

STRATFORD-UPON-AVON TOWN COUNCIL

PLANNING CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

03 August 2021 at the Town Hall

Present

Cllr V Alcock	Cllr J Fradgley
Cllr D Curtis	Cllr Jackson
Cllr J Fojtik	Cllr Lee
Cllr I Fradgley	Cllr Taylor

Planning Consultant: Mr Neil Pearce, Avon Planning Services (via Zoom)

Minutes Clerk: Margo Galvin

38. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Cllr W Dowling.

39. Declarations of interest on items on the Agenda

The Mayor, Cllr Taylor advised that he is a BID Director for the Stratford upon Avon Food Festival which is seeking a Street Trading Application.

40. To receive written requests for dispensation for disclosable pecuniary interests.

None were received.

41. To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate.

None were received.

42. Consultation Presentation on Pre-Planning Applications.

There were none.

43. Public Participation of non-agenda items on matters under which the Council has control or is a consultative body.

No members of the public had registered to speak at the meeting.

44. To approve the draft Open Minutes of the Planning Consultative Committee Meeting held on 13 July 2021.

The Minutes of the Planning Consultative Committee meeting held on 13 July 2021 were approved as a correct record. The Chairman requested that the Chairman's electronic signature be added to the minutes by the Clerk.

45. Town Clerk's Open Report

List of planning applications deferred from Chairman's Actions meeting on 28 July 2021 April 2021 with any additional items deferred from Chairman's Actions meeting on 02 August 2021.

The Chairman noted that planning application 21/01802/FUL had been deferred from the Additional Chairman's Action meeting.

45.1 Spa Farm, Bishopton Lane

The Ward Councillors relating to this application are Cllr Alcock and Cllr Wall.

The Chair invited the Planning consultant to make a presentation on this application via Zoom.

This is a full planning application for the demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of 10 residential dwellings. Access to the existing property is via Bishopton Lane.

The application, if approved, would result in a net increase of nine dwellings. In total there would be eight semi-detached houses (a mix of two and three-bedrooms) and two larger properties at the front of the development, all with gardens and accessed via Bishopton Lane. There would be an area of public open space to the rear and five visitor parking spaces. The Planning Consultant believes the proposed development falls below the threshold for affordable housing.

The Chairman invited Councillors to raise any Points of Clarification.

A Councillor asked if the boundary of the proposed development would be fenced in. The Planning Consultant noted that, although no detailed landscape scheme has been provided as part of the application, it seems to be possible to walk from the new development to the nearby public right of way. He advised Councillors that if they felt the proposed development should connect to the surrounding developments, including public open space, they can insist on this.

A Councillor asked if the internal road within the new development would be a private road. The Planning Consultant advised that the Highways Authority would be unlikely to adopt the road due to insufficient turning space. He noted a potential risk that non-residents may use the development's parking spaces and suggested the applicant may want to install bollards to prevent this.

A Councillor asked how many of the properties would feature metal cladding as part of the design. The Planning Consultant believes this is a feature of all the houses and would be positioned centrally at the front and back of each property. The properties would be built of red brick and have slate roofs.

A Councillor noted that the application appears to involve the loss of several trees and asked if a biodiversity report has been produced for this area and if a biodiversity offset charge will come into force. The Planning Consultant advised that a PEA and arboricultural report have been done. Some trees at the frontage of the development will be retained, while a group of trees at the back will be removed, along with a hedge and a lot of vegetation, which is unlikely to be replaced. This proposed development is poor in terms of biodiversity net gain.

A Councillor commented that her understanding from County is that if biodiversity cannot be achieved onsite, it can be done offsite through financial contributions towards new strategic biodiversity plans. The Planning Consultant advised that the Committee could flag this up as part of their consultative process. The Councillor commented that if there is a biodiversity offset, the money should be offered first to the town and not the County. The Planning Consultant believes there may be cascade approach whereby money would be allocated within the immediate area of the development. If no space were available, it would be offered elsewhere e.g. adjoining parishes and the wider district.

A Councillor noted that the two large houses at the front of the development are further forward than other properties in the vicinity where a building lineage has been established. The Planning Consultant commented that there appears to be sufficient space between both the proposed and existing houses on this side of the road, as well as between the proposed houses and those on the opposite side of the road. He advised that this could be raised as an issue.

A Councillor asked how much wider the access road onto the development would be compared to the current property's driveway. The Planning Consultant advised that it appears to be double the width of the current driveway and that one tree would be removed at the front of the proposed development.

A Councillor asked if there are any TPO trees at this site. The Planning Consultant was not aware of any.

A Councillor asked if any electric charging points will be provided. The Planning Consultant advised that all properties will have charging points, which are now a standard requirement in Stratford upon Avon.

A Councillor noted that no chimneys feature as part of the design. The Planning Consultant responded that these would not align with the modern design of this development.

There being no speakers for this application, the Committee went into debate.

A Councillor commented that she saw no issue with demolishing one house and building 10 new properties. However, she was very concerned that several trees would have to be felled and that there would need to be a large biodiversity offset. The applicant needs to do more work on this aspect of the development. She also noted that there appears to be no refuse collection point on the development and

expressed concern that, with insufficient turning space, bin lorries would have to back out onto Bishopton Lane to move off the site.

A Councillor noted that Stratford is seeing many smaller developments where developers are trying to build as many properties as possible. He also expressed concern about access to the new development, particularly in relation to refuse collection, noting that developers do not appear to pay sufficient attention to how services access sites. This would seem to be a major problem with this application and he suggested the number of houses proposed may need to be reduced.

A Councillor noted that there had been a debate about metal cladding in relation to properties in Old Town and that the developers had subsequently removed a lot of the cladding from the design. He asked if cladding would add anything to the proposed Bishopton development.

A Councillor commented that if the trees don't have TPOs, this would be a reason for objecting to the application. He felt there needed to be more clarification of the position regarding tree loss as well as vehicle access for refuse collection. The Planning Consultant advised that a holding objection could be made to the application with the request that further information is provided about the significant loss of trees and hedgerows and how this will be offset.

A Councillor also noted his concern about access for bin lorries. The Planning Consultant noted that no Transport Statement had been provided with the application and no information included about refuse collection. It is assumed that the vehicles would stop in Bishopton Lane with the refuse collectors walking onto the site to collect the bins.

A Councillor agreed that, while the mix of proposed housing in this application is acceptable, the alignment of the two large houses at the front of the development is a concern since they will jut out and look out of place.

The Ward Councillor noted that in the Neighbourhood Plan (CLW4 – Open space and Play Areas), reference is made to 10 homes or more. As this development will include 10 houses, there needs to be a play area included. The nearest play area to the proposed development is at the current development, access to which would involve crossing a road. She also noted that Bishopton Lane is a long, straight road and all the houses in the current development align; to have two new large houses projecting beyond this line would be very noticeable. She commented that this application seems to have come before the Town Council too soon and it would have been helpful to see a Highways report before it came to the Council.

The Ward Councillor also referred to Policy BE6 in the Neighbourhood Plan (Design Quality Standards – Code for Sustainable Homes, Lifetime Homes and Buildings for Life), noting that the application relates to agricultural land. It does not seem necessary for this development to go ahead in the middle of a 500-house development and it does not fit in with the Plan. The two largest houses in the application are not located in the centre of the development as would be requested in the Plan. A lot of the required detail is missing in this application, including drainage in what is a very built-up area, the number of trees that would need to be

removed and installation of solar panels. Additionally, the design of the houses, especially the use of metal cladding, does not match the existing street scene.

The Chair noted that the Committee's response to this application is required by 16 August.

It was PROPOSED, SECONDED AND AGREED unanimously to submit a **holding objection** with the following comment:

The Town Council has no objection in principle. However, there are a significant number of trees and hedgerows being removed as part of this proposal and there is limited information about Net Biodiversity Gain which must be provided.

There is no Transport statement accompanying this application. It is clear that the internal road will not be adopted and has inadequate space for refuse vehicles (and other large vehicles such as removal lorries) to enter, turn and leave in a forward gear. The Highway Authority will need to carefully consider this issue. At the very least, a screened bin storage area would need to be provided close to the site entrance, so details will need to be provided for this.

There is a lack of information on the use of renewable energy and sustainable drainage contrary to Policy BE5 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

In accordance with Policy CLW4 of the Neighbourhood Plan, a financial contribution must be sought towards offsite play space/equipment in lieu of the lack of space to provide this onsite.

The proposed cladding must meet all safety standards.

The Planning Consultant left the meeting at 19.30.

45.2. To note action of the Town Clerk after consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman (or their substitutes) and Avon Planning Services on 28 July 2021.

1	21/02069/FUL	Stratford Marina, Bridgefoot	Construction of a single storey extension to the restaurant.
2	21/01848/FUL	The Great Gardens of New Place, Chapel Lane	AMENDED – Drawing no. 17640 12 A containing structural engineers' details for the proposed rebuilding of the existing boundary wall to New Place have been received.
3	21/02248/FUL	19 Manor Green	Two small scale extensions either side of the property, which is a uniquely designed upside-down house. The first extension is a single storey small side extension. The second side extension will be a two-storey extension, that connects the basement floor to the main living space via a gallery staircase.
4a	21/02056/ADV	18 – 19, Rother Street	Installation of matt black aluminium letters to replace the previous 'Lloyds Pharmacy' signage with the new tenant signage 'Lola's Waffles & Crepes'. Circular hanging sign to be mounted using the existing decorative bracket.

4b	21/02070/LBC	18 – 19, Rother Street	Installation of matt black aluminium letters to replace the previous 'Lloyds Pharmacy' signage with the new tenant signage ' Lola's Waffles & Crepes'. Circular hanging sign to be mounted using the existing decorative bracket.
5	21/02094/FUL	6 Evans Close	Proposed entrance door remodelling and first floor extensions.
6	21/02098/FUL	8 Worcester Close	Proposed single storey rear extension.
7	21/02115/FUL	45 Clopton Road	Single storey rear extension and alterations to an existing conservatory to side elevation.
8	21/02117/FUL	12 Halford Road	Erection of a two-storey side and rear extension, single storey front extension for garage and porch.
9	21/02126/FUL	11 Blackthorn Road	Single storey rear extension and new roof to existing garage.
10	21/02151/FUL	7 Church Street	Demolition of rear wing at ground floor to allow for a single storey rear extension and internal alterations.
11	21/01247/FUL	10 Maple Grove (Clopton)	AMENDED – Single storey extension set back from the side boundary with no. 9.
12	21/02268/TREE	The Lawn Place, Alveston Leys, Alveston	T1 – Holm Oak – Reduce canopy of trees overhanging driveway back to boundary (c. 3m); T2 – Yew – Reduce canopy by up to 2m over building; T3 – Holm Oak – Raise lower canopy to c. 4.5m from ground level on south-west side.
13	21/02160/FUL	6 Trinity Place, Bull Street	Removal of dilapidated brick outbuildings and plastic roof conservatory. Erection of single storey extension to rear of existing dwelling.
14a	21/01629/FUL	The Old Rectory, Clifford Chambers	Erection of dwelling and associated development.
14b	21/01630/LBC	The Old Rectory, Clifford Chambers	Erection of dwelling and associated development.
15	21/01857/FUL	42 Orchard Way	Alteration to previously approved scheme (20/00323/FUL) to increase length of side extension and introduce dormer to front elevation.
16	21/02195/FUL	9 Albany Road	Replacement roof, new roof windows and bifold doors.
17a	21/02205/LBC	10 Henley Street	Installation of new traditionally manufactured fascia and projecting sign.
17b	21/02203/ADV	10 Henley Street	Non-Illuminated traditional fascia sign.
18	21/02201/FUL	49 Bull Street	Demolition of existing lean-to and erection of single storey side extension.
19	21/02352/DDT	Woodland Area Adjacent to Ferry Lodge, Ferry Lane, Alveston	T1 – Oak – prune off fractured limb over public right of way.
20	21/02221/FUL	11 Toll Gate Close	Construction of a single storey rear extension. Extension to create an open plan kitchen, dining, and family room. All external materials to match the existing dwelling.
21	21/02353/DDT	The Priory, Welcombe Road	T1 – Ash – Fell (Dead and decaying at base. No replacement tree planting, as insufficient space to establish a tree).

22	21/01952/ADV	The Toll House, Bridgefoot	Installation of small sign on front and rear door and use of two flag poles to use for advertisements for the business.
23	21/02190/LBC	4-5, High Street	Repair of roof and replacement of roof tiles.
24	21/02239/FUL	16 Bull Street	Proposed works comprise of a single storey ground floor extension and a part double storey extension at first floor in addition to some internal alterations to the existing property. This includes the demolition of an existing single storey conservatory and some demolition of an existing 2 storey extension.
25	21/01811/FUL	Gospel Oak House, Gospel Oak Lane, Pathlow	Demolition of redundant barns and building new dwelling house and garage on the site.
26	21/02247/VARY	Land West of Stratford Land South of Alcester Road North of Evesham Road	Variation of Condition 1 of planning approval 15/03764/REM (Shottery North Phase 1) to allow the replacement of 'Cottage' house-types with 'Classics' house-types across all plots (207 Dwellings). Submission includes those amendments/additions already approved through planning approvals 19/02831/REM, 20/03691/VARY and 21/01784/AMD.
27	21/02197/FUL	20 Mulberry Street	Installation of posts and rails with horizontal wire infill, to form safety barrier and support structure for climbing plants around existing small flat roof which, has been utilised for growing plants since early 2010.

1	21/02234/FUL	108 Banbury Road	New oak framed entrance porch linking to extension to garage with first floor extension over existing and part new garage. New dormer to replace existing roof light. All Incorporating new pitched roofs to match existing.
2	21/02242/LBC	Guildhall, King Edward VI School, Chapel Lane	Removal of existing poster and replacement of additional poster in internal passageway
3	21/02294/FUL	Conifers, Riverside, Tiddington Road	Demolition of existing bungalow and garage. Construction of replacement dwelling.
4	21/01802/FUL	Spa Farm, Bishopton Lane	Full planning application for the demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of ten residential dwellings.
5	21/02262/FUL	7 Evenlode Close	Two storey rear extension new windows and external insulated render.
6	21/02313/FUL	56 Tiddington Road	Proposed replacement of the existing conservatory with a more modern and more energy efficient conservatory (orangery) within the same footprint as that existing, and to a similar scale as the existing.
7	21/01915/FUL	4 Guild Street	AMENDED – Entrance gates amended to remain in existing location but will still be a like for like replacement.
8	21/02002/FUL	Capricorn, Bishopton Lane	Front and rear extensions and loft extension (revision of approved planning permission 20/01859/FUL).
9	21/02228/FUL	Land Known as The Lench Meadow, Warwick Road	AMENDED – Further documents received: G-21-214 Ground Investigation Report RT-MME-155141-01 (Great Crested Newt) RT-MME-155141-02 (Otter and Water Vole) RT-MME-155141-04 (Reptiles)

			RT-MME-155141-05 (Botanical Assessment) RT-MME-155141-06 (Preliminary Bat Roost) WFD Scoping Assessment A further consultation will take place once the full Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is received.
10	21/00917/FUL	5 Foxtail Close	AMENDED – A tree protection plan has been received.

The actions were noted. The Chairman's Actions meeting was conducted remotely via Zoom between Councillors I Fradgley and Dowling on 28 July 2021. The Additional Chairman's remote meeting on 02 August 2021 was attended by Cllr I Fradgley.

45.3 Street Trading and Licensing Applications

45.3a A Street Trading application has been received for the Stratford Town Food Festival in Stratford-upon-Avon Town Centre.

A Councillor commented that some form of crowd control would be advisable to help manage the risk of Covid at this event.

The Mayor stated he was unsure if there is a draft Covid-19 plan in place for the Festival but noted there will be fewer stalls. He will take the Committee's comments back to the organisers to see what can be put in place.

A Councillor stated she was happy that the Festival goes ahead, with the caveat that a conversation is had with the organisers regarding a Covid plan.

A Councillor commented he had observed that social distancing was not being observed at the Waterside Market. He felt the Food Festival should go ahead but if Covid measures are put in place, they must be enforced.

A Councillor stated he has visited the Waterside Market weekly and believes the stall holders have worked hard to keep everything safe. The Council can only advise people to be sensible because the Government has made it difficult for measures to be policed. The fact that the Festival will be outdoors will make it safer. The Chair noted that the event organisers are very keen to put safety measures in place. However, it is understood that not all visitors will heed these.

The Mayor noted that the Waterside Market was placed under great scrutiny after both lockdowns and extra measures had been put in place. However, it is only possible to advise the public and ask them to comply. He will discuss this further with the BID.

It was proposed that a letter be written to the applicant to say that the Council is happy in principle but would like to raise the above concerns.

45.3b The Chairman reported that there are currently no licensing applications pertinent to the Town Council.

45.4 Notices of decision

The Chair noted that the Planning committee continues to be very much in line with the District Council with its decisions. Of 36 applications made recently, 30 were granted, 3 were refused and 3 were withdrawn.

45.5 Any Other Business

45.5a **Request for Road Name:** development at Territorial Army Centre, New Broad Street, Stratford upon Avon

The developer has suggested 'Yeomanry Mews' to honour the historical connection to the military presence on the site since the early 1900s.

A Councillor noted that, while this name is not currently on his database of suggested road names, it is a good suggestion and there is a clear reason for proposing it.

A Councillor agreed that, while this suggestion would be acceptable, the Council's naming structure for street names should also be respected.

A Councillor acknowledged that, while the developer's suggestion was a good one, the Planning Committee should not feel pushed into accepting the developer's idea. She suggested adding a comment in the response to the request thanking the developer for the originality of their suggestion. She noted her concern about too many streets in the town having similar names.

A Councillor suggested that an information plaque could be put up near the new road name to explain the military connection.

45.5b **Request for Road Name** – Garage, Mansell Street, Stratford-upon-Avon.

The applicant has suggested four names: Poets Close; Poets Mews; Midsummer Close; Merchant Drive.

The Ward Councillor commented that, while the suggestions were inoffensive, the two 'Poets' options should be avoided as all the literary-themed streets are in the Bridgetown area.

A Councillor commented that he disliked all the proposed names and suggested 'Foundary Court' as an alternative.

A Councillor liked the idea of acknowledging Stratford's engineering past, noting the town was on a par with Birmingham in this respect 200 years ago. 'Forge Close' was suggested as an alternative to 'Foundary Court'.

Cllr Fotjik will investigate this further and draft a response from the Council to the applicant – this to be done ASAP and the draft circulated to the Councillors and the Committee Clerk.

46 Chairman's Verbal Report

The Chair noted that there will be a meeting on 25 August with the developers of the Riverside project (Stratford District Council and the Stratford Town Trust) to discuss the Town Council's objections and comments in relation to this development. This meeting was proposed at the previous Planning Consultative Committee meeting on 13 July 2021, when it was agreed a separate meeting should be held

47 Requests for Alterations of Recommendation

There were none.

48 To register, when necessary, a representative from the Planning Consultative Committee to virtually attend the Stratford District Council Planning Meeting on Wednesday 04 August, 2021.

The Chairman noted that there is nothing for Stratford on this agenda. It is not yet known what will be on the list for 18 August 2021. A decision on whether a representative is required at the latter will be taken when the agenda is published.

49 To appoint substitutes for the next Chairman's Actions on 25 August 2021, if required

The Mayor agreed to act as substitute for the Chairman Actions if neither the Chair nor the Vice Chair can attend.

The meeting closed at 19.58

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 31 August 2021 at 6.30pm at the Town Hall.

*Signed:
Chairman of Planning Committee*