

TENBURY TOWN COUNCIL 2013/14 – XTC15

Minutes of the **Extraordinary** meeting of **TENBURY TOWN COUNCIL** held on **THURSDAY 20th March 2014 at 6.00pm in the Pump Rooms, off Teme Street, Tenbury Wells.**

PRESENT: Mayor Cllr G. Price, Cllrs M. Drummond, J. da Costa, J. Fielder, E. Hudson, D. Ingram, J. Morgan, J. Watson

IN ATTENDANCE: Town Clerk, 3 Members of the Public

APOLOGIES: Deputy Mayor Cllr M. Willis, Cllr M. Brennan, Cllr S. Corfield, Cllr E. Weston

ABSENT: Cllr S. Bowkett

15.1 Apologies. To consider the acceptance of apologies for absence from Councillors.

Apologies had been received from Cllrs Brennan, Corfield and Willis and Weston

RESOLVED that apologies be accepted.

15.2 Declarations of Interest.

None

15.3 Planning Applications.

10.4.1 **14/00006/REM** - Application for the approval of Reserved Matters for Appearance, Layout and Scale for 43 dwellings, public open space together with associated works and parking following approval of Outline application 12/00659/OUT
Land At Oldwood Road, Tenbury Wells, Worcestershire

Cllrs expressed their disappointment that many of the points made by the Town Council when initially consulted on this application had not been addressed in the new submission.

Members were also disappointed to hear that District Representatives did not feel this application should be brought to committee and were likely to recommend a delegated decision despite express request from Council to go to NADC so that Council could make a statement. Councillors were aggrieved that when they were consulted and took the time to carefully consider applications with the benefit of local knowledge their comments appeared to be ignored. The felt this was not how the system was meant to work.

Cllrs felt that all previous comments should be resubmitted but with note of further concerns regarding:-

Visual Impact relating to the 3 storey height of plots 3, 14, 16, 18, 25, 27, 41 and 43 and the stark gable of Plot 1 which will be the main aspect of the site approaching from Oldwood Common. The new layout also sited plots 30-33, 34 & 35 much too close to the site boundary. There were also concerns at the revised road layout by plots 9 & 10 which appeared to suggest plans for further site expansion.

Surface Drainage - notwithstanding comments from SWLDP it will be MHDC that this Council and local residents will hold responsible for any future flooding caused by this development.

Doubt for maintenance of stream. Someone must be responsible for deciding and enforcing this?

Will SUDS upkeep be taken on by the developer. Safety hazard when the SUDS is full?

Reiterate that not convinced that enough consideration given to avoid exacerbation of any flood risk to areas lower than the development.

Not satisfied that no one appears to be solely responsible for these drainage issues and that MHDC planners must have some powers and take responsibility. The resolution of this matter should be a condition of any approval.

RESOLVED that revised original comments be resubmitted (as attached) requesting that no decision is made until these concerns have been considered and answered and that the Council would welcome the opportunity to speak on the matter at an NADC meeting. The response to be copied to district District Representatives with an expression of dissatisfaction that they had not wished to heed request to go to NADC thereby denying TTC the opportunity to speak on this matter and a further request for this application to be called to committee.

10.4.2 **14/00035/OUT** - Outline application with all matters reserved except for access. Development of land for up to 33 dwellings (13 affordable), access roads, footpaths, garages and public open space. Land South of Morningside with access from Oldwood Road, Tenbury Wells, Worcestershire

Councillors noted that this site was not included in the South Worcestershire Development Plan and that were the plan in place this would be reason enough to recommend refusal.

There remained a concern over the current draft status of the plan and previous Planning Inspectorate disregard for its contents. Members noted recent Ministerial statements by Nick Boles MP suggested that emerging plans were to be given more weight and that as the SWDP got further through the acceptance process it should have also carry more weight with any planning inspector who might become involved.

It was felt that the main objection to this application should be that it was not a designated site but that further concerns about the proposed layout should also be noted so that they could be demonstrated to have been concerns from the outset should this matter come to appeal.

- Serious concerns about junction with Oldwood Road due to significant increase in traffic from this new development.
- Concern over single access to the site creating a very long cul de sac with no other access for emergency vehicles.
- Concern over the steepness of the access road down into the valley and up into site.
- Concern over risk to this access road if brook is affected by flash flooding as has been the case in the past.
- Concern on the impact of the site discharge to the watercourse and potential for flooding of surrounding residential areas.
- Concern that ongoing responsibility for the proposed SUDs should be clearly agreed prior to any development.
- Concern as to safety of the proposed SUDs when full. How would any risk of drowning be addressed?
- Archaeological survey of the site should be required.

RESOLVED to recommend refusal as the site is not included in the South Worcestershire Development Plan with concerns noted (as attached).

Meeting closed at 7:10 pm

Signed

Date

TTC COMMENTS 14/00006/REM – Re-consultation

Tenbury Town Council wish it to be noted that they are extremely disappointed that the majority of their original comments made on this application remain un-addressed.

All of the previous comments should be taken into account but particular attention should be paid to comments in bold type. The Town Council would also appreciate the opportunity to speak on these matters and request that this application be considered by the Northern Area Development Committee and not treated as a delegated matter.

VISUAL IMPACT

The redesign of the site does not address the following issues at all and the new layout raises some further concerns.

- **The 3 storey height of Plots 3, 14, 16, 18, 25, 27, 41 and 43 is of concern as they are the predominant design on the site and will have a serious effect on the visual impact of the site when viewed from the other side of the valley. The elevation to open space still does not adequately visualise the site as it rises up the side of the valley. Truly representative visuals of the whole site layout elevations or sectional drawings should be provided to correctly assess this impact. Given that there are now proposals for further houses on the other side of the valley this visual impact is of far greater concern. This must be addressed.**
- **The position and orientation of Plot 1 has not been altered and remains a concern because it will present a very stark brick gable wall as the first main vista of the site when viewed approaching from the Southwest down Oldwood Road. The wing projecting towards the road will form an intrusive visual pinch point on this approach to Tenbury. This stark elevation is also adjacent to the nearest neighbouring property and very close to the road and site boundary. The elevation should be reconsidered and the building re-sited further back into the plot to be more in keeping with the development line of adjacent existing properties.**
- **The new layout of plots 30 to 33, 34 and 35 brings the buildings very close to the site boundary close to the junction with Mount Orchard. The properties are too close to the site boundary. They will be visually intrusive and may hinder visibility for vehicles on this downhill section of Oldwood Rd.**
- **Councillors also raised concerns regarding the position of the new access road by plots 9 & 10 which appear to suggest scope for extension of development boundaries which would be outside of the emerging SWDP development boundary.**

SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE

Further details of a proposed attenuation basin have now been provided raising further concerns particularly with regard to long term responsibility for the proposed SUDs and the watercourse into which it will discharge. The Town Council believe that there must be complete clarity on responsibility in this matter before any decision can be made.

- **The various expert opinions submitted on this matter are addressed as separate areas of interest, e.g. Highways, Severn Trent, SWLDP and EA. The cumulative effect of the various strands of flooding assessment should be considered so that areas adjacent to the site are not disadvantaged.**
- **The NPPF approach, that the development should be no worse than a Greenfield site, is not good enough when there is a known history of flooding from this site. As the planning authority the Town Council expect that MHDC should not merely accept the comments of individual consultees but assess what the total impact is likely to be.**
- **The Council feels that the responsibility for ensuring this is done must lie at development stage with the planning authority and wishes it to be noted that it expects Malvern Hills District Council to carry out this duty with due diligence.**

FOUL WATER DRAINAGE - Clarification still awaited

- The Council is aware that there have been issues with the discharge of sewerage from another site nearby and would like to be reassured that foul drainage provision is adequate for the site and will not have any detrimental impact upon sewers in any other part of the town. No details of proposed foul drainage for the site have been given and more detailed information should be provided prior to any decision being made.

SOLAR PANELS – Clarification still awaited

- Councillors wished for clarification as to whether solar panels were to be installed on these dwellings. This information should be provided prior to any decision being made.

ACCESS – this aspect appears to have been given no further consideration. From local knowledge Councillors are sure that the site road layout will have great impact on main road users on this downhill bend particularly at night. This should be reconsidered.

- The access roads to plots 1, 2, 3 and 38, 39, 40, 41 & 43 are directly adjacent to the main road separated only by a small hedge. This will create a dual carriage way effect on this section of road which is downhill and on a bend. This is felt to be unsafe and should be reconsidered.

DESIGN ASPECTS

- The mix of brown tile or grey tile/slate roofing materials is too random. More thought should be given to this element of the design.
- The only variety in materials is in the roof treatment – otherwise the development has a very homogenous look which is not in keeping with the surroundings and requires more thought.

LANDSCAPING

- The landscaping treatment to the South West boundary remains inadequate given the proximity of neighbouring properties and open countryside and should be reconsidered.

TTC COMMENTS - 14/00035/OUT

Tenbury Town Council recommend this application be REFUSED as it is not included as a development site in the South Worcestershire Development Plan.

The Town Council also wish these further concerns to be noted and feel they should be properly addressed prior to any decision being made.

- Serious concerns about junction with Oldwood Road due to significant increase in traffic from this new development.
- Concern over single access to the site creating a very long cul de sac with no other access for emergency vehicles.
- Concern over the steepness of the access road down into the valley and up into site.
- Concern over risk to this access road if brook is affected by flash flooding as has been the case in the past.
- Concern on the impact of the site discharge to the watercourse and potential for flooding of surrounding residential areas.
- Concern that ongoing responsibility for the proposed SUDs should be clearly agreed prior to any development.
- Concern as to safety of the proposed SUDs when full. How would any risk of drowning be addressed?
- Members also recommend that an Archaeological survey of the site should be required.