



Committee and Date

Central Planning Committee

18th September 2014

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 21 August 2014

2.00 - 4.29 pm in the Shrewsbury/Oswestry Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Responsible Officer: Emily Marshall

Email: emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 252726

Present

Councillor Vernon Bushell (Chairman)

Councillors Ted Clarke (Vice Chairman), Tudor Bebb, Pamela Moseley, Peter Nutting, Kevin Pardy, David Roberts, Tim Barker (Substitute) (substitute for Dean Carroll) and Mansel Williams (Substitute) (substitute for Jane MacKenzie)

28 Apologies for absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Jane Mackenzie (substitute: Mansel Williams).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Deal Carroll (substitute: Tim Barker).

29 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Central Planning Committee held on 26th June 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

30 Public Question Time

There were no public questions, statements or petitions received.

31 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 application 14/01037/OUT, Councillor Tim Barker stated that, for reasons of pre-determination, he would make a statement and then leave the room during consideration of this item and not vote.

With reference to planning applications 14/00823/OUT, 14/01037/OUT and 14/02385/EIA, Councillor David Roberts stated that, for reasons of a prejudicial nature he would leave the room during consideration of these items and not vote.

With reference to planning application 14/02385/EIA, Councillor Mansel Williams stated that, he would take no part in the debate and would not vote as he had prejudged the issues.

With reference to planning application 14/02425/VAR Councillor Peter Nutting stated that he was a member of the Planning Committee of Shrewsbury Town Council. He indicated that his view on any proposals when considered by the Town Council had been based on the information presented at that time and he would now be considering the proposals afresh with an open mind and the information as it stood at this time.

Following a question from a Member, the Area Planning Manager gave an update on the Council's five year housing land supply and its implications.

32 Land To The Rear Of 21 Hanley Lane, Bayston Hill, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/00823/OUT)

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and 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.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting. The Principal Planning Officer drew Members attention to an email from the Councils Arboriculture Officer confirming that there were no objections, however the final layout, submitted at reserved matters must take account tree constraints and a tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement would also be required.

Ms Emma Kay, on behalf of Bayston Hill 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:

- The proposed site was not included as a suitable site as it was outside the development boundary and would fill part of the gap between Bayston Hill and the surrounding settlements;
- There was no local requirement for this type of housing;
- The local doctors surgery and school were already oversubscribed; and
- The commitments made in the Design and Access Statement could not be verified as the application was only for outline planning permission.

Ms Amy Henson, the agent on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- The proposed site was a designated community hub in the SAMDev Plan;

- The proposed site benefited from excellent highway and infrastructure links and was a logical infill site;
- The visual impact of the development would be minimal;
- Ecological surveys of the site had confirmed that there were no protected species inhabiting the site;
- Affordable housing would integrate well into the community;
- Refuse vehicles were able to access the site more than adequately; and
- The development would provide much needed housing in a sustainable settlement.

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 T Clarke, as the local Ward Councillor, made a statement, took no part in the debate and did not vote. During his statement the following points were raised:

- The type of housing was of no value to Bayston Hill as a community;
- The application was contrary to the Bayston Hill Parish Plan and SAMDev;
- The saved Shrewsbury and Atcham Policy clearly showed the development boundary and this site was not within the development boundary; and
- The quality of the existing cul-de-sac would be spoilt and it would have a huge impact on those already living in a very well designed area.

In response to the comments made by the speakers, the Principle Planning Officer reminded Members that the housing mix and layout were indicative only at this stage.

The majority of Members felt that the proposed development offered affordable housing in a sustainable location.

RESOLVED:

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

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure on-site affordable housing and a commuted sum towards off-site affordable housing; and
- The conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

33 Development Land South Of Brook Cottages, Ford, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/01036/OUT)

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and 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. The Principal Planning Officer drew Members attention to the Schedule of Additional Letters.

Ms Kate Couttes, 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 area was prone to flooding;
- Back Lane was a narrow, poorly lit, single track country lane with no pedestrian path;
- There were no employment opportunities within the village and so those living in the proposed new development would be entirely car dependent; and
- The Parish of Ford wished to be designated open countryside.

Councillor Ray Blyth, representing Ford 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:

- The proposed access along Bank Lane was narrow and had no footpath in places and so had poor pedestrian connectivity;
- The site had a propensity to flood;
- Occupants of the properties would take short cuts and be reliant on cars; and
- The proposed development was unsustainable and did not reflect the needs and aspirations of the local community.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Roger Evans, as local Member, participated in the discussion and spoke against the proposal but did not vote. During which he raised the following points:

- A Housing Needs Survey had not identified a need for further housing in Ford;
- There seemed little role for Members of the Planning Committee if the only criteria was whether a development was sustainable;
- The Housing Land Supply had now been met and this application would set a precedent for others in the future; and
- The development would not be sustainable.

The agent for the applicant was invited to address the Committee, however he indicated that he had no further comments to make.

During the ensuing debate Members expressed concern at the lack of connectivity to the rest of the village for pedestrians and motor vehicles, establishing a link between the development and the rest of the community was critical to the sustainability of the site. Parking at the school was already difficult and would be worsened if the proposals went ahead.

RESOLVED:

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

The proposed development would comprise an unsatisfactory and unsustainable addition to the existing settlement, outside the current development plan boundary, as it would not provide an acceptable level of connectivity and integration with the existing settlement by means of access to services within the settlement (especially

in flood events) and would thereby fail to encourage the use of alternative means of transport to the car contrary to Policies CS5 and CS6 of the Shropshire Core Strategy and the push for sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework (in particular Section 4 – Promoting Sustainable Transport).

34 Development Land North Side of Station Road, Dorrington, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/01037/OUT)

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 31, Councillor David Roberts left the room during consideration of this item and the meeting at this point.

The Principal Planner introduced the application explaining that an appeal against non-determination had been submitted and therefore Officers were requesting a resolution from Committee as to what the decision would have been had the application been determined.

Councillor Edward Marvin, on behalf of Condover 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:

- The application site was outside of the village development boundary and therefore contrary to the Parish Plan and the SAMDev document;
- Station Road was a very narrow single access road with no public footpath, the line of sight onto Station Road was limited and as a result highway safety would be compromised;
- The existing highways network was unsuitable and would not be able to meet the increase in traffic a new development would create;
- Four other sites had already been approved within the village;
- The site would encourage individuals to use their cars to access services and therefore have a harmful effect on the environment.

By virtue of the amendment made to Shropshire Council's Constitution, as agreed at the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, and his declaration at Minute No. 31 Councillor T Barker, as the local Ward Councillor, made a statement, took no part in the debate and did not vote. During his statement the following points were raised:

- Consideration should be given to the cumulative impact the development would have on the village of Dorrington;
- The additional sustainability report produced by the applicant did not attempt to justify the cumulative impact of the proposed development;
- He believed that the development should be considered unsustainable for the reasons set out at the previous meeting on 26 June 2014.

Ms. Charis Denham, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the proposal in accordance with the Council's scheme for public speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Dorrington was a sustainable location,

- A pedestrian crossing would ensure that all services were accessible;
- There was a regular bus service;
- The development would supply a mix of housing type;
- The proposed development was sustainable and complied with the NPPF and the Shropshire Council's Core Strategy

In response to concerns raised by the local member in relation to cumulative impact, the Principal Planning Officer provided an update on the deliverability of other sites within Dorrington.

During the ensuing debate some Members expressed concern about highways safety and the cumulative impact of this and other developments on the village of Dorrington, however they acknowledged that the Council's Highways Team had assessed the scheme and raised no objections. The development was also considered to be sustainable and in accordance with the NPPF.

RESOLVED:

Following the submission of an appeal against non-determination, the Committee gave a resolution that they would have been minded to grant planning permission had a decision have been required, as per the Officer's recommendation, and subject to:-

- A Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure an off-site affordable housing contribution; and
- The conditions set out in Appendix 3 to the report.

35 1 Red Barn Lane, Shrewsbury, SY3 7HR (14/02425/VAR)

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report and drew Members attention to the Schedule of Additional Letters, which corrected some of the comments received from Shrewsbury Town Council.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted as per the Officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

36 Foxholes Buildings, Little Ness, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (14/02385/EIA)

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 31, Councillor Mansel Williams took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and 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. He drew Members attention to the Schedule of Additional Letters which detailed comments made by Shropshire Council Archaeology and Ecology. The Principal Planning Officer explained that following

receipt of a query relating to information provided within the Protected Species Survey, Officers were seeking delegated powers to issue planning permission, subject to the satisfactory resolution of outstanding ecology issues.

RESOLVED:

That subject to:

- A varied Section 106 Legal Agreement to include the following matters:
 - To secure the routing of traffic associated with the development via the Approved Route as set out in the existing legal agreement and as detailed in the report; and
 - To provide for the regular monitoring and review of the use of the approved route; and
- The conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report; and
- The Planning Services Manager be given delegated authority to resolve ecological issues.

Planning permission be **granted** in accordance with the Officer’s recommendation.

37 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

Members considered the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the Central area as at 21st August 2014.

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the Central area as at 21st August 2014 be noted.

38 Date of the Next Meeting

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that the next meeting of the Central Planning Committee be held at 2.00 p.m. on Thursday 18th September 2014 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: