



| |
|----------------------------------|
| <u>Committee and Date</u> |
| South Planning Committee |
| 11 November 2014 |

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2014

2.00 - 6.49 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

Councillor Stuart West (Chairman)

Councillors David Evans (Vice Chairman), Andy Boddington, Nigel Hartin, Richard Huffer, John Hurst-Knight, Cecilia Motley, Madge Shineton, Robert Tindall, David Turner and Tina Woodward

66 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

67 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the South Planning Committee held on 16 September 2014, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

68 Public Question Time

In accordance with Procedure Rule 15, the following public question was received:

- Received from Mr G Jackson and answered by Mr G French, Principal Planner – copy attached to the signed minutes.

By way of a supplementary question Mr Jackson requested clarification on the following:

- (i) The specific clause in the Scheme of Delegation which referred to 'exceptional special circumstances';
- (ii) The criteria used to define such circumstances; and
- (iii) On which dates following the Committee's decision had officers discussed the matter with:
 - (a) The Chairman of this Committee and the local Ward Member to agree that exceptional special circumstances applied;
 - (b) The applicant to agree what further information was required;

- (c) With statutory consultees, ie Highways; and
- (d) The democratically elected Town Council and the many residents who had opposed this application.

The Chairman explained that a written response would be provided.

At the request of Mr G Jackson, the Principal Planner explained that the Scheme of Delegation provided for some flexibility or discretion as to when Officers could exercise their own judgement. It was not an exact document that was specific to every circumstance. Following the decision and given the concerns regarding defensibility at Appeal and there being no highway objections raised, there had been an immediate dialogue undertaken with the applicant and, within a week, the Area Planning Manager had agreed, in principle, to the application being reported back to committee. He confirmed that a more detailed written response would be provided.

69 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 14/02873/FUL, Councillor Richard Huffer, declared that he was acquainted with the applicant but only in his capacity as a fellow farmer.

With reference to planning application 14/02807/FUL, Councillor Cecilia Motley, declared that she was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership Management Board.

With reference to planning application 14/01397/FUL, Councillor David Turner, declared that, for reasons of bias, he would leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

With reference to planning application 14/02127/FUL, Councillor David Turner, declared that, for reasons of bias, he would make a statement and then leave the room and take no part in the consideration of, or voting on, this application.

With reference to planning application 14/02807/FUL, Councillor David Turner, declared that he was a member of The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership Management Board.

70 Land south of Woodbatch Road, Bishops Castle (14/00885/OUT)

The Chairman drew Members' attention to the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting. He explained that the Committee Members had also received numerous emails and letters relating to planning applications to be considered at this meeting, all of which had been noted and would be taken into account by Members when making their decision.

Members noted the additional information circulated in paper form at the meeting and via email prior to the meeting regarding an Overview Report of the Highway Infrastructure to the South of Bishops Castle Town Centre, Shropshire, which had been commissioned by the applicant.

The Principal Planner introduced the application. With reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, access and amended layout. He confirmed that 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.

Councillor Mrs A-M Jackson, representing Bishop's 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:

- The Town Council had been shocked to learn that a decision to unanimously refuse an application carried no weight and expressed concerns relating to the brief time afforded to them to respond to the resubmission of this application;
- The traffic report contained no substance, data, verified costings or topographical information. No evidence to suggest that the improvements would be achievable;
- The confirmation of CIL monies was not within the remit of this Committee; and
- The proposal would be contrary to policies and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

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:

- The Officer's report outlined the reasons why this application was being reconsidered;
- Even without the highway improvements, there were no planning issues to justify refusal;
- He drew attention to the Cabinet meeting held on 30th July 2014 which indicated that the improvements to the highways could now be provided without recourse to public funds;
- Would not be contrary to policy, would result in significant benefits and, if refused, would jeopardise the provision of affordable housing on adjacent land; and
- If granted would avoid a costly appeal.

In response to questions from Members of the Committee, Mr Taylor and the Principal Planner provided clarification on the improvements planned alongside Bells Court and the covering of the culvert and the allocation and spending of CIL monies.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Charlotte Barnes, as local Member, participated in the discussion but did not vote. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- Concerns with regard to the targeting and spending of CIL monies;
- The Highways report had been made available on the website before she had been informed about it;
- Expressed surprise with regard to the comments in the report relating to Corporation Street;
- Covering the culvert by the Six Bell's Public House and permitting vehicles to drive close to the wall would be detrimental to a Grade II Listed Building. The culvert was currently a home for ducks and they would have to be re-housed;
- Campaigning for years for a crossing in the location referred to in paragraph 2.4 of the report but had been informed that it would be too expensive; and
- There were places where two vehicles could not pass and the high number of objections clearly demonstrated the concerns and knowledge of local residents regarding the inability of the road network to cope with additional traffic.

In response to comments and questions from Members, the Area Highways Development Control Manager (South) provided clarification on highway issues. She explained that Highway Officers had raised no objections to the scheme and that nine dwellings would not constitute a highway objection and drew Members' attention to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which indicated that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development were severe. She explained that along with the local Ward Member and representatives from the Town Council she had attended numerous site visits to Bishops Castle prior to the July meeting. Following a further meeting with the local Ward Member in September six recommendations for improvements to the local road network had been agreed.

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

RESOLVED:

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

- The Bishop's Castle community had overwhelmingly rejected sites on this side of the town for housing development during a rigorous Site Allocations and Management Development (SAMDev) consultation exercise because of access problems to the town's hinterland. Other more appropriate sites had been identified;
- A need for affordable housing had been identified in the area and the contribution of this application to the affordable housing stock would be minimal; and
- This proposal would exacerbate the already significant traffic problems that exist along Kerry Lane. To exit the proposed development site and the town, traffic would have to use Kerry Lane, which, in places is a single track road, has no footpath in places, has five junctions within close proximity, and is already unsuitable for existing residents and businesses. The deficiencies in the local road network would not achieve a good standard of amenity for existing occupants of the area and the occupants of the proposed dwellings.

Accordingly, the proposed development would be contrary to paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Core Strategy policy CS6 whereby the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

71 Hazeck, The Mines, Broseley, Shropshire, TF12 5QY (14/01341/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit the previous day 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, elevations and tree planting and protection plans.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting, which detailed further objections.

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 Turner, 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. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- A considerable number of local residents and the Parish Council had consistently raised objections to the changes made to what was originally a modest bungalow, which was largely hidden in a plot which contained a mixture of trees and shrubs and bounded by a low wall;
- The boundary fence which had been permitted retrospectively had attracted many objections;
- The property, as consented, was totally out of character in the Conservation Area;
- The current application sought to vary the scale and appearance of the property by adding more living space into the building and the limited visual interest in the consented building would now be lost;
- A healthy evergreen Norway Spruce would be lost; and
- If approved, consideration should be given to the species and maturity of replacement trees.

Mrs M Morgillo, 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 excessively increase the size of what was a two-bedroomed dwelling;
- Would be overbearing and out of character with the area; and
- Would impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties.

Councillor M Whiteman, representing Barrow 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:

- Local residents and the Parish Council considered the proposal to be overdevelopment and totally out of character with the area;
- Would impact on neighbouring properties;
- Much work had been undertaken retrospectively;
- The boundary fence had been erected without permission;
- Inappropriate tree planting had taken place; and
- An appropriate tree planting and replacement scheme should be conditioned.

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

RESOLVED:

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

- The proposed development, by reason of its massing and inappropriate design and the loss of trees would result in overdevelopment of the site, would detract from the character and appearance of the built and historic environment and would have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenities. The development would therefore be contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS17 and paragraphs 56 to 58, 60 and 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(The meeting adjourned at 3.18 pm and reconvened at 3.23 pm.)

72 Fox Studio, King Street, Much Wenlock, Shropshire, TF13 6BL (14/01397/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit the previous day 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 and elevations.

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 69, Councillor David Turner left the room during consideration of this item.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting, which detailed further objections.

Ms H Wilkins-Webb, 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 have a detrimental impact on her property, privacy and light and would change the way she used her existing living space;
- Would impact further on the access onto King's Street, which was already congested and had no pavement;
- The submitted site plan was inaccurate and did not include her studio;

- There was no provision for garden space or any form of outside open space; and
- The proposal constituted overdevelopment in a Conservation Area and would be contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Councillor Mrs M Hill, representing Much Wenlock 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 proposal constituted overdevelopment on a small site and would be detrimental to the Conservation Area;
- There was a need for small residential units but provision must be appropriate and in keeping with the area;
- King Street was already congested and this proposal would increase traffic movements and exacerbate the problem; and
- The demolition of part of the stone wall would have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area.

Mr D Myers, representing the applicant, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Would create affordable living units to a high standard with parking provision;
- Would be sustainable and in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan; and
- Would not exacerbate surface water and would have a greater impact on the access.

In response to questions from Members, Mr Myers provided clarification on the width of the access and explained that in order to meet the required affordable housing contribution and achieve a financially viable proposition, the application was as proposed.

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

RESOLVED:

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

- The proposed development, by reason of increased scale through extension and the insertion of the proposed pedestrian access within the existing stone boundary wall would result in overdevelopment of the site and would have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area, neighbour amenity and public safety. The development would therefore be contrary to Shropshire Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS17, Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan policies H4 and GQD2 and paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

73 Bradley Farm, Farley, Much Wenlock, TF13 6PE (14/02127/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit the previous day 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, layout, elevations, access, passing places and proposed junction arrangements.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting, which detailed further objections and comments from local residents, Much Wenlock Civic Society and Shropshire Council Archaeology Officers.

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 69, and 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 Turner, 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. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- He refuted the suggestions of the applicant's agent which suggested that he had interfered in the determination of this planning application;
- Both he and a number of local residents supported the provision of riding for the disabled, but expressed reservations with regard to scale, flooding and highways;
- Scale – The proposal would be contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan's Policy GQD1, which stated that:

“The high quality natural landscape outside the development boundary of Much Wenlock will be protected from any development which adversely affects the town's character, setting and open views.”;

“open views towards the countryside, or across open spaces should be maintained”; and

“Elsewhere, the parish is characterised by small settlements....as well as hamlets and scattered farmsteads and it is important that new development respects its rural setting and does not detract from the high quality landscape of the parish in line with CS6”;

- The proposal would be sited only 250 yards from the boundary of the AONB;
- Flooding – There was no quantitative assurance that the measures contained in the proposal would reduce the flow of water off the development, and, as such, would be contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan Policy RF2;
- Highways – It is difficult to gain access to and from the lane onto the A4169 and innumerable shunts had taken place. Although regular users of the lane were aware of the blind spots and the need to reverse for quite some distance in order to pass, and, although the proposed passing places would alleviate some of the problem, he expressed concerns that this might not be sufficient to resolve concerns given the likely increase in the number of vehicles using the lane. As such the proposal would be contrary to Neighbourhood Plan Policy EJ3, which suggested that in supporting development it should not have unacceptable impacts on the local road network;

- There was no reference to how users of the popular Shropshire Way and the Jack Mytton bridleway would be managed;
- Concerns with regard to the close proximity of the fertilizer works;
- Concerns with regard to the wider use and planning creep - The application also sought to accommodate other uses and referred to subsequent development of listed building, which had led to community apprehension about the future of the site; and
- If approved, he requested that matters that would have an early influence upon neighbouring vulnerable properties, ie highway improvements and flood relief measures, be conditioned to be implemented prior to construction stage; additional conditions to include limited hours of operation; and consideration to be given to the safety of walkers and horse riders in, and crossing, the lane.

Mr M Walton, a Planning Consultant speaking on behalf of local residents, 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 would be a large scale development that would have an adverse impact on the area;
- The Lighting Assessment failed to demonstrate how the lighting would impact on the area;
- Would lead to an increased number of vehicles entering and leaving the site;
- Activity on the site might continue until evening – no impact assessment had been submitted;
- Archaeology – insufficient information had been made available; and
- Drainage concerns.

Mrs M Budd, a local resident, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Supports the Olympic Heritage of Much Wenlock;
- Perfect location for the Centre;
- Would create volunteering opportunities for students at William Brookes School;
- Would support existing businesses in Much Wenlock;
- The Centre was needed to encourage and train the next generation of carriage drivers; and
- The Centre would close if refused.

Mr D Haston, 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:

- A significant number of representations had been made in support of the proposal and a low number of objections. Many objections had been with regard to flooding;
- Two passing places would be provided and there had been no accidents at the junction recorded;
- Surface water from the site would be limited and attenuation measures would be implemented;
- In accordance with the Development Plan;
- There was no intention for activities such as quad biking to take place on the site;
- Would provide employment for eight full-time staff and would support the wider economy; and
- There would be no Centre if planning permission refused.

In response to a question from a Member, Mr Haston confirmed that the Centre would operate until 8 pm Monday to Sunday.

Councillor Mr B Harper, representing Much Wenlock 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 proposal would be contrary to the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan;
- There were indications of a Medieval settlement on site;
- Concerns with regard to the close proximity of the Fertiliser Factory;
- Highway issues in relation to access;
- Increased flooding risk and no information of the Rapid Response Catchment Area had been provided; and
- Large scale development in the wrong location.

In response to comments from Members, the Principal Planner and the Area Highways Development Control Manager (South) drew Members' attention to the comments of Shropshire Council's Archaeology Officer detailed in the Schedule of Additional Letters, which detailed an amendment to Condition No. 11 and provided further clarification relating to highways.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Members commended the ethos of the scheme but expressed serious concerns relating to highway safety, particularly with the number of proposed passing places, the narrowness of the road leading to the site and the junction onto the A4169.

RESOLVED:

That this application be deferred to enable further consideration to be given to highway issues in relation to access to and from the development site.

(The meeting adjourned at 4.48 pm and reconvened at 4.56 pm.)

74 **Land West of Lavender Bank, Bishops Castle (14/02632/OUT)**

The Principal Planner introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning 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.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting; and the additional information circulated in paper form at the meeting and via email prior to the meeting regarding an Overview Report of the Highway Infrastructure to the South of Bishops Castle Town Centre, Shropshire, which had been commissioned by the applicant.

Councillor Mrs A-M Jackson, 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:

- Public Transport provision is inadequate to meet the needs of those needing to access employment, health and leisure facilities. As such the proposal was contrary to the Design and Access Statement which indicated that there were four bus services running from Bishops Castle;
- Employment prospects in Bishops Castle was limited and the business park remained unoccupied;
- The applicant had failed to acknowledge the problems associated with the stream which adjoined the development;
- Contrary to the Bishops Castle Town Plan and paragraphs 14 and 17 of the NPPF;
- The proposal would only make a minimal contribution to affordable housing;
- Approval would encourage piecemeal development;
- There were currently five applications ongoing all of which would access/egress onto Kerry Lane; and
- This application covered only half of the site so further applications would follow;

Mr T Watkins, 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 Officer was recommending approval, there were no outstanding planning issues and Highways Officers had raised no objections and had indicated that the development would not result in an unsustainable increase in traffic levels;
- In response to concerns, the applicant had appointed a consultant to investigate the potential for delivering improvements;
- Would provide an opportunity to improve traffic issues and Bishops Castle Town Council would be involved in discussions at a later date;

- Would help to meet SAMDev requirements;
- No objections had been raised by Shropshire Council Officers relating to affordable housing, drainage, ecology or archaeology;
- No pluvial flood risk had been identified; and
- Any concerns that had been raised would be controlled by appropriate conditions; and
- Would not be contrary to the NPPF.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Paragraph 6.1) Councillor Charlotte Barnes, as local Member, participated in the discussion but did not vote. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- She expressed her concerns relating to highway issues. Kerry Lane was already a congested road so any increase in traffic would not be welcomed.

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

RESOLVED:

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

- The Bishops Castle community had overwhelmingly rejected sites on this side of the town for housing development during a rigorous SAMDev consultation exercise because of access problems to the town's hinterland. Other more appropriate sites had been identified;
- The site was not sustainable as evidenced in SAMDev; and
- This proposal would exacerbate the already significant traffic problems that exist along Kerry Lane.

Accordingly, the proposed development would be contrary to Paragraphs 14 and 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Core Strategy Policy CS6 whereby the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

75 Land North of Henley Common, Henley Lane, Acton Scott (14/02807/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning 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.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting detailing further objections from a local resident and comments from the applicant and Shropshire Wildlife Trust.

In accordance with her declaration at Minute No. 69 and 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 Cecilia Motley, 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. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- Serious concerns that the site fell within the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
- This would be a large scale development and would include solar panels, palisade fencing, converter buildings, equipment cabins, security lighting and CCTV all of which would have a detrimental and visual impact upon the traditional and archaeology rich landscape;
- Concerns regarding the sudden influx of applications for solar panels, given the deadline for subsidy next year; and
- She questioned the designation of the land after the site had been decommissioned and commented that it would be important that all solar panels should be removed at the end of their design life.

Mr J 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 supported renewable energy but this development would be in the wrong location;
- This would constitute major development in an AONB as such it would be contrary to paragraph 116 of the NPPF
- The Government had indicated that the focus should now be on the placing of solar panels on the roofs of commercial, industrial, Government buildings, hospitals etc; and
- The proposal would not be appropriate in scale and would impact greatly on the landscape, as such would be contrary to CS6.

Mr J Wrench, representing Stretton Climate Care, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- Support the need to take action to reduce carbon emissions;
- The overall impact of the proposal would not be severe;
- Appropriate planting would reduce impact and very few public viewpoints would be affected;
- No flooding implications;
- Solar Panels were designed to ensure minimal glint and glare; and
- This would be a low impact proposal.

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

- Site would be well screened;
- This was poor quality agricultural land which would continue to be grazed by sheep;
- Should encourage diversification;

- A power line already crossed the site;
- Would help meet climate change obligations and would be carbon neutral within two years;
- No noise implications;
- An on-site viewing area would be provided; and
- Would provide community benefit package.

In response to comments, the Principal Planning Officer explained that a condition would be attached to any permission which would ensure that all solar panels and other structures would be removed at end of their design life and the site would be reinstated to an agricultural field. It would be in the interests of the applicant to ensure the site would be secure and twice monthly routine staff visits would ensure that the site would be maintained to an appropriate standard.

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

RESOLVED:

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

- The proposal would have a detrimental and visual impact upon the environment, character and landscape of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Paragraphs 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS17 whereby the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

76 Land at Whitton, Caynham, Shropshire (14/02873/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application and confirmed that Members had undertaken a site visit that morning 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 and elevations.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting detailing further comments from the applicant and objections from a local resident and the South Shropshire Green Party; and the additional information circulated in paper form at the meeting and via email prior to the meeting regarding a letter from the applicant's ecologist and the response from Shropshire Council's Natural Environment Manager/County Ecologist.

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 69 and 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. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- This application was tariff driven, given the deadline for subsidy next year;

- Other applications in the area were forthcoming; and
- The site was in close proximity of the AONB and the gateway to the Clee Hills.

In response to comments, the Principal Planning Officer provided clarification on the number of proposed applications in the area.

Mr D Duijvenvoorde, representing Save South Shropshire Countryside, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees, during which the following points were raised:

- High number of people had raised objections;
- The proposal would be contrary to the requirements of CS5 and CS6;
- The proposal did not comply or meet the test of community benefits; and
- He urged refusal.

Mr R Cavenagh, 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:

- Concerns regarding noise from inverter sheds. He had been assured that the inverter sheds would be relocated;
- Would disrupt the tranquillity of the area;
- Concerns regarding toxic substances;
- Sheep would set off alarm system;
- Would not provide long-term employment;
- The narrow lane would be unsuitable for large vehicles;
- Government policy supports localism;
- Proposal would have a negative impact on the residential amenity; and
- Proposal would have a negative impact on tourism and the local economy.

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:

- Renewable energy must be introduced in a positive way with the support of the community. The Parish Council and local residents were opposed to this proposal;
- Contrary to Department of Environment policy which indicates that solar panels should be appropriately sited and provides opportunities for the community;
- This was an historic landscape which supported and enhanced tourism not just for the local area but for Shropshire;
- Should be sited on brownfield sites; and
- This glint and glare, fencing, security etc would be totally alien in the surrounding area and as such would be contrary to the NPPF.

Mr G Maxfield, 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:

- Core Strategy Policy CS8 encourages infrastructure where there would be no significant adverse impact;
- Application had been submitted 13 months ago and no statutory or Council consultees had raised any objections during the statutory period;
- The site was outside the AONB;
- Visibility of the site was limited and it would not be visible from any footpaths or dwellings; and
- There would be no unacceptable impact and would deliver renewable energy.

In response to questions from Members, Mr Maxfield confirmed that the land was categorised as grade 3a; conditions would be attached to control noise; the proposal would bring local economic and community benefits; and the location of the invertors could be controlled by condition and that a unilateral undertaking had already been submitted by the applicant.

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

RESOLVED:

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

- The development site was in close proximity to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and would have a detrimental and visual impact upon the environment, character and landscape of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS5 and CS17 whereby the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

77 Little Beck House, Lion Lane, Cleobury Mortimer, Kidderminster, DY14 8BT (14/03611/FUL)

The Principal Planner introduced the application.

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 Madge Shineton, as the local Ward Councillor, left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item.

Members considered the submitted plans.

RESOLVED:

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

78 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions

RESOLVED:

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 14 October 2014 be noted.

79 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, 11 November 2014 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall.

Signed (Chairman)

Date: