

Clerk to the Council/RFO: Caroline Higgins

Chairman: Cllr Keith Keel

1 August 2017

Minutes of a Planning Meeting held at 7.00 pm on Monday 3 July 2017 in the Memorial Hall.

Present: Cllrs; Breeze, (Chairman); Miles, (Vice Chairman); Lewis; Gouge; Hudson and Jones

In attendance: Clerk, Caroline Higgins; Mr Bloor (representative of Richborough Estates); approximately 120 members of the public

P52.17 **APOLOGIES** – Cllr Keel (prior appointment); Mrs Peta Sams (resident - objects). It was resolved unanimously that these apologies be accepted.

P53.17 **DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST** – None

P54.17 **MINUTES** – It was **RESOLVED unanimously** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 25 May 2017 as a true record. The Chairman signed the minutes.

P55.17 **PUBLIC SPEAKING/QUESTIONS AT COUNCIL MEETINGS** – The Chairman welcomed all those attending and explained that public comments would be invited on each of the planning applications on the agenda in turn, which would then be discussed by the Council. *In the absence of paper copies of planning applications the planning documents were displayed on a projector screen although it was noted that they could not be seen easily from the back of the large hall. Some members of the public also commented that it was difficult to hear the comments of other residents due to the absence of microphones. Committee members stood to make their remarks in order to improve audibility.*

P56.17 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

- 1) 17/02532/FUL – **1 Sharpstones Lane**, Bayston Hill - *Erection of first floor extension and alteration to existing dwelling:*

No objections were raised by the public although the name of the applicant was requested by one resident. The Clerk explained that whilst this information could be provided, the application would be considered on its planning merits and that the name of the applicant was therefore irrelevant. It was reported by the Clerk that no adverse comments had been reported to Shropshire Council. No objections were raised by the Committee and it was therefore proposed by Cllr Miles; seconded by Cllr Lewis and **resolved unanimously** to support the application.

- 2) 17/02886/FUL – **Proposed dwelling North of Gorse Lane**, Bayston Hill – *Erection of 1 No dwelling with garage and retention of agricultural access (re-submission).*

The Chairman suspended standing orders and invited comments from the floor which resulted in a number of objections; These included concerns that the

agricultural access was much larger than would be required for farm machinery and had been relocated to a new position. Anecdotal evidence was provided that the existing access was rarely if ever used to access the field and that alternative access existed through the recently removed hedgerow. Objections were also raised that part of the proposed site lay outside the village development boundary and that the proposed house had very limited amenity garden space for a 4-bedroom house due to its poor positioning on the plot.

The Committee returned to Standing Orders and considered the application. Cllr Hudson expressed his concerns that the relocated and widened access would provide access for a further development application on the field behind and proposed the application be opposed.

It was subsequently **resolved** by a majority of three to one (with one abstention) that the principle of the development of a single property on the site be supported provided it is retained entirely within the village development boundary, however the Committee expressed strong concerns that the proposed access is unnecessarily large and its relocation unnecessary and objected to the position of the proposed dwelling within the plot and its lack of amenity space.

- 3) 17/02834/VAR – **Norton Farm Pit, Condover** – *Variation of conditions pursuant to 15/01476/VAR to enable the working of a proposed southern extension to the existing sand quarry.*

There were no comments from the public and no objections from the Committee which **resolved unanimously** to support the application.

- 4) 17/02561/OUT – **Proposed residential development land west of Lyth Hill Road** – *Outline application for residential development and associated infrastructure with new access:*

The Chairman suspended standing orders and invited comments. A large number of residents spoke in opposition to the proposals:

- Objections made that the advertisement of the application had not been displayed until 26 June and many residents of Lyth Hill Road did not receive notification of the application. Residents requested an extension of time to make public comments (*Action: Clerk*)
- Concerns expressed for pedestrian safety beyond the proposed new footpath and developer asked to clarify the proposed improvements to the safe pedestrian route identified
- Concerns expressed about increased pollution
- Considerable concerns were raised about highway safety and the capacity of Lyth Hill Road to cope with the additional traffic movements likely to be generated by the development. Residents expressed the requirement for traffic calming and it was noted that this would need to be paid for by a contribution from the developer. Waiting times at the junction of Lyth Hill Road would increase to unacceptable levels and it would be dangerous for unaccompanied children to cross due to parked cars and traffic flows. The Parish Council was strongly urged to reject the proposal on these grounds.
- Considerable concerns were raised by residents of The Hunttons that drainage would be inadequate. (The developer responded that the drainage would be designed to ensure that surface water drainage would not discharge into highway drains and an attenuation pond was proposed to ensure run off is controlled to below that of a green field site. This would have a beneficial effect on the existing drainage ditches however a CCTV survey of culverts had been commissioned by Shropshire Council

to resolve the existing flooding issues affecting The Hunttons and Yew Tree Drive. One resident invited Mr Bloor to follow up on his offer to inspect the drainage ditches in his garden at The Hunttons. (Action: J Bloor, Richborough Estates)

- The capacity of the local doctor's practice to cope with the residents of over 100 houses was questioned and the long waits for appointments already experienced by patients were noted by the Committee.
- The capacity of the A49 and Pulley Lane to cope with additional traffic from the development was questioned. The developer stated he had consulted the Highways Agency and Shropshire Council Highways and if required would improve any junctions not considered to have sufficient capacity.
- The capacity of the primary school to accept new pupils was raised. (A governor of the primary school and a note from the head teacher both confirmed that there was capacity to accept additional children should the need arise). The capacity of secondary schools was also raised as a concern. The developer stated that a fee per pupil was payable by the developer to cover increased capacity costs. A resident stated that as the primary school was also used by Shropshire Music Service it generated additional traffic and parking pressures until mid-evening on Long Meadow most weekdays in term time. Additional children and associated additional staff would generate further pressures on parking at Long Meadow.
- Concerns were raised that the development is in open countryside, outside the development boundary and contrary to the Local SAM.Dev Plan and should therefore be refused. The developer responded that Shropshire Council acknowledged a need to build on some greenfield sites to meet their housing targets and that some brownfield sites were allocated for employment use.
- The developer stated that the development would contribute to the shortfall in affordable housing in Shropshire and that a higher proportion of affordable houses could be provided on site if requested to meet local need.
- The low density of the indicative site layout was questioned by a resident and it was noted that the numbers of houses could be increased at reserved matters stage. If approved the site will be developed by a third party who may wish to build more houses. The developer offered to negotiate a covenant with the landowners that no more than the 106 houses proposed would be built on the site.
- A resident pointed out that the parish had already exceeded its housing target of 50-60 houses in the current plan period (2006 – 2026) and land was available for further housing at the Oaklands site. The need for additional housing was therefore questioned. The developer stated that the 5-year supply of housing land was under challenge from developers and that the SAM.Dev Plan could be considered out of date. (*The Clerk clarified that this position was rejected by Shropshire Council which claimed a 5.97 year supply of housing land*).
- A resident stated that access from side roads onto Lyth Hill Road would be unacceptably affected by both construction traffic and increased residential traffic. Visibility from side roads is poor and additional traffic would make egress more dangerous.
- The base traffic flows used by the developer to prepare his travel plan was challenged as they were based on winter traffic flows (November whilst the heaviest flows are experienced in summer when many visitors use Lyth Hill Road to get to Lyth Hill. (Action: *The Clerk was asked to request a summer traffic flow count prior to determination of the planning application*))

- Residents were urged to submit their own comments directly to Shropshire Council and the Clerk confirmed the contact details.
- Residents were invited to indicate their support or opposition to the proposals by way of a straw poll. This was unanimously against the development.

The Committee returned to standing orders to consider the comments and the application. The developer was thanked for attending and for responding to questions from residents, Residents were thanked for their strong attendance and comments.

Following a short discussion the Committee **resolved unanimously** to object strongly to the proposal on the grounds that it lies wholly outside the parish development boundary; that Lyth Hill Road is an inadequate access route and that the drainage infrastructure is inadequate to ensure protection from flooding beyond the site.

The Committee further **resolved** that should the Planning Officer recommend approval that the Council request the decision be referred to the Planning Committee.

The Committee **recommended** that in the event of planning approval against the objections of the Parish Council, that the following planning conditions be imposed:

- That a liaison committee be formed to include residents; representatives of the Parish Council and the site manager to minimise the impact on local residents;
- That working hours be conditioned to protect the amenity of local residents;
- That footpath improvements be installed prior to the wider development of the site to protect pedestrians during the construction phase;
- That the new footpath be extended beyond the site towards Lyth Hill Country Park;
- That a pedestrian crossing and any additional traffic calming measures be provided before construction begins to improve pedestrian safety on Lyth Hill Road;
- That an area be set aside off Lyth Hill Road for all deliveries to prevent obstruction of Lyth Hill Road during the construction phase;
- That green verges be protected from construction traffic and any damage reinstated as soon as possible during the construction phase;
- That existing hedgerows be protected and enhanced where needed;
- That an improved bus service be subsidised by the developer to increase the frequency of buses and extend the service to Sundays;
- That long term maintenance of landscaped and open areas be conditioned;
- That appropriate drainage percolation tests be undertaken before approval of drainage arrangements;
- That an equipped children's play area be provided and maintained on site;
- That access to potential sporting facilities be provided on neighbouring land owned by the Diocese of Lichfield;
- That the developer funds improvements of the junction with the A49 and Lyth Hill Road;
- That a binding covenant is obtained to ensure no more than the 106 houses proposed are built on the site.

5) **To consider planning applications published since the publication of the agenda:**

17/02926/AMP – **95 Lyth Hill Road** – Non material amendment to planning permission 16/05591/FUL – garage door (proposed amendment to install 1 double rather than 2 single doors) – *No objections*

P57.17

PLANNING DECISIONS - The Committee noted the following planning decisions:

1. 17/01436/FUL - **1 Burnell View, Blakemores Bank, Bayston Hill**, - Erection of single storey side extension; replacement of some windows plus new windows to extension; new cladding including 50mm insulation to southwest elevation; alterations to roof to replace existing single pitch roof at rear elevation with gable end; replacement and extension of veranda and siting of a demountable building to the side [to be clad]. Decision: *Grant Permission*
2. 17/01814/FUL - **75 Lansdowne Road, Bayston Hill**: Erection of a single storey rear extension - Decision: *Grant Permission*
3. 17/01022/OUT - **Development Plot, Sharpstones Lane, Bayston Hill**: Outline application (access, layout for consideration) for the erection of one dwelling and formation of vehicular access - Decision: *Grant Permission*

P58.17

PLANNING APPEALS – None

P59.17

PAYMENTS SCHEDULE – None

At 9:15pm the Chairman closed the meeting, thanking all those present for attending.