

Clerk to the Council/RFO: Caroline Higgins
Chairman: Cllr Paul Breeze

Minutes of a Planning Meeting held at 6.30 pm on Monday 15 July 2019 in the Memorial Hall.

Present: Cllrs; Hudson, (Chair), Breeze; Jones, Clode, (Vice Chair), Gouge, Lewis and Clarke;

In attendance: Clerk, Caroline Higgins; Mr Toby Cowell, Shropshire Council Planning Officer and seven members of the public

P21.19/20 **APOLOGIES** – Cllr Ryan - accepted.

P22.19/20 **DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST** – None

P23.19/20 **PUBLIC SPEAKING/QUESTIONS AT COUNCIL MEETINGS** – The Chair proposed that due to the numbers attending, public speaking be deferred to precede each of the relevant planning applications. This was resolved.

P24.19/20 **MINUTES** – It was **RESOLVED unanimously** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 10 June 2019 as a true record and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

P25.19/20 **MATTERS ARISING** – The Clerk confirmed that the additional documents requested for the Oaklands developments had not yet been provided. Shropshire Council had expressed their intention to provide them by the end of July.

P26.19/20 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee **considered** the following planning applications:

1. 19/02860/FUL : **21 Sunfield Gardens, Bayston Hill:** Erection of single storey rear extension and two storey side extension following demolition of garage and store:

The Committee resolved unanimously to **SUPPORT** the application which had received no objections from neighbours or members.

2. 19/02575/FUL : **34 Langley Drive, Bayston Hill:** Erection of first floor extension over existing garage conversion

The Committee noted an objection from a neighbour and that the extension was large but reflected that similar applications had been supported by the Council in the past.

It was resolved unanimously to **SUPPORT** the application.

3. 19/03087/TPO : **12A Grove Lane, Bayston Hill;** Crown lift protected oak tree; The Committee noted that the tree was infected by a fungal growth and resolved to **SUPPORT** the application.

4. **19/01873/OUT: Site of Oakland County Primary School / Glebefield, Glebe Road – Hybrid (full and outline) application for residential development (outline) and the erection of community building with car parking (full)**

The Clerk confirmed that the consultation period for this application had been extended to 6 August. The Chair introduced Toby Cowell as the Planning Officer from Shropshire Council responsible for producing recommendations for consideration by the Planning Committee for this application. He was attending as an observer and was not able to express an opinion on the merits of the case. He was able to comment only on matters of fact or procedure.

The Chair suspended standing orders and opened the public session.

Mr Underwood explained his suggested changes to the proposed site layout which had previously been submitted to Shropshire Council. He reiterated his concerns about a loss of privacy and suggested bungalows be considered to the rear of Eric Lock Road if the layout could not be amended. He also expressed concerns for the loss of ecological habitat. He suggested his alternative site layout could result in increased open space.

Mr Glossop reminded the Committee of the designation of the Glebefield as a playing field since 1949. He presented a copy of the planning approval granted to Condover Parish Council which was the relevant local council at that time. The Chairman observed that the Diocese had asserted that the land is capable of being disposed of legally.

Mr Underwood asked how Shropshire Council maintained impartiality in this instance when it was both applicant and planning authority. Mr Cowell explained that where Shropshire Council is the applicant the application would automatically be referred to a Planning Committee rather than be delegated to an officer to determine. He confirmed he had not been involved with the development of the proposals and as a professional planning officer is bound by a code of conduct to consider all applications on their merits. There will be an opportunity for the Parish Council and residents to make representations to the Planning Committee if appropriate. He confirmed a summary of all comments received would be provided to the Planning Committee together with his opinion as to whether the concerns are material and can be addressed by the imposition of conditions. Late comments are provided on an update sheet.

M Underwood asked whether an alternative layout would be considered by the Planning Officer. Mr Cowell stated that if appropriate it might be drawn to the developer's attention as might a condition suggested by a Councillor.

Mr Barlow asked whether the developer would be able to change the layout after the application is approved. Mr Cowell observed that other than the Community Hub this application had been submitted in outline form. The site layout is not subject to approval at this stage and is therefore not being considered.

The amount of open space to be provided is being considered but the layout of the open space is not. The site layout is a reserved matter.

The number of houses is being considered but the mix of housing is not. These details will require separate approval and the developer will then be required to comply with the approved plans.

The Planning Officer confirmed that new housing developments tend to be of a higher density than in the past. The application does not seek approval for the density of housing as that is also a reserved matter.

Mr Long asked how he could confirm his boundary as his deeds had been destroyed in a fire. His property backs onto the site and the boundary is ill defined.

Cllr Clode sought clarification about the status of the footpath along the south-west boundary of the Glebefield. Clarity was also requested about pedestrian access from Eric Lock Road into the proposed public open space. The Planning Officer agreed to confirm these matters.

The development brief approved by Shropshire Council Cabinet had promised to provide a number of documents at outline planning stage which were still outstanding. The Planner indicated it might be possible to extend the time for comments beyond 6 August but not later than mid-August to ensure the matter can be included with the August Committee meeting. He will formally respond to the Parish Council when he receives the missing information.

It was therefore proposed by the Chair that the Committee **defers consideration** of the application until the missing information is provided. Thus it was **resolved**.

5. **19/01866/OUT Proposed Vicarage SW of Christ Church, Glebe Road**

It was noted by the Committee that this development relies upon approval of the Hybrid development proposal above and resolved to defer discussion until further information is received on the Hybrid application.

6. **19/01859/OUT Mary Web Library**

It was noted that the redevelopment of the library would be unacceptable without alternative provision and is subject to approval of the proposed Community Hub application above. It was therefore resolved to defer discussion until further information on the hybrid proposal is provided.

P27.19/20 **PLANNING DECISIONS** – The Committee **noted** the following planning decisions:

1. 19/02005/VAR: **Star Kitchen, 13A Lyth Hill Road, Bayston Hill**: Change of opening hours; Decision : Refuse
2. 19/01668/FUL : **28 Lansdowne Crescent, Bayston Hill** : Erection of two storey side extension : Decision : Grant permission
3. 19/01921/FUL: **2 Westbourne Rise, Bayston Hill**: Erection of a single story rear extension and two storey side extension : Decision: Grant Permission
4. 19/01995/FUL : **1 Beeches Drive, Bayston Hill**: Erection of single storey side extension : Decision : Grant permission
5. 19/01776/FUL : **1 The Maltings, Bayston Hill**, Erection of a two storey side extension following demolition of existing single storey part of property, single

store extensions to the front elevation and the rear of the garage and new brinck boundary wall/fence : Decision : Grant permission

6. 19/02287/OUT : **Proposed dwelling to west of Betley Lane, Bayston Hill,**
Decision : Refused

P28 19/20

PLANNING APPEALS –

Appeal Ref. APP/L3245/W/19/3224092 – **Land to the North of Betley Lane, Bayston Hill** - The Committee noted with disappointment the approval on appeal for two dwellings on Betley Lane. The Planning Inspector had made observations about access and maintenance of access on unadopted roads. It was noted that the police hold differing views on access on unadopted highways. Cllr Clarke stated he was seeking an officer's view as to whether the decision represents an error in law, in which case there may be a case for a judicial review.

P29.19/20

APPROVAL OF PAYMENTS – Cllr Breeze proposed, Cllr Lewis seconded and the Committee **resolved unanimously** that the list of payments becoming due be approved.

The meeting closed at 7:30pm