

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held on **MONDAY 28<sup>th</sup> JULY 2014 at 7:00 pm in the Pump Rooms, off Teme Street, Tenbury Wells.**

**PRESENT:** Cllr E. Hudson (Chairman), Cllr M. Brennan (Deputy Chairman), Cllr S. Bowkett, Cllr S. Corfield, Cllr G. Price, Cllr J. Watson

**APOLOGIES:** Cllr J. da Costa, Cllr D. Ingram, The Mayor

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Town Clerk, Cllr M. Drummond, Cllr J. Morgan

**3.1 Apologies. To consider the acceptance of apologies for absence from Councillors**  
Apologies had been received from Cllr J. da Costa, Cllr D. Ingram and the Mayor

**RESOLVED** that apologies be accepted

**3.2 Declarations of Interest.**

None

**3.3 Public Participation**

None

**3.4 To approve as a true and accurate record the resolutions and Minutes of the previous meeting held on 30th June 2014.**

The minutes of the meeting, held on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014, were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record of proceedings.

**3.5 Planning Applications.**

3.5.1 **14/00736/HOU** - Two storey side extension to existing domestic dwelling  
2, Mile End Villa, Oldwood, Worcestershire, WR15 8TB

Members had no objection to the extension per se but were concerned by the proportion of the window on the ground floor of the front elevation and did not feel it was in keeping with the existing dwelling. They also felt that the proposed render finish was not in keeping with the building.

**RESOLVED** to respond with the following comments but give no recommendation for approval or refusal in the hope that planning officers might take some note of the comments made.

*There was no objection to an extension per se but Councillors wished to express their concern over the proportion of the window proposed for the front elevation of the extension and the exterior finish of the extension.*

*Councillors felt that the window should be in better proportion with and in the same orientation as the ground floor windows of the existing dwelling and that the extension should be finished in brick matching the existing dwelling since the lower roofline and stepped back footprint were sufficient to establish it as an extension to the original building.*

*Members hoped that MHDC Planning Officers would take these comments into account when reaching their decision.*

3.5.2 **14/00836/ADV** - Fascia sign & window vinyl

Sue Ryder Care, 16 Market Street, Tenbury Wells, Worcestershire, WR15 8BQ

Members had no objections.

**RESOLVED** to recommend approval

**3.6 Planning Appeals.**

DISMISSED - APP/J1860/A/14/2214582: 7 The Oaklands, WR15 8FB4

Cllr Watson reported that the fence posts had now been taken down from the site.

ALLOWED - APP/J1860/A/14/2212084: Brook House, Berrington, Tenbury Wells, WR15 8TJ

**3.7 Planning Decisions**

APPROVAL - 14/00569/LBC - To replace old and dilapidated bronze plaque with new blue plaque  
18 Teme Street, Tenbury Wells, Worcestershire, WR15 8BA

APPROVAL - 13/01225/HOU – Proposed internal and external alterations to existing residential development Brook House, Berrington, Worcestershire, WR15 8TH

REFUSAL - 13/01199/FUL – New stable block to replace existing and garages  
Brook House, Berrington, Worcestershire, WR15 8TH

### **3.8 To be updated on presentation re Neighbourhood Planning attended by Cllrs Bowkett and Hudson**

Cllr Hudson reported that he had attended the presentation along with Cllr Bowkett and the Clerk. He noted that the presentation was made by Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council who had completed their plan and were now awaiting the inspectors decision to have it made.

Cllr Hudson noted that the Chaddesley situation differed from Tenbury as follows:

- Chaddesley Corbett has a population of 1800 persons.
- It is entirely in the Green Belt, therefore protected from development.
- It had grants of £27,000.00 so could afford to pay consultants.
- It had support from WFDC with a dedicated planning officer to help.
- Eleven councillors of which seven stayed involved throughout the preparation of the plan.
- Only one potential development site in their area.

Cllr Bowkett said he felt that more plans would need to be looked at in order to make a proper decision on how much work would be involved.

Cllr Hudson said his principal concern would be the levels of commitment required because he doubted that enough of the Town Councillors would be prepared to be committed to such a lot of work.

Cllr Price felt serious support from MHDC would be necessary or funding to employ expert help in preparing a plan. Without a guarantee of such help and advice there is no way this council can expect to complete a plan.

Cllr Bowkett felt it would be far harder for Tenbury in comparison to Chaddesley Corbett as it was so much more complicated.

Cllr Watson said it was a Catch 22 situation as Tenbury really does need a plan but it would be difficult to take on this amount of work.

Councillors were also worried that as the SWDP was still not in place the neighbourhood plan, which must be based on its policies, would be difficult to get off the ground.

The Clerk reminded Members through the Chair that the Council had resolved to prepare a neighbourhood plan and that if members were now having second thoughts this must be seriously considered and the decision reversed in need be. If a plan was to be made it would be better to start the actual work than to repeatedly discuss how difficult it might be.

Members agreed they in principal acknowledged that a plan was needed but they needed to find out what help is available. The Clerk reminded members that the published guidelines and information available from MHDC had been circulated.

Members wished to be quite clear on what practical assistance would be provided by MHDC planners in preparation of a plan. They felt that when this was discussed at Full Council it would also be necessary to gain a clear statement of commitment from Town Councillors willing to be actively involved in all aspects of plan preparation before deciding whether to proceed.

**RESOLVED** that the Clerk request further clarification from MHDC on what practical assistance they would offer to assist with neighbourhood planning. Definite commitment and support for preparation of a plan to then be considered by Full Council in September.

### **3.9 To consider Town Council response to WCC Statement of Community involvement consultation**

Members noted the information received but felt there would be no material change to current practices and they therefore had no comment to make.

### **3.10 To consider Town Council response to WCC Minerals Local Plan: Call for Sites – Preferred locations for aggregate extraction in Worcestershire.**

Members noted the information received but felt there were no suitable sites in Tenbury due to the underlying features and they therefore had no comment to make.

**3.11 Correspondence.**

None

**3.12 Councillors' reports and items for future agenda**

Cllr Watson – Concerned at the signage at the Round Market and the general look of the building. Should there be advertising consent?

Meeting closed at 7:55pm

Signed .....

Date .....