

STRATFORD-UPON-AVON TOWN COUNCIL

PLANNING CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

19 October 2021 at the Town Hall

Present

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

Planning Consultant: Mr Neil Pearce, Avon Planning Services

Minutes Clerk: Margo Galvin

Speakers: Tony Perks (Stratford District Council) and Sara Aspley (Stratford Town Trust)

77. Apologies for Absence

Cllr Dowling.

78. Declarations of interest on items on the agenda

Cllr J Fradgley advised that she had received communications from the Town Transport Group and Elliot Goodall in relation to the 1 Arden Street application. Development. Cllr Jackson advised that, as a Town Trust Trustee, he would not participate in any discussion on, or vote on, the Lench Meadows application. Cllr Lee advised that he had also received communications about the Lench Meadows, and Cllr Curtis has had several meetings on the subject. The Chair advised that he had chaired a meeting for the Lench Meadow applicants to provide an update to the Planning Committee on the proposed project.

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

None were received.

80. To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate.

None were received.

81. Consultation Presentation on Pre-Planning Applications.

There were none.

82. 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.

83. To approve the draft Open Minutes of the Planning Consultative Committee Meeting held on 28 September 2021.

The Minutes of the Planning Consultative Committee meeting held on 28 September 2021 were approved as a correct record.

84. List of planning applications deferred from the Chairman's Actions meeting on 13 October 2021 with any additional items deferred from the Chairman's Actions meeting on 18 October 2021.

The Chairman noted that planning applications **21/03126/FUL** and **21/02447/FUL** had been deferred from the Chairman's Action meeting.

21/03126/FUL Land Known As "The Lench Meadows", Warwick Road - Change of use of land to form an increased area of public open space and works to include extension to Fisherman's car park and associated access improvements, pedestrian/cycle paths, ponds, earthworks, riverbank regrading, shelters and other structures, platforms, boardwalks, and planting.

The Chair noted that the Ward Councillors for this application are Cllrs Coles and Taylor.

The Planning Consultant made a presentation, noting that the application is very similar to the previous one (21/02228/FUL – withdrawn in August 2021). This included a skateboard park which no longer forms part of the application. He reminded the Committee that they had objected to the previous application, questioning how nature conservation can be accommodated successfully alongside an accessible leisure and recreational use. The Committee had felt that the provision of a fully accessible open space would potentially conflict with existing policies that seek to preserve and enhance nature conservation. The need to extend Fisherman's car park was also questioned when the Leisure Centre car park is underused. Additionally, there were concerns that a high concentration of people in this area, along with catering facilities, would cause noise and disturbance which would conflict with the aims of nature conservation. The Town Council had raised a Holding Objection to the application and welcomed further discussions / meetings with the District Council and Town Trust.

The Planning Consultant noted that these meetings had taken place, although he had not attended. The application remains largely unchanged in terms of design.

Points of Clarification

A Councillor asked how many additional parking spaces would be provided in the car park. This was confirmed as 71 extra spaces on top of the existing 48.

A Councillor asked if there had been any update to the Environment Agency's objection to the application made in July 2021 on the basis that it did not include

a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The Planning Consultant advised that the FRA had since been carried out and that the Environment Agency have not yet commented on this application.

A Cllr asked if there was now clarity around how cyclists would be accommodated through the park. The PA noted that this question relates to Bridgefoot Park. There are two paths dissecting this area and this remains unchanged in the application. It will probably be wide enough to accommodate a combined cycle/footpath; it is believed the pathways are designed to be both pedestrian- and cycle-friendly but the Consultant could not advise if there was a wider strategy in terms of providing signage on the path.

Speakers

The applicant, Mr Tony Perks of Stratford District Council, noted that the application is very similar to the previous one but is now supported by a comprehensive contamination survey. The applicant has worked with Natural England to understand what needs to be done to achieve Local Nature Reserve (LNR) status on the site.

He noted that the recent public consultation exercise had been useful.

Mr Perks advised that the pathways across the site would serve as shared space for use by both cyclists and pedestrians.

Mr Perks felt that more car parking is needed at the site and a compromise might be to extend the car park at the Southern side only.

He noted that signage is being looked at as part of the application and he would be happy to incorporate cycling into this.

Questions arising

A Councillor asked for clarification on how the site is being defined. Mr Perks referred to the Natural England document *Local Nature Reserves in England* which sets out the different types of LNRs. The strategy for Lench Meadow would be to “manage the land not only for a conservation purpose but also for a recreational purpose” to get people engaged in nature. The Councillor asked if this had been clearly communicated to people who may have concerns about the site being a shared space. Mr Perks stated that he believes this is the case but would be happy to clarify any points.

A Councillor raised the question of potential contamination since part of the site is situated on the former town tip. Mr Perks advised that the tip site is adjacent to the Leisure Centre car park and no invasive work will take place in that area; some of the excavated material from the riverbed will be placed on top of the site. Twenty bore holes had been sunk across the site to establish if contamination might be made worse by the proposed development work. The full contamination report submitted with the application shows this won't be the case.

A Councillor asked how deep the tip is and how much/what type of waste had been dumped there. Mr Perks replied that there is no clear evidence about this since there was no requirement to keep records in the 1970s. The proposed

scheme will not disturb what is there and, ideally, will improve the area by adding soils to the tip site. It is not known how deep the landfill site is but data from the bore holes can be reviewed to learn more. It is believed that the top of the tip is not more than 12" below the land surface. A Councillor then advised that the environment report indicates the landfill site was 2-4 metres deep.

A Councillor requested clarification about the increase in the size of the car park. Mr Perks confirmed that the proposal is to extend to the North and South of the existing car park area, with each extension comprising 35 spaces. Based on Warwick Road traffic volumes, it is felt there should be more parking on the site. Feedback from the recent public exhibition showed that something needs to be done but that the current proposal is too much. Mr Perks wondered if, as a compromise, extra parking could be provided in the Southern area of the car park, leaving the Northern area untouched unless there was a subsequent demand for extra parking spaces. The Councillor asked what would happen to the Northern area if the land was not developed immediately. Mr Perks replied that it would be left as cut grass.

A Councillor noted that the Lench Meadow area had been managed in the past for biodiversity but that this had fallen away some years ago. Mr Perks noted that it is generally understood this is a valuable area but, due to lack of management, it has become dominated by certain species and the biodiversity has degraded. It will never be a rewilded scheme because of its location. If the biodiversity can be improved, something valuable can be created for the town.

There being no further questions or points of clarification, the Committee went into debate.

A Councillor noted that, as a regular visitor to Lench Meadows, he believes more parking spaces are required. He agreed that the site needs managing and that improved biodiversity would be a positive aspect of the proposal. On this basis, he would support the application.

A Councillor applauded the idea of improving the management of the site. However, he was not convinced about the need for extra parking at Lench Meadows, given the Leisure Centre car park is underused. He agreed the Fisherman's car park is overused but felt this could be overcome by better road signage. He expressed concerns around potential contamination and felt that, perhaps, the bore hole testing was not as comprehensive as it could have been. He felt the conflicting needs of a share space do not necessarily sit easily with intervention.

A Councillor expressed his disappointment that the application has not fully addressed the design changes suggested by the Town Council previously, the main issue being the car park. He felt that the infrastructure around the existing Leisure Centre car park should be improved before considering any extra parking at Fisherman's car park. He supported the idea of the site being improved from an ecological point of view.

A Councillor commented that she would prefer to see one car park at the site, not two. She would like to see the Environment Agency report before making any decisions about this application. She would also like to see a dedicated cycle

route through the site, as opposed to a shared pathway. She felt that the issue of litter has not been addressed, which was part of the Committee's holding objection. Despite these concerns, she felt that the application is heading in the right direction.

A Councillor commented that expert advice on pollution is needed to build confidence around the contamination issue. She would prefer the Northern site of the car park to be extended so that the Southern area could be part of the nature reserve, making it bigger. She felt that the pathway should be a shared space, not a dedicated cycle way. Overall, she felt progress is being made but she would welcome another conversation about the car park.

A Ward Councillor noted that no residents have contacted him with any concerns about the application. He believes there is room for improvement at the site, especially when compared to other similar projects such as those in Leamington Spa. He noted car parking will always be an issue and that, perhaps, there needs to be a compromise, potentially using the Leisure Centre car park.

A Councillor noted that potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists on a share pathway would depend on the width of the footpath.

A Councillor suggested extending the Holding Objection to allow the Town Council to discuss the car parking issue further, since most of the other issues have been resolved. The car park cannot be closed but the size of the car park is one of the biggest issues with local residents.

The Planning Consultant noted that, while he had listened to the debate about the car park, the Town Council should focus on what the planning issues are here. He noted that people visiting Stratford from the North use the Fisherman's car park and walk into the town; they are not adding to the town's congestion. Therefore, there might be some benefit in extending the car park. Unless there is a highway safety issue associated with the application, he could not see what the planning issue might be.

A Councillor responded that the planning issue would be that the site is listed as a Local green space in the Neighbourhood Plan.

A Councillor commented that this proposal is a massive investment into the town and he did not see any planning reasons to object to the application.

A Councillor noted the car parking issue related to the increased number of people using it. He would like to know what Highways' view is since the original application was withdrawn before they were able to respond.

It was noted that Highways do not appear to have commented on the current application.

It was PROPOSED, SECONDED AND AGREED by a majority vote to return a Holding Objection to the revised scheme with the following comment:

The Town Council previously supported the principle of the development but raised concerns over the dual use of recreation and nature conservation.

Having listed to the arguments now put forward in respect of the ability to create nature conservation areas with active uses/public access on the edge of settlement locations, the Town Council understands this could be achieved but still has some reservations about how this will be achieved in reality, particularly given the increased use and popularity this project will bring.

The Town Council is still concerned about the implications of the proposed car park extension and its effect on the designed Local Green Space, Local Wildlife site and River Avon corridor and therefore a Holding Objection is still raised.

Any approval must properly address contamination issues within the site in close discussion/consultation with Environmental Health officers.

If a car park extension is approved, the Town Council would support the phasing of the extension with only one of the proposed areas being brought forward first, whilst, at the same time, improvements made to the existing Leisure Centre car park (including signage) which may negate the need for car park extensions on the site.

Any approval should be subject to the Environment Agency support.

A clear cycle strategy needs to be provided to ensure there is no conflict with pedestrians using the paths.

Litter bins must be provided and emptied regularly.

21/02447/FUL 1 Arden Street - Construction of new Private Rented Sector apartment building to incorporate 18 no. apartments and ground floor commercial space.

The Chair noted that the Councillors for this Ward (Clopton) are Cllrs How and Fotjik.

The Planning Consultant made a short presentation on the application, noting that had originally been approved in October 2017 when the Planning Committee commented No Reps. The 2017 application related to the demolition of the former nightclub on the site which was to be replaced with 9 apartments, ground floor office space and a bin store to the rear. The current application relates to the construction of a new private rented sector apartment building to incorporate 18 apartments and ground floor commercial space. The new development would consist of 16 1-bed and 2 2-bed apartments, would be higher than the previous application and extend further out to the back. The overall appearance would be very similar to the approved version.

Points of clarification

A Councillor asked if there are any guidelines around the minimum size of apartments, given that this application is likely to consist of several small dwellings. The Planning Consultant advised that planning applications can be refused if the proposed accommodation is too small. The Planning Committee can flag that this development must comply with national minimal space standards.

A Councillor asked how many parking spaces will be provided. The Planning Consultant advised that there will be three spaces on site. These are shown as electric pool cars on the plan, which are understood to be Smart cars. The Councillor noted that the new development seems to be very high (consisting of three and four storeys), when the neighbouring property is only two storeys.

A Councillor agreed that the proposed development seems to be very intrusive. He noted that this site is in a very strategic position, being part of the gateway into the town and there are plans to develop this gateway. He asked if there would be a valid planning reason to object if it was felt this development would compromise the gateway project. The Planning Consultant advised that, given the extant planning approval, the Committee would need to focus on the changes that are being proposed, including the increased height of the building and the more intensive use of the site.

It was noted that deliveries will not come onto the site.

A Councillor asked if there will be a requirement for affordable housing given 18 apartments are now being proposed. The Planning Consultant advised that this would be the case and might be achieved onsite or via a contribution; it would be subject to a section 106 agreement.

A Councillor expressed concern about the height of the new proposal and asked if there is anything in the Neighbourhood Plan that considers the height of buildings in the town centre. The Planning Consultant advised that concerns about the height of this proposal could be raised in the Committee's response to this application.

A Councillor asked if the ground floor would include retail units. The Planning Consultant advised that the application refers to commercial use and it would depend on the letting agents as to how the space was used e.g. it may be used as office space. The Councillor asked if Highways have expressed a view on this application. The Planning Consultant noted that they did not object to the 2017 application and no response has been received to the current application so far.

There being no speakers, the Committee went into debate.

Councillors agreed that this application represents overdevelopment of the site.

It was PROPOSED, SECONDED AND AGREED unanimously agreed to Object to the revised scheme with the following comment:

The Town Council objects to the proposed development on the grounds that the increased mass, bulk and height proposed, over and above the extant planning permission would cause a serious detrimental impact on the adjoining private residential properties by way of overbearing effect and loss of daylight. This would represent a clear overdevelopment of the site.

85. To note action of the Town Clerk after consultation with the Chairman (or their substitutes) and Avon Planning Services on 13 October 2021.

Application No Site Proposed Development

1	21/00687/FUL	Bell Inn, Shottery (Shottery)	AMENDED – The proposed plan has been updated to re-site the proposed pergola; the plan also indicates revised boundary treatments the description of development has been updated to reflect the most up to date plan. The patio area extension has been removed from the description of development as it is considered to be permitted development (as indicated on updated drawing J803-11 B.
2	21/02938/TREE	1 Tanworth Court, 26 Elgin Gardens (Tiddington)	T1 – Silver Birch – Fell. T2 – Lime – Crown lift to 0.5m. T3 – Lime - Crown lift to 2.5m.
3	21/01271/FUL	Unit 25, Bell Court (Guildhall)	AMENDED – Amended plans received.
4	21/02953/TREE	The Limes, Loxley Road (Tiddington)	T1 – Ash – Fell.
5	21/02851/VARY	3 Chesterton Drive (Bridgetown)	Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 21/00046/FUL, to vary the approved plans to include a larger single storey rear extension and inclusion of roof lights in that extension and in the side roof slope of the approved two storey side extension.
6	21/03082/TREE	43 Albany Road (Guildhall)	T1 – Lime – Re-pollard crown to top of trunk and original pollard points. T2 – Rowan – Reduce height from 8.5 metres to 6 metres and reshape crown. T3 – Holly – Fell. T4 – Conifer – Fell.
7	21/03002/FUL	29 Sanctus Road (Shottery)	Proposed single storey rear/side extension, dormer window to facilitate loft conversion and enlarged basement window.
8	21/03005/FUL	35 Bordon Place (Shottery)	Construction of a single storey rear extension to create an enlarged kitchen, sitting and dining space.
9	21/02431/FUL	The Close, Flat 9, Saffron Meadow (Guildhall)	AMENDED – The red line on the location plan has been extended and additional notices have been served. The application has therefore been re-validated.
10	21/02958/FUL	124 Loxley Road (Tiddington)	Exterior Alterations, including windows, rendering and timber cladding. Erection of an attic room over existing ground

			floor, partial garage conversion and pitch roof over and erection of a garden outbuilding.
11	21/03055/TREE	The Fold, Flat 10, Payton Street (Welcombe)	T1 – Apple – Reduce by approx. 3 metres to just above the old pollard point, pruning to growth and shaping to suit the space.
12	21/02992/FUL	73 Loxley Road (Tiddington)	Revision to approved scheme 20/02613/FUL – Side/Rear extensions, re rendering, over skinning existing facing brickwork, replacement windows, replace existing roof tiles, addition of a flat roof dormers to the rear with two small balcony areas and general updating and modernisation. Enlarge the existing off road parking area to enable three vehicles to be parked off road. Replacement low level wall to the front boundary.
13	21/02447/FUL	1 Arden Street (Clopton)	Construction of new Private Rented Sector apartment building to incorporate 18 no. apartments and ground floor commercial space.
14	21/03126/FUL	Land Known As "The Lench Meadows", Warwick Road (Welcombe)	Change of use of land to form an increased area of public open space and works to include extension to Fisherman's car park and associated access improvements, pedestrian/cycle paths, ponds, earthworks, riverbank regrading, shelters and other structures, platforms, boardwalks, and planting.
15	21/02961/ADV	Approved Drive Thru, Land Adjacent To, The Rosebird Centre, Shipston Road (Bridgetown)	Installation of 2 x internally illuminated fascia signs, 1 x internally illuminated height barrier, 1 x internally illuminated exit sign, 1 x internally illuminated triple menu sign and 1 x internally illuminated key seller sign.
16	21/03015/FUL	31 Brookvale Road (Guildhall)	Erection of ground floor porch extension and first floor extension to form fourth bedroom.
17	21/03011/FUL	21 Avenue Road (Welcombe)	Erection of a two-storey front extension, first floor side extension, single storey rear extension, new render, and windows.
18	21/02409/FUL	47 Evesham Road (Shottery)	AMENDED – Proposal Retrospective.
19	21/02555/FUL	27 Campbell Close (Shottery)	AMENDED – The eaves overhang on the proposed extension has been reduced. Elevations of the new garden walls and the proposed shed have been submitted.

20	21/03047/FUL	36 Oak Road, Tiddington (Tiddington)	Proposed replacement single storey rear extension and a converted loft with dormer extension.
21	21/02766/LBC	5 – 7 Wood Street (Guildhall)	Replace two dormers for two roof lights.
22	21/03056/TREE	The Fold, Payton Street (Welcombe)	T2 – Robinia – Reduce up to 4m in height and up to 3.5m from radius. T3 – Robinia – Fell. T4 – Multi stemmed Prunus – Reduce height by 2m and radius spread of branches overhanging parking area by a maximum of 2m. Sever Ivy. T5 – Mixed species bordering canal – Fell to near ground level.

1	21/03113/TREE	63 Albany Road (Guildhall)	T1 – Sycamore – Reduce crown from approximately 16.5metres in height and 7.5 – 9 metres spread, by 30%.
2	21/03046/FUL	Hillside, Warwick Road (Welcombe)	Demolition of existing rear element and erection of part 2-storey & part single-storey rear extension with roof terrace.
3	21/03161/LBC	19 High Street (Guildhall)	Repairs to two purlins with steel.
4	21/03068/VARY	195 Loxley Road (Tiddington)	Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 20/03617/FUL to build a larger first floor bedroom extension onto the western elevation with dormers front and rear. Amended front porch design.
5	21/02995/TPO	Alveston Leys Nursing Home, Kissing Tree Lane, Alveston (Tiddington)	T1, T2 and T3 (AR000111,112 and 114 on the plan) – Lime – Remove epicormic growth to crown break.
6	21/01751/FUL	6 Sequoia Mews, Shipston Road (Bridgetown)	To install a Velux window in the tiled roof.
7	21/01521/FUL	18 Byron Road (Bridgetown)	Single storey extension to the rear of the property.
8	21/03160/TREE	5 Warwick Crescent (Welcombe)	T1 – Apple – Fell.
9a	21/02987/LBC	The White Swan, Rother Street (Clopton)	Installation of glazed roof sections between buildings to create covered area.
9b	21/02986/FUL	The White Swan, Rother Street (Clopton)	Installation of glazed roof sections between buildings to create covered area.
10	21/03240/TREE	Alveston Leys Nursing Home, Kissing Tree Lane, Alveston (Tiddington)	T1 – False Acacia – Reduce crown from 14 metres to 11 metres and shape. T2 – Sycamore – Fell. T3 – Lebanese Cedar – Install cable brace.

11	21/02511/FUL	3 The Willows (Guildhall)	AMENDED – The proposed extensions have been reduced to omit overbearing impact to neighbours and design is subservient.
12	21/02779/FUL	2 Martin Close (Clopton)	Replace existing fence and move to give more rear garden space.
13	21/02936/TREE	3 Avenue Road (Welcombe)	T1 – Prunus – Fell. T2 – Maple – Thin 10%, deadwood, lift highlighted branches and reduce back to clear property by 2.5 metres.
14	21/03204/FUL	22 Trevelyan Crescent (Bishopton)	Construction of a single storey rear and side extension & internal alterations.
15	21/02117/FUL	12 Halford Road (Shotton)	AMENDED – Proposed extension set back and removal of canopy link.
16	21/02729/FUL	Unit 10, Drayton Manor Farm, Alcester Road (Hathaway)	AMENDED – 7192-TB-201-Rev-A Proposed Site Plan (A3) has been received which updates and clarifies parking arrangements.
17	21/03038/TREE	16 Avenue Road (Welcombe)	T1 – Beech – Fell. T2 – Maple – Crown lift 2 metres above ground level and very light prune.
18	21/03112/FUL	1 Broadmeadow Lane (Bishopton)	Proposed single storey infill (first floor approved application 21/00754/FUL).

The actions were noted. The Chairman's Actions meeting was attended by Cllr I Fradgley on 13 October 2021. The Additional Chairman's Action remote meeting on 18 October 2021 was attended by Cllr I Fradgley and Cllr K Taylor.

The Planning Consultant left the meeting at 20.26

86. Street Trading and Licensing Applications

86.a Application for sale of alcohol at Aldi, Cannors Way, Stratford-upon-Avon, CV37 0BJ. Councillors raised no objection to this application.

There were no street trading applications pertinent to the Town Council.

87. Notices of decision

The Chairman noted that there had been 31 applications, of which 23 were granted where the Committee had responded 'No Reps'. One had been refused, which the Committee had supported (7 Benson Road). The decisions closely reflect those of the District Council.

88. Any Other Business

88.a to consider a response to the proposes stopping up of highway at Drayton Manor Drive, Stratford-upon-Avon, CV37 9RQ. There were no objections.

88.b To note street naming and number consultation process information. This was noted. The Chairman also commented that there had been a lot of discussion about street naming. A Councillor advised that the Committee has the

right to object to proposed name but not necessarily to say what the name should be unless approached to do so.

89. Chairman's Verbal Report

The Chairman advised that, at the District Council meeting on 18 October, there was a proposal to change the Scheme of Delegation in relation to planning decisions. The District Council have advised that they have found on several occasions that they could have recalled an application so that it would not need to go to committee if they had known certain information beforehand. When a decision is taken to committee, the officer must do a lot of work, and this is an attempt to cut this out. With the new approach, if the officers believe an application will be granted or objected to, they will put it to the Head of Planning and the Planning Committee, thereby butting out the work required to put it to the Committee. The Chair advised that, at the District Council meeting, he made the point that the Town Council doesn't often get into this situation because it has built up a relationship with the District Council Planning Officers and we communicate directly with them. An example of how this works in practice is subservience where the District Officers will contact an applicant to ask them to make something subservient it and the applicant does so, thus avoiding it having to go to Committee. It is hoped that the Town Council will not be affected too much by the change to the Scheme of Delegation.

90. Requests for Alterations of Recommendation

There were none.

91. To register, when necessary, a representative from the Planning Consultative Committee to virtually attend the Stratford District Council Planning Meeting on Wednesday 27 October 2021 and/or Wednesday 10 November 2021, if required.

The Chair advised that there is nothing for Stratford on this agenda and there were no details yet for the meeting on 10 November.

92. To appoint substitutes for the next Chairman's Actions on 03 November 2021.

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

The meeting closed at 20.36.

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 09 November 2021 at the Town Hall.

Signed:

Chairman of Planning Committee