

**Clerk to the Council/RFO: J Hodgkiss**  
**Chairman: Cllr C Clode**

---

Minutes of the Full Council Meeting held at 6.30pm on **Monday 12<sup>th</sup> June 2023** in Margaret Oliver Room, Bayston Hill Memorial Hall.

Present: T Clarke (TC), C Clode (CC) (Chair), K Fairclough (KF), H Merricks (HM), T Osenton (TO), P Stevens (PS), C Shaw (CS), C Teckoe (CT), M Underwood (MU)

Not Present: J Whittall

In attendance: Julie Hodgkiss – Clerk (JH), 45 members of the public

**FC1.23/24 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES AND REASONS FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Cllr Whittall – annual leave

**FC2.23/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllrs Underwood and Shaw declared a non-pecuniary interest in item FC4.23/24 as property owners in a neighbouring road.

**FC3.23/24 PUBLIC SPEAKING/QUESTIONS AT COUNCIL MEETINGS**

9 members of the public spoke strongly in opposition to item FC4.23/24.

**FC4.23/24 PLANNING APPLICATION**

23/02061/OUT | Residential Development (Outline) with Vehicular and Pedestrian Access off Glebe Road, along with Use of Existing Vehicular Access to Serve Relocated Church Car Park | Land To The Rear Of Christ Church Glebe Road Bayston Hill Shrewsbury Shropshire.

**RESOLVED:** MU proposed that Bayston Hill Parish Council strongly object to this application on the following grounds

**1. Object on the grounds of the significant loss of open green space**

We object to the loss of a significant area of greenfield and open space available to the residents of Bayston Hill. The area of green space being lost totals 7,400 m<sup>2</sup> the public open space being offered totals only 482 m<sup>2</sup> (6.5% of the current open space) and includes an existing remembrance garden. Policy MD2(5ii) of the Local Plan requires adequate open space of at least 30sqm per person, assuming an average of 3 people in each of the proposed 24 properties then this application is only achieving 6.7m<sup>2</sup> per person. By the time that parking for the church is provided this open space will be even smaller.

Signed:..... Date:.....

The Scouts and Guides regularly held their summer fete on the Glebelands, and football was played every week during the season up until around 2003. Children regularly play now on the Glebelands when the weather permits.

In 2022 the Village Association in conjunction with the Parish Council held a celebration on the Glebelands for the late Queen's Platinum Jubilee. This was attended by over 2000 residents from the village. The same would have been the case for the King's Coronation had the weather not been suitable on the day it was held, plan B to use the Church was used instead.

A village celebration for HM The Queen was held on the Glebelands in 1953. The Bayston Hill Parish Council have leased the land since 1949 and have been responsible for its upkeep, cutting the grass, emptying the dog bins and any other requirements. This was undertaken until recently when the Lichfield Diocese asked the Parish Council to stop doing this.

The small scout hut was built at the very edge of the site and has been in use as a community building for over 50 years (since 1972). The idea that this helps define the whole site as brownfield land is stretching the imagination somewhat. The site is clearly a greenfield site, as recognised by Shropshire Council.

**2. Object on the grounds that the Glebelands does not feature in the Draft Shropshire Local Plan 2016-2038**

The draft plan is just that at the moment – a draft! This site is not earmarked at all in the current adopted plan. Even in the draft plan there is no mention made in the plan for the development of the Glebelands, only for the Former Oakmeadow School Site and land of Lyth Hill Road.

**3. Object on the grounds of the impact of car parking and traffic.**

Currently when the church hosts large events the existing car park is insufficient and invariably car parking over spills on the Glebe Road, Christ Church Drive and Eric Lock Road West. This will be only made significantly worse with the proposal to use what is the church car park now as the main access to the site. No provision has been made for this with the outline planning application. If this outline application is passed why is this development not being linked through to the Oakland School development currently underway as was the proposal in the Application Ref: 19/01873/OUT that was withdrawn.

**4. Object on the grounds that an ecological survey was completed in the month of October & November 2022.**

How can it be possible to gain a proper understanding of the ecology of the site by completing a survey in November, a time of dormancy for wildlife.

**5. Object to the disregard of the area G4 as a potential habitat for wildlife and its removal significantly effecting the privacy of properties on this boundary in Eric Lock Road West.**

Signed:..... Date:.....

Area G4 backs on to the boundary of properties in Eric Lock Road West. The Area G4 offers a wonderful area for wildlife, there is not a single picture in the ecology report showing this area and the proposal to remove this will enable properties built along this boundary to oversee the properties in Eric Lock Road West significantly impact the level of privacy that is currently enjoyed.

Section 6.3 Site Layout in the Planning Statement states in the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point “respect the context of the existing development surrounding the site”, this is certainly not the case for the properties on Eric Lock Road West that boarder the development.

## **6. Object on the grounds of drainage from the proposed site.**

During times of heavy rainfall there is already a significant issue of water runoff from the Gleblands running down the existing church car park and on to Glebe Road and there has been significant flooding on the access to the back of Christ Church and the front of York House.

The Flood Risk and Drainage report (TFR&DR) makes the statement “The development proposals will not result in an increase in surface water with the design of the surface water drainage system limited to existing Greenfield run-off rates.” How can this be if you are going to build over open green space the runoff will be exacerbated with all the hard surfacing?

Table 3.2 Potential Risk of Flooding to the Proposed Development of this report states potential risk of flooding from run off as medium, WE would challenge this and sate it is high.

Section 4.3 Pluvial (Drainage System) states that “There is no reported evidence of pluvial flooding at the application site”. This is not the case as there has been flooding created offsite from rainwater runoff from the Gleblands. It goes on to state that “The proposed drainage system for the site will utilise Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) where possible. This will include the provision of an attenuation system, with a controlled discharge to the existing surface water sewers in Glebe Road and Christchurch Drive”. Where is this attenuation system to be located as it is not shown in the application documents?

Section 4.4 Surface Water Runoff states “4.4 Surface Run-off Currently the surface water simply discharges to ground.” This is not the case as at times of heavy rain fall water pours of the Glebelands on to the Church car park and as stated previously has caused flooding on the access to the back of the church and in front of York House and pours on to Glebe Road. Where is this significant attenuation system going to be located that is mentioned again?

In summary the flood risk assessment states that the landowner reports no flooding of the site. Building on the site will increase the flood risk on Glebe Road. Prior to the building of Church and York House the area consisted of the current Glebelands and some allotments. When the allotments were removed in favour of hard impermeable surfaces, Glebe Road began to flood. This happens every winter with

Signed:..... Date:.....

some houses being affected. The runoff water freezes during cold weather, creating a 'skid pan' on Glebe Road, not far from the proposed staggered junction. The loss of land and increase in impermeable surfaces will make the situation worse, creating hazardous conditions and lead to increased floodwater reaching the areas inside garages on Glebe Road.

Sewage - the current foul water waste pipe that crosses the proposed development area and Eric Lock Road West has backed up on several occasions in recent years and had to be unblocked, it will not cope with additional capacity without significant upgrades and investment.

**7. Object on the grounds that there is no indication within the application who will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the infrastructure for the site and the Public Open space.**

There will be street lighting, drainage and flood prevention schemes and the Public Open Space, all of these will require ongoing maintenance and there is no mention of this within the application.

**8. Object on the grounds of insufficient medical provision and school places to support this development.**

The existing Beeches Medical Practice is already not fit for purpose as was communicated during the consultation for the proposed Health and Wellbeing Hub now not proceeding. It is not clear what action will now be taken by the Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital Trust to rectify this position with the practice now that the Hub is not proceeding. Bringing circa another 72 people into the village with a practice that cannot serve them is not good planning.

Oak Meadow is already at capacity and we have no secondary provision at all within the village.

**9. Loss of Playing Field**

Section 5.6 of the Planning Statement, Loss of Former Open Space/Play Area suggests that the £75,000.00 contribution made under application 22/02517/FUL at the request of Sports England removes any obligation on this application 23/02061/OUT to have to make a contribution. If this application is granted, then it should also be subject to a similar contribution as the Glebelands was also used a playing field and has not been proved as surplus to requirements.

**10. Consultation**

In the Planning Statement, section 6.13 refers to a meeting with the Parish Council. To clarify this meeting held with the Parish Council was at the request of the Parish Council and specifically we wanted to discuss the ongoing maintenance of the Glebelands which at the time we were still undertaking despite a lease not being in place. The Parish wanted to know if the lease could be put back in place now that

Signed:..... Date:.....

the Application 19/01873/OUT had been withdrawn and to explain that they in conjunction with the Village Association would be looking to hold an event like 2022 to celebrate the Kings Coronation on the Glebelands. The Parish had been for some time trying to get clarification from the Diocese and their Agent over what was now happening with regards to the Glebelands.

The Steering Group undertook work for many years on a wholly different proposal, it is underhand (at best) to allude that public opinion and that of the Parish Council remains the same when so much that was promised has been taken off the table.

## 11. Housing Need

Within the adopted Local Plan, policy S16.2 provides the development strategy for the settlement. It specifies that Bayston Hill has a residential development guideline of 50-60 dwellings to 2026 and that “development by infilling, groups of houses and conversion of buildings may be acceptable on suitable sites within the development boundary identified on the Policies Map”. No sites are allocated for development at Bayston Hill within the adopted Local Plan.

Within Bayston Hill, over the period from 2011/12 to 2021/22, 65 dwellings have been completed. As of 31st March 2022, 7 dwellings were committed on sites with Planning Permission or Prior Approval. In addition, 22/02517/FUL bring forward a further 23 dwellings. As completions already achieved exceed the residential development guideline of 50-60 dwellings within the adopted Local Plan, this residential development guideline has been achieved.

Therefore, the requirements of paragraph 2 of SAMDev Plan Policy MD3 are relevant and require due consideration. The erection of 27 dwellings would bring the total of new homes (built and permitted) within Bayston Hill over the adopted plan period to 122 and this does not, except for the Oakland School site, include any other permissions granted since March 2022. Therefore, the proposed pre-app would more than double the guideline figure for the settlement of 50-60.

Development going beyond it by too great a degree will result in unsustainable development that stretches infrastructure and community goodwill towards breaking point.

The houses proposed will not be the type that will genuinely meet the housing demands required in terms of social housing or housing for the disadvantaged.

In addition, 150 homes have been allowed under appeal on our boundary at Meole Brace.

### Summary

23/02061/OUT is not the former Oaklands Site, the land outlined shows the rear of Christ Church, the Oaklands School site is subject to a separate planning application 22/02517/FUL. The previous application that concerned both the Oaklands School site and the Glebefields was withdrawn. Therefore, this represents a considerable deviation from the **draft** local plan BAY050.

Signed:..... Date:.....

Short term economic benefits will only relate to employment for existing companies, not new jobs created.

This is the only substantial area of green space located in the centre of the village to the West of the A49 and is an invaluable asset for the community of Bayston Hill for the reasons given above. Being able to hold events like those held in 2022 and 2023 brings the community together and allows community groups within the village to share what they are doing. For these reasons the Glebelands should remain an area of Open Green Space available to the village.

This was seconded by TO and agreed unanimously by all members present.

**RESOLVED:** CC proposed a 10 minutes adjournment for a comfort break, seconded by MU and agreed by all members present.

**RESOLVED:** CC proposed to resume the Full Council meeting, seconded by KF and agreed by all members present.

**FC5.23/24 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP UPDATE**

The Clerk gave a verbal update of the resignations of Cllr C Higgins and Cllr P Higgins on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2023. As of June 13<sup>th</sup>, we have 5 vacancies.

**FC6.23/24 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** CT proposed that the minutes of the Annual Council 15<sup>th</sup> May 2023 were a true record, seconded by TC and agreed by all members present.

**FC7.23/24 CHAIR'S REPORT**

None

**FC8.23/24 SHROPSHIRE COUNCILLOR'S REPORT**

Cllr Clarke highlighted the issue of the 544 bus

**RESOLVED:** MU proposed that the Clerk write to the service provider to ask why there was no consultation before this was ceased, seconded by CC and agreed by all members present.

**FC9.23/24 CLERKS REPORT**

The Clerk wishes to highlight the Big Green Week activities that were taking place this week and the budget planning meeting in July for members.

**FC10.23/24 PAYMENTS**

**RESOLVED:** MU proposed to approve all payments, as per the attached schedule, including May 2023 salary payments. Seconded by CC and agreed by all members present.

**FC11.23/24 GRANT APPLICATION**

Signed:..... Date:.....

**RESOLVED:** TO proposed to grant the 2<sup>nd</sup> Bayston Hill Brownies the sum of £390 as requested, seconded by CT and agreed by all members present.

**FC12.23/24 INTERNAL AUDITORS REPORT**

**RESOLVED:** MU proposed that the report be noted, seconded by TC and agreed by all members present.

**FC13.23/24 ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT**

Each statement was read out in turn by the Chair and agreed by all members present. It was duly signed and minute referenced and dated.

**FC14.23/24 ANNUAL RETURN**

**RESOLVED:** TO proposed that the council confirms its approval of the Annual Financial Return the period 1 April 2022 – 31 March 2023, and proposed that the public inspection notice will be published Tuesday 13th June 2023, period of inspection to run from Wednesday 14th June 2023 to Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> July 2023, seconded by CT and agreed by all members present. It was duly signed and minute referenced and dated.

**FC15.23/24 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

The Clerk explained the current committee vacancies, MU volunteered to join the Finance and Personnel Committee.

**FC16.23/24 BOUNDARY REVIEW**

**RESOLVED:** CT proposed that BHPC feedback the following points

- Retain a single member division for Bayston Hill as it better serves our interests
- A single member could better focus on the needs of Bayston Hill
- BH has its own identity to be retained and this format has always worked well.
- BH is a geographically compact area for one member to serve.

This was seconded by TO and agreed by all members present.

**FC17.23/24 ARMED FORCES COVENANT**

**RESOVLED:** MU proposed that BHPC sign the covenant pledge, seconded by PS and agreed by all members present. CC signed the document.

**FC18.23/24 BIKE RAMP USE**

The Clerk gave a verbal update regarding Shropshire Council Youth Service utilising the bike ramps for some outreach sessions in the school holidays.

Meeting closed at 8.30pm

Signed:..... Date:.....