SHIPSTON ON STOUR TOWN COUNCIL

EXTRAORDINARY PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

New Clark House, West Street, Shipston on Stour, CV36 4HD
01608 662180 email: clerk@shipstontowncouncil.org

Minutes of a meeting of the Shipston on Stour Planning Committee held at Council Chambers, New Clark House on **Tuesday 2nd July 2024**

Those present: Cllrs P Tesh (chair), J Dinnie, C Howarth G Kelly, SDC Cllrs D Passingham and O Hatch, and non-Cllr member Mr P Sykes

Public: 33 **SDC**: 2 **Clerk:** D Hardiman

1	**TO NOTE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** None
2	**DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST** Councillors are reminded that, unless they have been granted a dispensation, if they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter as defined by Regulations made by the Secretary of State where the interest is theirs, their spouse or civil partner's, or is an interest of somebody with whom they are living as a husband or wife or as if they were civil partners, they may not participate in any discussion of or vote on the matter and must also leave the room for the duration of the matter. They must also disclose the interest if it has not yet been entered on the Authority's register unless it is a sensitive interest. None.
3	**TO NOTE DISPENSATIONS RECEIVED BY THE CLERK** None.
4	**MINUTES** To approve minutes of the meeting held 24th June 2024 It was decided to suspend approval of minutes until the next scheduled planning meeting, taking place on the 22nd July 2024
5	**OPEN FORUM** Cllr P Tesh opened the meeting and informed all members of the public that whilst we have the public open forum, decision making power does not lie with Shipston Town Council, anything submitted by Shipston Town Council will be consultation only, decision making power lies with Stratford District Council. He informed members of the public that their comments need to be logged on the Stratford District Council's Eplanning portal. Residents, many of which came along to listen before making their decisions, were then invited to have their say, with a maximum of 3 minutes each:

DRAFT

	Resident - Concerns of access into Webb road not being suitable for large vehicles. Should be 5.5metres wide but isn't. Vehicles parking on either side of the road, not leaving much space. Another issue is there is an extensive amount of water running through the estate already, own garden has been flooded. Suggested that the area is better suited for an attenuation pond rather than housing development. The local services can't cope with what we have already, how will it then cope with another 30+ houses? Can't currently get in with an NHS dentist, doctors surgery is overrun and we don't have a hospital at the moment. There are 5/6 developments on the Campden road already, which have been left in appalling states when they were built. Cllr P Tesh commented that we are aware of these issues and are working to get these rectified with the help of SDC Cllrs and enforcement. Resident - queried the transport statement – roads need to be 5.5 metres wide, states that they are no where near this, roads of 5 metres should be limited to 50 dwellings. Resident - asked about it being an Outline Planning application – only things have been submitted are drainage and access, is this normal. Have they stated if they are going to use Webb road as construction access, or will they use Hanson Track? This needs to be clarified as not clear. Hanson Track is a public footpath, so can't use this, and Webb Road is totally unsustainable, as not enough room. Cllr P Tesh confirmed that as this is an Outline Planning Application certain details won't be available yet. He also mentioned that they have not confirmed construction access on these plans Resident - Hanson Track being a Public Right of Way, have they applied for a diversion if planning to use track for construction access, this will take 3 years plus to do. SDC Cllr D Passingham offered to speak to the case officer and get some more information on this application, also stated that he sits on the planning committee with Stratford District Council and hears applications and objections, made the point that there has to be planning reasons to object to an application, clauses from the core strategy and national planning framework, important to find wording within these documents to object. Needs a firm case to object, will have to step down from this case as he has an interest, being in his ward. But can voice opinion on behalf of the residents. Resident - Hanson Track, being a bridleway, who owns this track? Cllr P Tesh replied that we are currently trying to find this information out on a previous query, could possibly lie with Worcestershire, as Shipston was previously within the Worcestershire District. P Sykes – Speaking of the Neighbourhood Plan, this is a legal document, to be adhered to by everyone. The reserve site is mentioned within this document approved in 2016/2017.Policy within the plan HSG5 – Allocating Housing Land, if more houses are to be built in Shipston, this would be our preferred site. Conditions were put in place, shouldn't be built on until after 2021, if it is required to meet the housing requirements set out in part D of the Core Strategy CS16. There is no requirement for reserve sites to be released to cope with situations in the core strategy at the moment. If they are to build there, they have to meet the conditions put in place in the Neighbourhood Plan, Local Planning Authority's reserve site should they be asked for more houses.

DRAFT

	Previous Contact (before this application went in) was made to Stratford District Council and asked where they are with regards to the reserve housing site, they replied with, the only sites that the district council would consider releasing through the provisions of the core strategy policy CS16 D at the present time would be those associated with point 4, which is the housing needs outside the Coventry and Warwickshire area. The final sentence from their reply - I therefore see no reason for site HSG5 within the Shipston on Stour Neighbourhood development Plan to be released based on the above assessment of housing provision – in other words the reserve site is still a reserve site not needed by the district council. Core Strategy indicative dwelling target is 510 homes for Shipston in the planning period (takes us up to 2031) actual numbers built, numbers from Stratford District Council, 708 houses built. Resident – worried about the town square, too many cars/traffic already, with more houses built in the area suggested, it is perhaps too far to walk for over 55s, so more traffic will be added to this as they will need to drive to town. Would also like to make sure that all who are objecting say the right things to put a stop to this application. Cllr P Tesh – no guarantee on putting a stop to this on what we say to them. Resident – asked if we could finance a QC to help put a stop to this. Cllr P Tesh – that is beyond the remit of the Town Council P Sykes – will be asking the question to the Planning Officer, are the words used in the letter to us saying there is no reason to release the reserve site, still standing. If it was said there are no requirements for the reserve site then why is someone coming along and putting in planning permission. Cllr P Tesh – closing the open forum. Encourages everyone to submit their responses to the SDC planning portal, individual and original comments, not copied from other objections and expand comments and concerns. Resident – concerned about back up of traffic at the traffic lights with extra traffic going into Webb Road. Resident – do they measure the land for wetness, as it is a quagmire at the moment. Cllr P Tesh – they should do a fully intrusive technical survey to determine what foundations will be but also what drainage issues are. This should be put into a comment, that the area suffers from land drainage. Resident – came to listen to get wording right for her objection. Asking a question about the Ransom Strip next to Rowett Drive, have heard that Crest Nicholson won't be giving this up, is that true? Cllr P Tesh – Ransom strips are purchasable, for a certain price, but the ditch is owned by someone else Resident – the ditch and hedges are not maintained as they should be. Cllr P Tesh - advised that this is a separate issue that the council are aware of and will be talked about at a different time. Resident – continued – noticed lots of wildlife in this area, is there anything they can mention within their objections in the environmental side. Another Resident – environmental study was carried out in the Autumn, when really it should have been carried out in the Spring. Cllr P Tesh – correct, this point should be mentioned Cllr C Howarth – comments have already made about Bats around this area.
6	**PLANNING MATTERS – all planning applications can be viewed at:** **https://apps.stratford.gov.uk/eplanning/**

DRAFT

a	**NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS** 24/00303/OUT – Land at Hanson Farm, Webb Road, Shipston on Stour – Outline planning application for the erection of up to 34no. dwellings (including up to 12no. affordable dwellings) restricted to occupation for over 55s. Matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved. Access is submitted. Discussion then took place between the committee about this application Cllr P Tesh summarised points he has noticed within the application Site layout – there is a bend in the site from the Taylor Wimpey side, does it meet the design statement as it seems quite a sharp bend, there is a visibility splay. The access road is outside the built-up area boundary. Housing needs survey – this came up with a need for 1 bed bungalows within Shipston – this plan is the wrong area for this type of housing, and there is not a need for 3 bedroom bungalows. Doesn't meet the requirements set out in the Core Strategy. Cllr P Tesh wished to set out points to consider for the committee, these are as follows: - Would like a response from the planners with regards to the status of the Reserve site - Details of the application - Parishoners reports - Do we object and what grounds do we object on - What is our wish list if granted permission - Recommendations to take to Full Council on Monday Drainage plan – this is unreadable due to the text boxes. The drainage strategy shows works outside the red line and hasn't been updated with the latest site plan. The red line drawing, the area retained by a landowner, could we persuade the land owner to gift the land to the Town Council for Public Open Space? The other comment on the red line drawing, some of the drawings that appear in various technical reports, including in the red line, others don't. Transport statement – we have heard concerns from residents, points that have been picked up. They have misquoted walking distances within the town, if these have been miscalculated then how accurate is the rest of the statement? The Webb Road junction is shown on the drawings as 5.5 metres, then the access road into the site, reduces from the proposed 5.5 down to 5metres, on the planning application drawings submitted by Taylor Wimpey, we need to check as to whether that is correct or not with the road widths, but have heard from residents regarding difficulties at the junction. 5.5meters is ok for up to 100 units, 5metres, in accordance with Warwickshire design guide, is only suitable for up to 50units. Need to check road widths here to clarify. Traffic figures have been disingenuous. Their own figures, from TRICS data, show the morning peak hour is between 8 and 9am, afternoon peak hour is between 3 and 4pm, whereas the accepted peak hour is between 5 and 6pm.

DRAFT

	When comparing these afternoon peak hours from TRICS data 3-4 pm shows 25 movements in and out whereas 5-6pm shows 17 movements. When looking at the TRICS data for 34 units it shows movements in a 12 hour period would be 196 movements. States that there are footways either side of the Campden road, this is false. Assessment of Webb Road and Campden Road junction, they should have included a capacity assessment. 5.5 metres width, there is already a problem with refuse vehicles passing parked cars, this will worsen with a further development having access here. Public Transport – this is irrelevant as there isn't any public transport going in and out of this junction. Planning Statement – there is a concern here with a statement regarding public consultation – it states leaflets were dropped to residents – how many were delivered? Reserve site – to be released after 2021 they have missed out – "if" it is required to meet the housing requirement for the District Flood Run off – claiming it is going to better than neutral discharge and that it is going to be 10 metres per second discharge for 1 in 100 year plus climate change which is about 40%. The estate it estimated to be less than the 1 in 1-year greenfield run off. The connections for foul sewer in Hanson track. Design and Access Statement – Incorrectly identifies site in the Neighbour Hood Plan as a housing opportunity, no reference in the statement to the site as its status as a reserve site. Other key points, it quotes Stratford District Council Local Plan references to affordable housing. 20% is going to be affordable for rent, 20% intermediate and 60% social, what is actually meant is the 35% that is going to be made affordable will be split 20-20-60, therefore 12 affordable houses equates to 2.4 houses as affordable, 2.4 houses as intermediate and 7.2 houses as social rent, would liked to know what actual figures are, as you can't have 0.4 of a house. Talk about the Neighbourhood Plan housing policy 5, incorrectly labels the site, no reference to it being a reserve site. Contextual Analysis – it states we have hospitals, primary schools and secondary schools, all plural. This is incorrect. Picked up errors on the plan, that shows location of facilities, hospitals etc. Includes Public Open Space on upper half of the site, we are to understand the landowner is going to retain the land, therefore it can't be used as Public Open Space as will not be accessible to the public. Contradictions between documents. Flood Risk assessment – not enough attention given to foul discharge. Underestimated the sewage flood risk. Taylor Wimpey site have flood problems already that need to be rectified, further development will add to these problems. Capacity of surface and foul water needs to be assessed to prove it can cope with the development. This does not include a detailed design and goes on to say that under recommendation that detail design stage should consider the most appropriate SUDS technique available for use in consultation. Need to make sure sufficient pollution mitigation measures are in place. No reference being made to sewage works and potential risk of discharging into the Stour, this needs an assessment.

DRAFT

Heritage Statement – minor visual impact, designated heritage assets will be preserved from harm. Shows Hanson Track as a road not a Public Right of Way.

Arboricultural Assessment - No urgent impact, hedges required to be removed must be out of nesting season, trees must be protected during construction. It was also mentioned that they are not replacing any trees/hedges that have been removed.

Landscape Appraisal – half of the document is not on the planning portal, we have sent an email to the planning officer about this and also some documentation has been removed.

Comments added by committee members. Affordable housing – no mention of affordable to purchase, only for rent. Housing Needs Survey states there is a need for affordable housing for purchase.
Comments were added from committee members about the ditch down the side, if there is more water being added this will add more problems, there are already issues here.

Cllr P Tesh continued
Refer to the Neighbourhood Plan – they are missing the point that "if" it is required as set out in the core strategy – will need to check status of Stratford Districts Council's previous comments, if this is still valid.

Mention of Public Open Space, but this is not within the red line, this needs to be clarified

Geo environmental investigation shows red line around the whole site, desk study low to moderate risk but further investigation required to determine exact ground conditions for foundation design etc

Ecology reference further ecological survey needed for habitat for various Wildlife.

Committee member added there is no statement for Bio Diversity Net Gain. This will need to be checked.

Proposed materials plan – they have included fake chimneys.

After discussion on these points, it was mentioned that committee agree to provide a recommendation to Full Council to object to the application for the discussed reasoning.

Recommendation that Council object to the planning application 24/00303/OUT, land at Hanson Farm, Webb Road as per the unanimous motion carried by the Planning Committee. Proposed by Cllr P Tesh, seconded by Cllr C Howarth, unanimous, motion carried.

Cllr P Tesh then summarised points made to take to the Full Council Meeting on Monday 8th July.

DRAFT

	- Reserve site – Referred to SDCs email - Drainage - Access – insufficient - Infrastructure Shortfall - Affordability - Traffic increases on Campden Road and Webb Road junction - Loss of agricultural land - Site suitability for over 55s - POS area referred to is not within red line area - Ecological survey needs to be done - Lack of Public Transport - No Construction Management Plan Committee then discussed having a realistic wish list ready, in case the application gets approved by Stratford District Council - Gifting of Blue land to Shipston Town Council, for Public Open Space - Hanson Track improved for leisure activities if used for construction
n	**DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING** Monday 22nd July 2024

The meeting closed at 2100 hrs.

Signed…….

Date…….

Cllr P. Tesh (Chair), Shipston Town Council Planning Committee

DRAFT