**MINUTES OF WOORE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**

**Monday 12th September 2016**

**Held at Woore Victory Hall**

**PRESENT:**

Cllr M. Moore (Chairman), Cllr M. Blake (Vice Chairman), Cllr H. Blake, Cllr K. Chell, Cllr S. Clifford, Cllr M. Cowey, Cllr J. Higgin and Cllr H. Lightfoot.

**IN ATTENDANCE**:

Shropshire Cllr J. Cadwallader, Ms C. Bedson and Ms S. Tyson (Tree and Footpath Wardens) and Miss S. Pimlott, Clerk to the Parish Council (PC).

**PUBLIC**

4 members of the public, Mr Alistair Bush, Mr Anthony Garth, Mr James Crook and Mrs Diane Crook attended the meeting.

**15256 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllrs Allison and Ford apologised for being unable to attend for business reasons.

**15257 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There was one declaration of a pecuniary interest by Cllr Lightfoot in the forthcoming Agenda Item 15260 (A) 3. The Chairman advised that he also had a non-pecuniary interest in the same Agenda Item and that he too would retire from the meeting when that Item was under discussion.

**15258 OPEN FORUM**

1. Agenda Item 15260 (A) (1) – Mr Garth said that he was concerned about the possible future development of the Swan car park and bowling green. He was worried that such a development would lead to the loss of an important village or community asset, Woore Bowling Club. The loss of a Club which had existed for over a hundred years would be a serious loss for the Parish. He said that any development which involved the loss of the Club, without an adequate replacement, was unacceptable and completely inconsistent with developing sustainable communities.

Cllr Cowey, Lead Cllr for the application to develop the Swan, advised Mr Garth that he had spoken to the Bowling Club Secretary. He was intending to report back to the Secretary following the Parish Council Meeting. Cllr Cowey said that he was hoping to make arrangements in a private capacity to meet the Club’s Management Committee to ascertain what discussions there had been between the Club and the Swan’s owner to guarantee the future of the Club should the owner apply for planning approval for a scheme which included the bowling green.

1. Agenda Item 15260 (A) (3) – Mr Crook raised concerns about this retrospective application for planning permission. He was, in particular, concerned that one of the persons who had carried out the development was a Cllr and she must have been well aware that planning permission should have been obtained prior to carrying out the development. He said that it looked as if the Cllr had deliberately carried out the development in the expectation that, once built, it was more likely to be granted planning permission. He said that the Cllr’s behaviour was reminiscent of MPs’ inappropriate behaviour and that it was completely inappropriate for a Cllr to act in this manner.

Mr Crook said that he was also concerned, as someone who had walked along the redundant railway for 20 years, that this development had started at about the same time as the same landowner had erected a padlocked gate on the redundant railway line on the far side of the bridge on Watery Lane. This prevented walkers walking along the railway track.

The Chairman advised Mr Crooks that the propriety of the Cllr’s behaviour might be discussed by the Cllrs considering the retrospective application for planning permission, but it seems it would not be a material consideration for the planning application. The other issues he had raised might be relevant and would be considered by the Cllrs.

**15259 TO APPROVE AND SIGN MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 11TH JULY 2016**

The Cllrs resolved to approve the above Minutes.

**15260(A) PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

1. **16/03011/FUL - Change of use of public house to form five residential units at Swan Hotel, Nantwich Road, Woore CW3 9SA**

Cllr Cowey was the Lead Parish Cllr in respect of this application. He reported that everyone he had spoken to about the application was relieved that the plan was to redevelop the building without damaging the external structure and façade of the building. He said that the current proposal would at least ensure that the building did not fall into disrepair and that it would be maintained in the future. It was suggested that Shropshire Council (SC) should make any permission subject to a condition protecting the façade.

A number of Cllrs were disappointed that the Swan, as a historic posting inn, could not be retained as a pub. It was suggested that any chance of it becoming a successful pub was rendered impossible by the terms of any tied tenant’s tenancy of the pub. Some Cllrs were of the view that Woore simply could not sustain three pubs all in such close proximity to one another. It was generally agreed that it was unfortunate that, notwithstanding its location in the business / commercial area of Woore, the Swan was now intended to be used for housing. A medical centre or mixed commercial and residential use would have been preferable.

It was the majority view that the current proposal was, in the circumstances, the best solution.

In the pre application discussions with SC, the developer was advised that the appropriate level of car parking would be 2 spaces for each flat. At the time, the developer proposed 6 flats. The developer was now seeking permission for 5 flats. The Cllrs agreed with the advice which SC had received that 12 spaces should still be provided and that the access arrangements should be improved.

It was resolved by a majority of the Cllrs to support the application subject to the following:

1. The external appearance of the Swan Public House, as a building of historical and architectural interest, should be safeguarded by the imposition of a planning condition which ensures that the external appearance of the Swan remains unchanged.
2. The current proposals for car parking and access are unsatisfactory – see Mouchel’s Highway Advice Note with which the PC agrees. The PC is of the view that, before any permission is granted, amendments to the planning application should be made or required to give effect to the recommendations made in that Advice Note.
3. The current proposals for the provision of open / amenity / recreational space for the occupants of the proposed residential units are inadequate. The PC is of the view that, before any permission is granted, the Applicant should be required to provide greater space or, should that not be possible, that either the Applicant should be required to enter into a Section 106 Agreement requiring him to provide such space elsewhere in the Parish or that he be required to make a CIL payment to assist in the provision of such space.
4. **16/03349/OUT - Outline application (with means of access) for residential development (resubmission) at land north of Newcastle Road, Woore (see also (B) below).**

Cllr Allison was the Lead Parish Cllr on this application**.** In her absence, Cllr Clifford reported on the issues which Cllr Allison had raised in her written report to the Council.

In the course of the discussion concerning this application, concerns were raised that the Drainage Report, which suggested that the development would not cause any drainage or flooding problems, was incorrect. The flooding in recent years at Pipe Gate and elsewhere in the Parish suggested the need to revisit the water attenuation calculation.

The Vice Chairman reported that the letter from the Cricket Club Secretary to SC in support of the Application had not been authorised by the Club and the Club will be writing to SC withdrawing the letter. The same letter also appeared in the Shropshire Star and again the Club will be writing to the Star to withdraw the letter. From discussions with the Club, it appears that the developer’s representative may have misled the Club Secretary.

Following a full discussion, it was resolved to object to the application on the following grounds:

1. The Applicants have previously made an application for outline permission for residential development (54 houses) on a larger site (3.64 hectares) in the same location. The PC objected to this application, as did a large number of parishioners, and SC refused the application. The Applicants have appealed against that refusal and the appeal is ongoing (see **Agenda Item 15260(B**) below). The PC has made submissions to the Planning Inspector hearing the appeal objecting to the proposed development. The PC considers that its grounds of objection to the first application (see its comments lodged on 20th January 2015) and what was said in its submissions in connection with the appeal apply with equal force to the current application.
2. The current application is described as a “resubmission” for outline planning permission with means of access for residential development on a site of 2.60 hectares. That site forms part of the original 3.64 hectares site referred to in 1 above. It is suggested that many other matters, such as the number and type of dwellings, density of housing, number of affordable homes and public open space should be dealt with as reserved matters. The PC submits that reserving such matters until after an outline planning permission is granted would be completely inappropriate.
3. The PC submits that the Applicant’s “sustainable surface water drainage solution (SUDS) which will attenuate surface water run-off and discharge to the pre-existing drainage ditch at the edge of the site” (2.16 of the Supporting Statement) and the Flood Risk Assessment water attenuation calculation should be reviewed.
4. The Supporting Statement and other reports in support of the current application largely appear to have been recycled from the earlier application and, for this reason, are now out of date, inaccurate or misleading in a number of significant areas. By way of example, whilst the Supporting Statement correctly states that SC’s SAMDev proposed 15 further dwellings for the Parish in the period up to 2026, the quota has already been met and substantially exceeded by the granting of other permissions for residential units.
5. Furthermore, it is submitted that, contrary to the Applicants’ assertion in the Supporting Statement, the Parish’s infrastructure is, in fact, currently inadequate to support further residential development. The primary school is full, there are no GP surgeries or other primary care facilities in the Parish and, far from the Parish being well connected, public transport is non-existent.
6. **6/03317/ FUL - Application under Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the installation of a utility building on a concrete slab and installation of grey metal security railings (1.94 m high) at the Old Railway Line, Pipe Gate.**

Both the Chairman and Cllr Lightfoot left the meeting. For this Agenda Item, the Vice Chairman acted as Chairman in the Chairman’s absence.

Cllr Chell was the PC’s Lead Cllr in respect of this application. She informed the meeting she had walked around both Priory Gardens and Phoenix Rise and knocked on all the doors. Only one person was in. She had left the PC’s standard letter at all the houses. This letter invited parishioners to contact her should they wish to discuss the application. No one had tried to contact her.

Cllr Allison, in anticipation of her absence from the meeting, had sent a note which was read out, in which she expressed her concern that Cllr Lightfoot who, as a Cllr, must have known that this development required planning permission, had decided to go ahead with the development without having obtained planning permission beforehand. Acting in this way, was, in Cllr Allison’s view, completely unacceptable. Cllr Allison’s views were endorsed by all the Cllrs.

The Cllrs then moved on to consider the merits of the application for retrospective planning permission. At the conclusion of the discussion, it was unanimously resolved to object to the application on the following grounds:

1. The Applicants’ failure to obtain prior planning permission for this development meant that this development went ahead without any environmental impact survey and appraisal by SC of whether or not the development would be satisfactory in terms of its open countryside location, the access onto Watery Lane, its potential impact on public rights of way, the recreation area on Phoenix Rise, the houses on Phoenix Rise and on the forthcoming Station Road development, all of which are in the vicinity of this development. Had this application not been retrospective, such a survey and appraisal by SC would have been required before consideration, and they should be insisted upon now.
2. The Application describes the development as a utility building but it does not specify for what purposes the building will be used and it is difficult without this information to comment on the suitability of the development.
3. It is proposed, if retrospective planning permission is granted for the development, to connect the utility building to the water and electricity supply. Again, it is difficult to comment on the suitability of these proposals given that there is no explanation as to the use to which the building is to be put and thus there is no explanation why connection to the utilities is required or desirable.

The Chairman and Cllr Lightfoot returned to the meeting at the conclusion of the discussion of this Agenda Item.

1. **16/03527/FUL - Erection of extension to existing agricultural building to provide further cattle accommodation at New Farm, London Road, Knighton, Market Drayton TF9 4HL**.

Cllr Lightfoot was the PC’s Lead Cllr in respect of this application**.** She had visited the site and left the PC’s standard letter at the homes which were located within the Parish and located closest to the proposed extension. She reported that the nearest houses to the proposed development are not in the Parish and that no parishioners had raised any objections with her. It was agreed that the application appeared satisfactory. It was unanimously resolved to support the Application

**15260 (B) OTHER PLANNING MATTERS**

The Clerk reported the planned resumption at 10.00am on 12th October 2016 of the hearing at the Bridgnorth Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury SY2 6ND of Berry’s appeal (**Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/L3245/W/16/3143516**) concerning the refusal by Shropshire Council (SC) of its previous application (**14/05206/OUT**) for a residential development at land north of Newcastle Road, Woore (see also (A) 2 above). It was agreed that no-one from the PC would attend the resumed hearing given that the PC had already lodged its written submissions opposing the appeal.

**15261 TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM THE CLERK ABOUT MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 11TH JULY 2016 AND NOT INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA**:

The Clerk reported concerning the following matters:

1. Manhole covers and grids in the vicinity of Mr Rigby’s house **(15222(2))**-The Clerk reported that Cllr Cowey had seen the gullies / grids being cleared by SC in mid-July. SC had apologised for not progressing the repair of the manhole covers. Severn Trent and SC had visited the area to check the manholes covers. Following the meeting, Severn Trent advised SC that it did not own the covers. Cllr Clifford volunteered that Severn Trent are responsible for the water supply and United Utilities for the infrastructure. It was agreed that the Clerk would advise SC accordingly.
2. War Memorial **(15225(1))**–The Clerk said that Mr Burt, Monumental Stone Mason, was to check the War Memorial and forward a quote to the Clerk for cleaning and if necessary repairing the war memorial. The aim was that the work should be completed prior to Remembrance Sunday.
3. Felling of ash tree on Candle Lane **(15225(2))**–The Clerk said that she had been notified by SC that the dead ash tree had been felled.
4. Signage for Children’s Play and Adult Exercise Equipment Areas **(15250)**-The Clerk said that she was waiting to see examples of the signs.
5. Freedom of Information Request **(15252)**- In accordance with the resolution passed at the last meeting, the Clerk said that she had sent a letter to SC requesting it to enforce the Section 106 Agreement on Phoenix Field.
6. Improvement of pathway between Blaizefield Close and Cherry Tree Lane **(15253)**– The Clerk reported that SC had agreed to carry out the repair and put in a ramp and that she was waiting to hear when the work would commence.

**15262 REPRESENTATIVES’ REPORTS**

(a) Victory Hall - Cllr H Blake said that she had nothing new to report.

(b) Movable Vehicle Activated Signs (MVAS)– the Vice Chairman confirmed that it was business as usual in terms of deploying MVAS at the MVAS sites across the Parish. He said that he had also continued to send the statistics obtained from MVAS to the Safer Roads Partnership. West Mercia Police are members of the Partnership.

(c) Tree and Path Wardens’ Report – Ms S. Tyson & Ms C. Bedson reported that the landowner had agreed to SC replacing a rickety stile on the Northlands Footpath. They further reported that the Station Yard footpath had been cleared. They also said that SC had now opened its Free Tree Scheme. A prompt application should be made by those interested in acquiring a tree/s.

(d) Neighbourhood Plan –the Vice Chairman reported that Cheshire Community Action had been appointed consultants to the Neighbourhood Planning Team (NPT). The next NPT meeting would be on 26th September. The NPT were looking forward to supporting the next review of SC’s Local Plan and giving the Parish an opportunity to influence future development in the Parish. On 17th September, the NPT would be having a stall at the Village Fete. Flyers explaining the purpose of a Neighbourhood Plan, the work of the NPT and seeking volunteers to assist in that work would be handed out, together with forms for parishioners to complete if they were willing to provide assistance. The Vice Chairman, on behalf of the NPT and the PC, thanked the Village Shop / Post Office, The Coopers Arms, The Falcon Inn and Festival Drayton for providing prizes for the Fete.

(e) Shropshire Councillor Mr J Cadwallader informed the meeting that SC had been successful in opposing a number of appeals against its decisions to refuse applications for planning permission. However, an appeal in Ellesmere had been successful. The reason that appeal was allowed was because the Inspector concluded that SC was unable to demonstrate an adequate supply of land to meet housing need. SC has appealed to the High Court against this decision.

(f) Shropshire Association of Local Councils (SALC) – Cllr Higgin advised that she had not yet received the Minutes of the last meeting. It was agreed that she and / or the Clerk would circulate the Minutes following receipt of them by the Clerk from SALC.

**15263 PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS**

The Council resolved to pay the following accounts:

1. S.H. Pimlott (for July and August 2016) -
2. Salary £792.88
3. Expenses £64.76
4. Mileage £170.80
5. Sundry £156.49

TOTAL: £1184.93

1. HMRC £209.42
2. Shropshire Assoc of Local Councils £65.00
3. Garden Care Services (Lengthsman) £127.50

**15264 CLERK’S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Clerk reported that all correspondence for the period from 12thJuly 2016 to 12thSept 2016 had already been copied to Cllrs.

The meeting closed at 9.45 pm.

**DATE OF NEXT PARISH COUNCIL MEETING: MONDAY 10TH OCTOBER 2016 AT 7.30PM**

**RECORD OF VOTING FOR WOORE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 12THSEPTEMBER 2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Motion** | **Cllr** | **For** | **Against** | **Abstain** |
| **15259** | To approve the Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 11th July 2016. | Moore | **X** |  |  |
| Blake H |  |  | **X** |
| **Prop: Clifford**  **Second: M. Blake** | Blake M | **X** |  |  |
| Chell | **X** |  |  |
| Clifford | **X** |  |  |
| Cowey | **X** |  |  |
| Higgin | **X** |  |  |
| Lightfoot |  |  | **X** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Motion** | **Cllr** | **For** | **Against** | **Abstain** |
| **15260 (A)(1)** | To support planning application 16/03011/FUL subject to the matters referred to in the Minutes. | Moore |  |  | **X** |
| Blake H | **X** |  |  |
| **Prop: Cowey**  **Second: Clifford** | Blake M |  | **X** |  |
| Chell | **X** |  |  |
| Clifford | **X** |  |  |
| Cowey | **X** |  |  |
| Higgin |  | **X** |  |
| Lightfoot |  |  | **X** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Motion** | **Cllr** | **For** | **Against** | **Abstain** |
| **15260 (A)(2)** | To oppose planning application 16/03349/OUT on the grounds set out in the Minutes. | Moore |  |  | **X** |
| Blake H | **X** |  |  |
| **Prop: Clifford**  **Second: Cowey** | Blake M | **X** |  |  |
| Chell | **X** |  |  |
| Clifford | **X** |  |  |
| Cowey | **X** |  |  |
| Higgin | **X** |  |  |
| Lightfoot | **X** |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Motion** | **Cllr** | **For** | **Against** | **Abstain** |
| **15260 (A)(3)** | To oppose planning application 16/03317/OUT on the grounds set out in the Minutes. | Blake H | **X** |  |  |
| **Prop: Clifford**  **Second: M. Blake** | Blake M | **X** |  |  |
| Chell | **X** |  |  |
| Clifford | **X** |  |  |
| Cowey | **X** |  |  |
| Higgin | **X** |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Motion** | **Cllr** | **For** | **Against** | **Abstain** |
| **15260 (A)(4)** | To support planning application 16/03527. | Moore | **X** |  |  |
| Blake H | **X** |  |  |
| **Prop: Moore**  **Second: Higgin** | Blake M | **X** |  |  |
| Chell | **X** |  |  |
| Clifford | **X** |  |  |
| Cowey | **X** |  |  |
| Higgin | **X** |  |  |
| Lightfoot | **X** |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Motion** | **Cllr** | **For** | **Against** | **Abstain** |
| **15263** | Resolved to pay the Accounts listed in the Minutes. | Moore | **X** |  |  |
| Blake H | **X** |  |  |
| **Prop:**  **Clifford**  **Second: M. Blake** | Blake M | **X** |  |  |
| Chell | **X** |  |  |
| Clifford | **X** |  |  |
| Cowey | **X** |  |  |
| Higgin | **X** |  |  |
| Lightfoot | **X** |  |  |

**SIGNED………………………………… DATED………………………………….**

**CHAIRMAN/VICE CHAIRMAN**