



# Church Stretton

## Town Council

### Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held at 7pm on Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> January 2023 in the Silvester Horne Institute.

Present: Councillors: Cllr J Luck (Chair), Cllr C Carson, Cllr M Morris, Cllr J Burns, Cllr A Munro  
In attendance: Mrs H Merrett (Committees and Finance)  
Members of the Public: 1

#### PC.103 Apologies

None

#### PC.104 Disclosable Interests

It was noted that Cllr Davies had a Planning Application for discussion at this meeting. There were no other declarations of interests.

PC.105 It was proposed by Cllr Munro, seconded by Cllr Morris and **22/23 068 RESOLVED** unanimously to suspend standing orders to allow the member of the Public to take part in discussions if wished.

PC.106 The Chair invited committee members to introduce themselves to the Member of the Public

#### PC.107 Minutes

It was proposed by Cllr Burns, seconded by Cllr Munro and **22/23 069 unanimously RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the meeting held 13<sup>th</sup> December 2022. The Chair signed the minutes.

#### PC.108 Planning Applications Review

##### i. Current List

#### **22/05486/FUL Hazel Brow, Hazler Road, Church Stretton, Shropshire, SY6 7AF**

Works to apply phenolic Insulation (PHS) boards finished in a white render to the external walls of the house, apply white render to the attached garage, install a mixture of solar photovoltaic and solar thermal panels to the roof, with a battery store and replace wooden backdoor with a composite or uPVC

It was proposed by Cllr Carson, seconded by Cllr Burns and **22/23 070 unanimously RESOLVED** to support this application with the following comment:

This planning application was reviewed at the Church Stretton Town Council Planning Committee on 17th January 2023. The property is the home of one of the Town Councillors, Cllr. Sheila Davies. Cllr Davies is not a member of the Planning Committee and was not present at the meeting. One member of the public attended the meeting and was advised of the above. In the interests of transparency and openness the committee felt that an explanation of the process when dealing with this application should be uploaded to the Shropshire Planning Portal.

On reaching its decision to SUPPORT the application the committee applied the same criteria as it would any other application.

Hazel Brow is located within the Church Stretton Conservation Area and is situated at the end of a private drive off of Hazler Road and is not visible from the road. The thermal cladding that is to be applied to the exterior matches the current colour of the render and will be indistinguishable from the original render. The change of door is for a more thermally efficient one is to be commended. The installation of solar panels will ensure that the carbon footprint of the building is reduced. The Town Council is committed to reducing carbon emissions and will wherever possible support the installation of solar panels, even within the conservation areas.

**22/05377/FUL Owls Cottage, Ludlow Road, Little Stretton, Church Stretton, Shropshire**

Erection of a single storey self-contained one bedroom annexe within the curtilage of the existing dwelling

It was proposed by Cllr Carson, seconded by Cllr Burns and **22/23 071 unanimously RESOLVED** to object to this application with the following comment:

22/05377/FUL. Owls Cottage, Ludlow Road, Little Stretton. (OBJECT)

Little Stretton within the parish of Church Stretton is located within the Shropshire Hills a protected landscape (AONB). The village has a large number of listed buildings and structures for its size and consequently a large conservation area.

Owls Cottage, Ludlow Road, Little Stretton is a semi-detached Grade 2 listed property sitting within the heart of the Little Stretton Conservation Area. This part of Little Stretton has a plethora of similar grade 2 or 2\* listed properties including adjacent to or in close proximity four Grade 2 listed dwellings, Darrell Cottage, Ragleth House, The Tan House (2\*) and Linden Lea. Owls Cottage fronts the Ludlow Road, with the gardens stretching for quite a distance to the west of the property. Car parking for Owls Cottage is located at the far west of the garden at its boundary with Brock View a modern brick built bungalow. Here there is a small garage and a gated access onto the lane leading to the Small Batch camping & caravanning site.

The proposed application envisages replacing the small garage with a self-contained dwelling within the curtilage of Owls Cottage at its far western boundary with Brock View. The dwelling is to be single storey, the walls clad in horizontal timber weather boarding and all windows and doors being a coloured Upvc.

The Town Council OBJECTS to this proposal on the grounds of:

- Its visual appearance in respect of siting scale and mass in that it fails to comply with Paragraph 130 National Planning Policy Framework. Policies MD2 & MD13 of the SAMDev and policy CS6 of the Shropshire Core Strategy
- Overshadowing and loss of outlook to Brock View.
- Loss of amenity by pruning or removing trees
- Negative impact on surrounding designated historical properties.

Siting scale and mass:

The proposed dwelling is located extremely close to the boundary with Brock View and involves demolishing the current garage which has a footprint of 6.25 square metres and an undetermined height with that proposed which has a footprint of 51.84 square metres and a height of 3.30 metres. As can be seen the new build footprint will be in the order of eight times the current and substantially taller.

The dwelling will be “Shoehorned” as one objector describes it into the far reaches of the curtilage of Owls Cottage, indeed as far from the cottage as it can physically be, one presumes due to the restrictions placed on developments abutting listed properties.

The exterior of the proposed dwelling is to be constructed of horizontal timber cladding with Upvc doors and windows. On travelling the lane from the Ludlow Road to the site it is clear that the cladding of the dwelling is anomalous with the prior properties with only the garage of the Tan House, a Grade2\* having such timber boarding and then only part of the height with the remainder being a mixture of antique brick and stone. The other properties, including Brock View being brick, stone, or render. The use of Upvc for doors and windows within the setting of the conservation area and so close to the Listed buildings adjacent cannot enhance the conservation area or as required by Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework

#### Overshadowing and loss of outlook.

As already stated the dwelling proposed will have over 8 times the footprint of the garage it is to replace and it will be located as close to the boundary of Brock View and Ragleth House the Grade2 listed property abutting Owls Cottage. Although the actual Ragleth House is some distance from the proposed dwelling it will be extremely close to Brock View and dominate the skyline from the bungalow.

#### Loss of amenity by pruning or removing trees

The application although stating in section 7 that there are trees within falling distance and that some trees may need to be pruned does not contain supporting plans or schedules of work from a qualified arboriculturist. From a recent site visit it does not appear to be possible to build the proposed dwelling without removing trees or causing serious damage to tree roots. The loss of trees within the conservation area is something to be avoided during and after development. The Town Council would like to see a full arboriculturist report and map showing the impact of the development on the existing trees.

#### Negative impact on surrounding designated historical properties.

Owls Cottage and its adjoining neighbour plus three other close properties are Grade 2 listed. All development should be of high quality. However, where conservation areas and/or listed buildings are affected, there is a need for special care and attention to detail with regard to design, colour and materials. The services of an architect or qualified professional agent should therefore be employed. It would appear that has not happened and it is believed that if this had been done the current proposal would not have been submitted.

The Town Council believes that development within conservation areas (buildings, extensions and alterations to existing buildings, and other important contributors to the overall scene such as walls, fencing, parking, street furniture and landscaping) should positively enhance the characteristics of the street scene and blend with the local building tradition and that this proposal does not do this and will have an unacceptable impact on the street scene, especially so close to the surrounding listed buildings. Even the degree of pitch jars with surrounding properties and again especially with the listed properties.

This application is short on detail and fails to take into account the nature of the Little Stretton Conservation Area, the relevant national and County policies and runs a serious risk of harming the setting of numerous close by Grade 2 listed properties.

**22/05586/FUL Linwood, 44 Ludlow Road, Little Stretton, Church Stretton, Shropshire, SY6 6AB**

Erection of single storey link extension and internal layout alterations

It was proposed by Cllr Carson, seconded by Cllr Morris and **22/23 071 unanimously RESOLVED** to support this application.

**22/05602/FUL Magpie Cottage, 24 Shrewsbury Road, Church Stretton, Shropshire, SY6 6JB**

Erection of replacement dwelling with garage following the demolition of the existing dwelling and garage

It was proposed by Cllr Morris, seconded by Cllr Munro and **22/23 072 unanimously RESOLVED** to support this application.

**ii. Actions taken**

Councillors noted the actions taken.

**iii. Unitary Decisions**

Councillors noted the decisions made by Shropshire Council.

**iv. Appeals**

Councillors noted that one new appeal had been made to the planning inspector regarding 6 Hazler Road

**v. Enforcements**

Councillors noted that no new enforcements had been made.

**PC.109 Caradoc Yard**

Councillors noted an advisement letter in connection with the sale of Caradoc Yard, All Stretton:

17th January 2023

Mr James Evans  
Halls Estate Agents  
43 Church Street  
Bishops Castle  
SY9 5AD

Dear Mr Evans

Re: Sale of Caradoc Yard, All Stretton. SY6 7JQ

I am writing to you as I understand that you are handling the sale of Caradoc Yard, All Stretton, a commercial premises located within both the Parish of Church Stretton and the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Town Council is keen to work with you to ensure that potential purchasers of the land are aware of the restrictions which we believe exist on the use of the land.

You will be aware that the Town Council and All Stretton Village Society have had past dealings in respect of the operation and development of the site. On reading the brochure, the Town Council feel that there are a number of points that should be drawn to your attention as the Agent to ensure that any potential purchaser is clear as to what they are purchasing and the restrictions of the property's usages in connection with Waste Transfer Permit EPR/AB3505CQ, and the three relevant Planning Permissions: SC/ML1994/4368/SS,

13/02817/MAW & 18/00534/FUL.

The premises applied for retrospective application for a waste transfer station in 1994 which was granted by Shropshire Council on the 27th of July 1994.

The retrospective planning permission was approved by the Local Planning Authority (Ref: SC/ML1994/4368/SS), in July 1994 and restricts the number of vehicles entering and leaving the Site in connection with the waste transfer activities to no more than three movements in any one day.

Condition 1 of this planning permission states the following. "This permission shall enure for the benefit of J. Stephens Landscapes Ltd and shall not enure for the benefit of the land." It would therefore be our understanding that the site cannot be sold with the benefit of a waste transfer licence.

On 16th July 2013 the Local Planning Authority received a planning application (13/02817/MAW) which was granted. The development was for the erection of an office and covered waste recycling and recoverable material building which had certain. This permission had a number of restrictions relating to vehicle movements and improvements to the access. This development was not implemented, and the permission expired on the 21st of November 2016.

The brochure states that the property has, "the benefit of a planning consent for the construction of a two storey office extension to the existing unit" Page six of the brochure entitled "office building plans" shows the proposed development. This development (18/00534/FUL) was granted permission on the 20th March 2018. Standard Condition 1 applies to this planning permission and therefore the permitted development had to have begun by the 19th March 2021. There is no record of this development commencing and therefore the consent is understood to have expired in March 2021.

Yours sincerely

Cllr. John Luck  
Chair Planning Committee  
Church Stretton Town Council

It was proposed by Cllr Carson, seconded by Cllr Burns and **22/23 072 unanimously RESOLVED** to approve the sending of the above letter to Halls Estate Agents

**PC.110 Crown Carpets**

Councillors received a verbal update on the letter sent to Shropshire Council re. Crown Carpets on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2022.

**PC.111 Correspondence**

Cllrs noted letter sent to Unitary Cllr David Evans:

Cllr. David Evans  
30th December 2022

Dear David

Planning concerns, Church Stretton.

I am writing to raise concerns that the Town Council have in the management and handling of Church Stretton planning applications, in particular a lack of details on applications which affect our ability to make informed decisions. We also have concerns around openness and transparency regarding undocumented meetings by members of the Unitary Authority, especially members of the Southern Planning Committee with applicants and or agents.



In respect of the lack of details we are seeing more and more validated planning applications where dimensions are not included. This severely restricts our ability to judge the massing of developments, and this can be compounded when variations are later submitted. The most recent example of this is an application to redevelop a property at 20 Church Street, Church Stretton (21/04759/FUL) and the subsequent application to vary standard condition 2 (22/05461/VAR). This application and its subsequent application to vary the agreed plans highlights how the lack of inadequate plans can be capitalised at a later stage.

Another current example of inadequate information is an application (22/05405/FUL) to erect a large farm equipment storage building in open countryside at "Barnacre" in All Stretton. The plans and elevations submitted in support of the application do give the 2D footprint of the building but there are no measurements given of the height on which to gauge the visible impact on the landscape.

The second concern regarding openness and transparency we are raising is also connected to the application (21/04759/FUL) the redevelopment of 20 Church Street. As you are aware the original application was objected to by both the Civic Society and Town Council as well as a neighbour. Within the case officers Development Management Report, it is mentioned that the application had been referred to both yourself and Cllr. Hilary Luff and that you both supported this application. The Case Officer goes on to say that..." on consideration by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Southern Planning Committee it was agreed that the application be approved under the adopted scheme of delegation as following a site visit by the Chair no issues were identified.

It is usual that where a site visit is planned by members of the Southern Planning Committee the Town Council is notified in order that a representative may attend and observe the visit. This opportunity was not afforded us. The Case Officer states that the local members both supported the application. If this is true, then why did neither Councillor upload comment to this effect to the Planning Portal comments section?

We would ask that as one of our Unitary Authority Councillors and the Chair of the Southern Planning Committee that you support our request that Shropshire Council carefully consider the following:

- The Town Council asks that in respect of the inadequacy of plans submitted that Shropshire Council, the Local Planning Authority requires, that any site plan accurately shows the written dimensions of the intended structure in 3D ie. Length, width, height and also include distance to boundaries.
- In respect of the second point around openness and transparency the Town Council would ask that Shropshire Council Standing Orders require that when an individual Councillor makes a judgement on a Planning Application that may or may not influence the determination that their comment is uploaded to the Planning Portal.

On behalf of the Church Stretton Town Council, I would appreciate a formal written response to the points raised at your earliest convenience

Yours sincerely

Cllr John Luck  
Chair, Planning Committee  
Church Stretton Town Council

Copy: Cllr Lezley Picton,  
Leader Shropshire Unitary Authority.

Cllrs noted the response to this letter received from Tracey Darke:

From: Tracy Darke

Sent: 13 January 2023 16:20

To: Cllr John Luck

Cc: Lezley Picton; David Evans; Tabitha Lythe; Cllr Andy Munro; Cllr Colin Carson; Cllr Mark Morris; Cllr John Burns

Subject: RE: Church Stretton Town Council Planning Concerns letter

Dear Cllr Luck

Thank you for your letter regarding concerns that Church Stretton Town Council have regarding the planning process. I have been asked to respond on behalf of Cllr Evans.

First, you raise the issue about applications being validated without dimensions on the plans and the difficulty it causes. I appreciate that it would be helpful, but there is national requirements regarding the submission of planning applications that all authorities have to conform to. This states that:

‘Any plans or drawings must be drawn to an identified scale, and in the case of plans, must show the direction of north. Although not a requirement of legislation, the inclusion of a linear scale bar is also useful, particularly in the case of electronic submissions’.

Therefore, we cannot require this. Please feel free to google the ‘National Validation Requirements’ for the submission of planning applications for information. If you are struggling to interpret plans, please contact the planning officer and they will always assist. Moreover, there is a measuring tool on line that can be used when you view the plans.

With regard to the second concern, Cllr Luff did write to the case officer, but unfortunately this was marked ‘sensitive’ in the system rather than ‘public’ and was therefore not visible. I apologise for that. The site visits that happen as part of the agenda setting process are purely for the Chair and Vice Chair to view the site if they so wish. Often an officer may go with them, but they are not formal site visits as you find with applications going to planning committee.

Officers are willing to come to one of your meetings in the future and we can discuss these types of issues and other planning matters. Tabitha Lythe is the new Planning and Development Services Manager whom I have included in the email. Please contact her if you wish to do this. We also have two new people starting at the end of the month that will be in senior positions in the south managing the teams and it may be an opportunity to meet them also.

I hope the above covers your concerns. Let me know if you require anything further.

Kind regards

Tracy Darke

Assistant Director Economy and Place

Place Directorate

**PC.112 Next Meeting**

Councillors noted the date of the next meeting as being Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> February 2023 at 7.00pm.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.15pm

Signed by .....

Date 17<sup>th</sup> January 2023

As a true and accurate record of the meeting.

DRAFT