection, recommends conditions.
Advises that the information submitted with the application is appropriate and that the loss of a small number of low value trees (primarily on safety grounds) would not have a significant impact on the arboricultural resource or character of the site or the wider public amenity and can be compensated for through new planting.
- 4.4 SC Ecology – No objection, recommends conditions.
Advises that the survey work undertaken is satisfactory.
- 4.5 SC Environmental Protection – Recommends condition requiring submission of a suitable construction management plan which includes measures to control noise and dust impact, should permission be granted to protect the amenity of the occupiers of the converted PH during the construction phase of the proposed development.
- 4.6 SC Drainage – Recommends condition requiring the submission of a detailed scheme of surface and foul water drainage.
- 4.7 SC Rights of Way – No comments.
- 4.8 SC Waste Management – Observes that:

A refuse vehicle tracking drawing of the vehicle manoeuvring the road would be useful to ensure that that the vehicle can access and turn on the estate.
Bin collection points would need to be provided for the 4 plots accessed via a private drive (Plots 7 – 10).

4.9 SC Highways – No objection.

Comment: The development seeks to utilise a new vehicular access now fully constructed and the access road is intended to remain private. In view of the surrounding highway network and former use of the site it is not considered that the impact of the development on the highway network would be severe.

Public Comments

4.10 Pontesbury Parish Council – Supports application. Comments made are summarised below:

- Both Shropshire Council and NPPF support a mix of housing to meet local need and maintain the vitality of rural communities which are the aims of this application.
- In recent years, in Pontesbury Parish, there has been a good provision for affordable homes, especially for rent, but there has been a glaring omission - little or no provision, especially in the Cruckton area for low cost, affordable homes for sale.
- Both the Pontesbury RHRP housing survey and the 2020 Pontesbury Neighbourhood Plan consultation identified a need for low cost affordable homes, especially 2-bedroom houses.
- The NPPF states support for rural exception sites which provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs by considering some market housing on site to help this.
- Whilst the existing cross-subsidy policy is primarily for rent, the revised Local Plan makes allowances for other than rented properties.
- Pontesbury Parish Council assume that the properties will remain affordable in perpetuity.

Location –

- The application site is adjacent to 4 houses, has several close neighbours, on a busy road & bus route.
- The site is not isolated nor remote and is a part of Cruckton settlement.
- Consider that the planning department is applying a narrow and incorrect definition of Cruckton settlement which has been contested by both local inhabitants and the Parish Council, and the view of this Parish Council has been agreed by Southern Planning Committee on three occasions. i.e. application - 19/01303/OUT, which was regarded as part of Cruckton by the Parish Council, whose view was upheld by the Planning Committee.

This site is further away from what the planning department erroneously regard as Cruckton, than this application.

Design –

- Considers that the design builds upon the character and identity of Cruckton by following Pontesbury Neighbourhood Plan policy and the recommendation of the NPPF to identify the special qualities of an area.
- The architecture takes inspiration from two neighbouring properties and the linear shape to the affordables acknowledges the shape of the former farm buildings.
- Recommends amendments.

Other Matters –

- To maintain historic links within Cruckton, recommends that some CIL money from Hare & Hounds developments be allocated to improving active travel between the site and Thieves Lane bridleway as per NP policy.
- An additional bus stop should be made to serve the development.

5.0 THE MAIN ISSUES

Principle of development/Suitability of the location
Character and Appearance/Layout and Impact on the non-designated Heritage Asset
Housing Need / Affordable Housing

6.0 OFFICER APPRAISAL

- 6.1 Principle of development/Suitability of the location
- 6.1.1 The development plan for the area includes the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (2015) (SAMDev). A draft Neighbourhood Plan for Pontesbury Parish has been subject of examination and referendum and was adopted by the Council on the 14th December and now forms part of the development plan.
- 6.1.2 Policy CS4 of the CS indicates that development in the rural area will be focused in Community Hubs and Community Clusters, and states that development outside of these Community Hubs and Community Clusters will not be allowed unless it complies with the requirements of Policy CS5 of the CS.
- 6.1.3 In order to provide for sustainable patterns of development Policy CS5 strictly controls development in the countryside (this being the rural area beyond Community Hubs and Community Clusters). However, the policy does allow for appropriate new development in the countryside where it maintains and enhances countryside vitality and character and improves the sustainability of rural communities. While Policy CS5 sets out a list of types of development that it

particularly relates to, it does not explicitly restrict market housing in the open countryside. One of the exceptions noted as being acceptable in open countryside is affordable housing to meet local housing need. Guidance relating to acceptable affordable housing in terms of location, scale and tenure is stipulated in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the Type and Affordability of Housing.

- 6.1.4 Policy MD7a of the SAMDev expands on and complements Policy CS5. It includes strict controls on market housing development in areas defined as countryside. Policy MD3 of the SAMDev recognises that windfall residential development, including on sites within the countryside, will play an important part in meeting Shropshire's housing needs. However, Policy MD3 requires proposals to comply with other relevant development plan policies, such as Policies CS4, CS5 and MD7a.
- 6.1.5 The application site is situated in the countryside for policy purposes. Cruckton is not identified as a Community Hub settlement or a settlement which is part of a Community Cluster within the adopted development plan. Therefore, the settlement of Cruckton is considered to be countryside in policy terms. As such, the proposal for new market housing would be in conflict with the development plan policies outlined above. Together these policies seek to direct development to the most accessible locations, protect the character of the countryside, and support the well-being and vitality of rural communities.
- 6.1.6 The site is located in a relatively isolated position, in that with the exception of the former PH currently under conversion to residential use and the public highway, the site is surrounded by open farmland and scattered dwellings and is located outside and a significant distance to the north of the recognised settlement of Cruckton. Whilst the development would have a relationship with the former PH residential conversion this would not constitute a settlement in its own right.
- 6.1.7 The Councils SPD (Type and Affordability of Housing) makes it clear that exception sites that do not lie in a settlement, constituting isolated or sporadic development, or which would adversely affect the landscape, local historic or rural character (for example due to an elevated, exposed or other prominent position) are not considered acceptable. The guidance acknowledges that, whilst each case is considered on its own merits, *A settlement always comprises a group of houses occupied by households from different families. The group becomes a settlement due to the number and proximity of the houses in the group. Although a matter of judgment in each case, particularly for settlements where the number is small or where the houses are dispersed, for example strung along a road, it is the combination of these two factors that determines whether the dwellings constitute a settlement.*

- 6.1.8 The SPD also acknowledges that recognisable settlements are also characterised by how local people refer to them and that it will usually (but not always) be named on the Ordnance Survey map.
- 6.1.9 With respect to the character of the settlement of Cruckton, the Officers opinion and that of the Parish Council and the Ward Member are not aligned. Officers are of the opinion that Cruckton is a small relatively tight knit settlement with a modest sphere of influence. Whilst the historic development of the settlement is noted, this is not unique in the sense that most settlements developed from agricultural activity. The nucleus of the settlement of Cruckton that is experienced today stems from the housing which was constructed in the settlement centre in the 1950's. Officers acknowledge that when looking at historic maps provided by the agent that the properties addressed as Cruckton were more dispersed than the settlement as it exists today. But even in the map provided by the applicant it is the nucleus around Cruckton Hall that is named as Cruckton. Notwithstanding the history of a settlement, local plan policy has to be applied to a settlement as it exists today, whether that be a small hamlet such as Cruckton or a larger village such as Ford or the town of Shrewsbury.
- 6.1.10 Whilst all the houses along Montgomery Road might have the name Cruckton in their address this does not mean that they are in the settlement of Cruckton. All buildings or sites have either a hamlet, village or town in their address and it is usually the nearest settlement, but this does not indicate that the site is situated within the settlement stated in the address but that it is associated with or near to that settlement.
- 6.1.11 Cruckton has evolved over the last 50 -100 years and whilst there has been some growth along the Montgomery Road the significant growth has been in the centre close to Cruckton Hall. The Farm shop along Montgomery Road is a 'Farm Shop' and not a 'Village shop' and it is considered by officers to be outside the settlement. Caravan sites, although having the name of a settlement in their address are usually located outside of a settlement and in the countryside, as is the case in Cruckton. Historically, public houses were located along transport routes and are not necessarily located within a settlement. The fact that Cruckton ploughing match is held along Montgomery Road is not evidence that Montgomery Road is part of Cruckton but more that it is in the countryside. A ploughing match would not usually be held in the confines of a village but on farmland outside of a village.
- 6.1.12 The agent has referred to the location of the former railway station to the north east of the site as being further evidence that this stretch of Montgomery Road is part of the settlement of Cruckton. Officers do not concur with this view as many (and probably the majority) of rural railway stations were not located within the village, but for obvious reasons had to be located alongside the railway line.

- 6.1.13 The type and affordability of housing SPD clearly states that sites that do not lie in a settlement, constituting isolated or sporadic development, are not considered acceptable. Officers consider that the proposed site (and any other site) along Montgomery Road would therefore not be a suitable site for new build residential development, affordable or otherwise.
- 6.1.14 Officers have always been consistent when considering this and other sites in and around Cruckton. Other applications for open market housing along Montgomery Road include an application in the garden of 'The Chestnuts' fronting the B4386 Montgomery Road (17/02589/OUT) which was refused by officers and dismissed at appeal by the Inspector who considered that the ribbon of development along Montgomery Road fell 'outside the reasonable limits of Cruckton' APP/L3245/W/17/3185134). In respect of single plot affordable dwellings that have been approved these have been either close to the centre of Cruckton, or located adjacent to and opposite Coppice Farm (16/03379/FUL and 17/05333/FUL respectively). An application for a site between the centre of Cruckton and Hanwood was refused as that site was not considered to be within or adjacent to the settlement (17/022333/FUL).
- 6.1.15 It is noted however that a single plot affordable dwelling was approved, contrary to Officer recommendation, some 200 metres to the northeast of the site, further away from the settlement of Cruckton (19/01303/OUT) by the Area Planning Committee (Central) where a majority of the Members resolved to grant permission on the grounds that the specific applicant had demonstrated housing need and a local connection and that, contrary to Officers recommendation, the proposed site could be considered to be within or adjacent to the named settlement of Cruckton.
- 6.1.16 Application 22/05217/FUL is referenced by the agent which it is contended supports this current application. This application, which approved the erection of 3 dwellings (two affordable rent and one discounted open market dwelling) also in the Parish of Pontesbury was also an exception site and was put forward as a cross subsidy scheme. However, this scheme was distinctly different from that proposed at the Hare & Hounds site as the site lies in an established residential area within the settlement and represents an infill plot.
- 6.1.17 For the reasons set out below, Officers do not consider that the proposed development would maintain the character of this section of the countryside. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies CS5 and MD7a.
- 6.1.18 The Pontesbury Neighbourhood Plan is now adopted and so weight can be applied to it in the decision making process. Neighbourhood Plans must align with the wider development plan, as is the case for the Pontesbury Neighbourhood Plan. The Pontesbury Neighbourhood Plan does not propose to change the status of Cruckton from countryside and does not provide any information contrary to officer's views regarding the extent of Cruckton.

- 6.1.19 It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan Policy LAN2 specifically addresses circumstances within which development in or adjacent to Cruckton village will be supported, namely where it involves a residential conversion, with minimal alteration or rebuilding of heritage assets in accessible locations close to services and facilities; and development in or adjacent to Cruckton Village which respects the historic environment. This policy is specifically addressing the importance of and need for development to respect the heritage of the settlement. It does not impact on the role of the settlement within the development plan. Indeed, the justification to the policy makes specific reference to draft Policy SP10 of the draft Shropshire Local Plan, which addresses countryside in a manner similar to policies CS5 and MD7a of the adopted development plan.
- 6.1.10 The draft Shropshire Local Plan is at an advanced stage, with the examination currently ongoing. As such some limited weight can be applied to this document. Within the draft Shropshire Local Plan, the status of Cruckton is proposed to remain 'countryside' for policy purposes and the approach to countryside is proposed to remain generally consistent with that in the adopted development plan. Whilst a cross-subsidy policy is proposed, due to the officers' views on the location of this site, it would not be consistent with the requirements of this draft policy in any event. Furthermore, even if the site was considered consistent with this draft policy, it is considered that the weight applied to it would be insufficient to justify a departure from the adopted development plan.
- 6.1.21 The issue of local housing need and affordable housing is addressed in section 6.3 below.
- 6.2 Character and Appearance/Layout and Impact on the non-designated Heritage Asset
- 6.2.1 The Council has previously identified the former public house as a non-designated heritage asset. The application has been supported by a Heritage Impact Assessment which has been assessed by the SC Conservation Officer. It is acknowledged that the rural vernacular design of the dwellings proposed are not inherently unacceptable and the scheme layout broadly follows the pattern of the existing buildings where it runs parallel to the public highway, which reflects the general position of the historic lost building ranges.
- 6.2.2 However, the proposed development would unacceptably extend the built form into the undeveloped land to the rear of the site which cumulatively with the development running parallel to the highway and the garage ranges proposed associated with the conversion scheme under a separate application (23/04274/FUL) would have an urbanising impact which would harm the visual amenity and rural character of the area. In addition, this cumulative harm is judged to have an adverse impact on the setting of the non-designated heritage asset which amounts to "less than substantial harm" (NPPF paragraph 209 terms).

- 6.2.3 Therefore, in accordance with the NPPF the decision maker is required to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposals.
- 6.3 Housing Need / Affordable Housing
- 6.3.1 Exception sites are permitted in locations that would not normally obtain planning permission for new housing development. The exception is made where the development provides affordable housing for local need. There are several ways in which affordable homes on exception sites can be delivered. The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – Type and Affordability of Housing at Appendix G lists different mechanisms for the delivery of affordable housing, paragraph (8) Cross subsidised schemes are one such mechanism, whereby discounted market sale dwellings are used to subsidise (fund) affordable rented dwellings.
- 6.3.2 The guidance notes that one of the big challenges facing rural affordable housing, is how to bring forward local needs rented homes on exception sites with either no or limited public subsidy. Cross-subsidised guidance in the SPD notes that the properties for “rental on the exception site will normally be owned and managed by a Registered Provider and be intended to meet local housing needs.”
- 6.3.3 The proposal in this instance seeks to provide 4 full open market dwellings and 6 discounted sale dwellings. This is contrary to the guidance in the SPD which requires a proportion (no more than 50%) of the housing on the exception site to be a form of low cost home ownership of sufficient value to the developer to allow them to cross subsidise and develop on that same site, a proportion (no less than 50%) of local needs rented housing or other such affordable tenure as the Housing Enabling & Development Officer agrees to in writing. The cross-subsidy mechanism supports affordable rented tenure and not discounted sale tenure as currently proposed. Additionally, the cross-subsidy mechanism does not allow full market value properties.
- 6.3.4 The proposed affordable housing (6 discounted sale dwellings) does not comprise the required rented tenure and the tenure proposed has not been discussed or agreed with the Housing Enabling and Development Officer as specified in the SPD and would also conflict with the expectation that a scheme would be tenure blind i.e. that there would be an inability to differentiate between the tenures, which is clearly not the case in this instance. Furthermore, the submission references a discount of 20% for the discounted market sale dwellings (i.e. 80% of market value), which is contrary to the definition of discounted market sale in the NPPF, which references ‘at least’ 20% and based on local income and house prices. A reduction of 20% is unlikely to be deemed ‘affordable’ to local households.

- 6.3.5 In addition, no evidence has been submitted with this application to demonstrate that this is a cross-subsidy scheme, as the requirement in the SPD is that the sale value of the properties required to generate the necessary cross subsidy must not exceed 90% of their Open Market Value as determined by an average of no less than two written off plan valuations.
- 6.3.6 The agent and Parish Council contend that, whilst good provision has been made for affordable homes in the Parish, insufficient provision has been made for low cost, affordable homes for sale. The supporting information submitted with the application draws attention to the draft Pontesbury Neighbourhood Plan and its associated survey and public representations which the agent contends supports the provision of discounted sale housing. Within the Parish, Mount Close an exception site comprising 18 houses in Pontesbury is under construction with a view to complete and release of homes next year. The SC Affordable Housing Officer advises that this provision will satisfy an element of evidenced housing need, which weighs heavily towards the need for rented tenure.
- 6.3.7 The agent also references the Draft policy DP7 in the emerging Local Plan. The emerging Local Plan can be given limited weight in the determination of the application however this emerging policy also requires, amongst other criteria for the site to be within a settlement and where there are opportunities for future residents to access services and facilities by walking, cycling or public transport.
- 6.4 Other Matters
- 6.4.1 The access arrangements are considered acceptable, the access and driveway having been approved previously to meet adoptable standards. Suitable conditions could be attached to ensure that satisfactory drainage arrangements are achieved. Ecological interests can be safeguarded, together with appropriate landscaping provided to compensate for the loss of a small number of low value trees and protect the retained trees/hedgerows through planning conditions.
- 6.4.2 Notwithstanding the above should Members resolve to grant planning permission a legal obligation to secure the affordable units discounted against market value in perpetuity would be required.
- 6.5 Planning Balance
- 6.5.1 It is acknowledged that the proposed development would lead to social benefits through the delivery of 10 houses in a rural location, including 6 offered for sale at a discounted price. However, whilst there is a need for more affordable homes these should be in appropriate locations and not as here on a site which lacks a close relationship with a settlement and one which is judged to harm the open countryside and setting of the non-designated heritage asset. Furthermore, no evidence has been submitted with this application to demonstrate that this is a cross-subsidy scheme.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.

8.0 Risk Assessment and Opportunities Appraisal

8.1 Risk Management

There are two principal risks associated with this recommendation as follows:

- As with any planning decision the applicant has a right of appeal if they disagree with the decision and/or the imposition of conditions. Costs can be awarded irrespective of the mechanism for hearing the appeal, i.e. written representations, hearing or inquiry.
- The decision may be challenged by way of a Judicial Review by a third party. The courts become involved when there is a misinterpretation or misapplication of policy or some breach of the rules of procedure or the principles of natural justice. However their role is to review the way the authorities reach decisions, rather than to make a decision on the planning issues themselves, although they will interfere where the decision is so unreasonable as to be irrational or perverse. Therefore they are concerned with the legality of the decision, not its planning merits. A challenge by way of Judicial Review must be made a) promptly and b) in any event not later than six weeks after the grounds to make the claim first arose.

Both of these risks need to be balanced against the risk of not proceeding to determine the application. In this scenario there is also a right of appeal against non-determination for application for which costs can also be awarded.

8.2 Human Rights

Article 8 gives the right to respect for private and family life and First Protocol Article 1 allows for the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. These have to be balanced against the rights and freedoms of others and the orderly development of the County in the interests of the Community.

First Protocol Article 1 requires that the desires of landowners must be balanced against the impact on residents.

This legislation has been taken into account in arriving at the above recommendation.

8.3 Equalities

The concern of planning law is to regulate the use of land in the interests of the public at large, rather than those of any particular group. Equality will be one of a number of 'relevant considerations' that need to be weighed in Planning Committee members' minds under section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

9.0 Financial Implications

There are likely financial implications if the decision and / or imposition of conditions is challenged by a planning appeal or judicial review. The costs of defending any decision will be met by the authority and will vary dependent on the scale and nature of the proposal. Local financial considerations are capable of being taken into account when determining this planning application – insofar as they are material to the application. The weight given to this issue is a matter for the decision maker.

10. Background

Relevant Planning Policies

Central Government Guidance:

West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Policies:

Core Strategy and Saved Policies:

- CS1 - Strategic Approach
- CS3 - The Market Towns and Other Key Centres
- CS4 - Community Hubs and Community Clusters
- CS5 - Countryside and Greenbelt
- CS6 - Sustainable Design and Development Principles
- CS11 - Type and Affordability of housing
- CS17 - Environmental Networks
- CS18 - Sustainable Water Management
- MD1 - Scale and Distribution of Development
- MD2 - Sustainable Design

AGENDA ITEM

- Hare And Hounds

MD3 - Managing Housing Development
MD7A - Managing Housing Development in the Countryside
MD12 - Natural Environment
MD13 - Historic Environment
SPD Type and Affordability of Housing
National Planning Policy Framework

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

14/02888/OUT Outline application for the erection of 6 residential dwellings to include access (existing public house to be retained and restored) WDN 17th December 2015
21/01756/FUL Alterations and extensions in association with the proposed conversion of redundant fire damaged public house to provide four dwellings, construction of new access and driveway with parking area and provision of associated drainage treatment facilities. GRANT 9th November 2021
22/03036/FUL Revised access and driveway arrangements (to adoptable standard) in relation to previous application ref 21/01756/FUL GRANT 21st October 2022
22/03783/VAR Variation of Condition No. 2 attached to planning permission 21/01756/FUL dated 15 October 2021 GRANT 31st October 2022
23/04274/FUL Erection of 4No. detached double garages to serve dwellings approved under reference 21/ 01756/FUL and 22/03783/VAR, dated 15th October 2021 PCO

11. Additional Information

View details online: <http://pa.shropshire.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=S1EFEZTDK9C00>

List of Background Papers Planning application reference 23/04167/FUL and plans and supplementary reports.

Cabinet Member (Portfolio Holder) - Councillor Chris Schofield
--

Local Member : Cllr Roger Evans

Appendices

AGENDA ITEM

-

Hare And Hounds

-