

A PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING OF ALCESTER TOWN COUNCIL WAS HELD AT 7.00PM ON TUESDAY 27 MARCH 2012 AT GLOBE HOUSE, PRIORY ROAD, ALCESTER (Seggs Lane entrance)

Present

Cllrs C Gough (Chair), L Cumberbatch, Y Hine, J Styles, C Neal-Sturgess, Y Morrison, J Bunting, M Cargill, N Knapman, P Haggerty (Assistant Clerk), C Wright (Clerk).

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT DISCRETION OF CHAIR

Mr Andrew Mann gave his views on item 6 on the agenda.

1. Apologies

None received.

2. Declarations of Interest

None declared.

3. Minutes of Last Meeting

The minutes of Planning Committee meeting of Tuesday 13 March 2012 (circulated) were approved and signed.

4. Planning Applications

- a) 12/00636/FUL - Proposed replace existing conservatory with orangery at 12 Springfield Road for Mr & Mrs Leydon. No representations to make.
- b) 12/00416/VARY - Proposed removal of condition no. 2 of planning permission ref. 10/01851/FUL to allow hair salon to also provide manicures and pedicures at 46 Fairwater Crescent for Miss V Rippington. No representations to make.
- c) 12/00550/FUL - Proposed single storey annexe to side of dwelling at 10 Wain Close for Mr & Mrs Lomas. (*In Kinwarton parish but we have been consulted as a neighbouring parish*). - No representations to make.

5. Notice of Decision - Permission with conditions

- a) 12/00106/LBC & 12/00104/FUL - Erect hardwood conservatory to the rear of 11 Butter Street.
- b) 11/02711/FUL - Proposed change of use from offices to restaurant at 26 High Street.
- c) 12/00092/FUL - Erect single storey side extension and add front porch at 39 Newport Drive.
- d) 12/00161/FUL - Construct disabled ramp to access front of property at 2 Bridge End.

6. Response to Draft Core Strategy consultation

It was generally felt that the document was OK and the committee was in agreement with it.

Cllr Knapman registered concern about agreeing to the traffic management principle as it stands.

Cllr Neal Sturgess had picked up some further questions that related to Alcester and would forward these to councillors.

The Clerk, Assistant Clerk and the Chairman of the Planning Committee would take all the comments received and produce a draft document to cascade for further comments before sending to Stratford on Avon District Council. The draft document is set out below.

Q157 - Are the policy principles identified for the Alcester area appropriate? Should any of them be deleted? Are there any others that should be added?

Alcester Town Council are in agreement with the General Policy Principles, however it feels there are a few amendments that need to be addressed.

There is a feeling some of the statements are too specific and that under (a) Environmental Principles, bullet point 4, it should read "Assess the scope for introducing traffic management measures in the town." ie the words 'centre, particularly the High Street' should be deleted.

It was felt that there is a need for a Master Plan to be drawn up for Alcester to ensure a cohesive pattern of development.

Alcester has three Senior schools satisfying both the District and beyond with both established and expanding sixth forms, and two Junior and Infant schools with minimal space for expansion. It was therefore felt there is a necessity to develop a more robust and inclusive educational principle for the town.

Recreational facilities within the town are already below the necessary space and unable to cope with expansion. It was therefore felt that a principle calling for recreational facilities to be increased in line with development should be also included.

Q158 - Are the issues identified in the Future Development Strategy for the Alcester area appropriate?

Is the proposed scale of housing and employment development appropriate?

The Council felt that the Development Strategy did not adequately address transport issues in Alcester and traffic management around Alcester, and that these need to be addressed as a matter of urgency as new development will only exacerbate an existing problem.

It was also felt that development should be by balanced phasing e.g. employment facilities should precede major housing developments.

Q159 - Which of the potential locations identified on Plan 2 are suitable or unsuitable for development?

Are there any other potential locations that should be considered?

Location ① Concern over the size and location which does not allow for already planned access routes.

Location ⑤ should be reviewed to ensure orchard/eco site is not affected. Location nos. ③④⑤ should be part of a phased development.

Location ⑥ was thought to be unsuitable because of access problems and the contour of the land.

Location ⑦ needs clarification as to whether future development here relates to expansion of Alcester Academy.

A holistic approach should be taken to include public open space.

Q160 - Should consideration be given to amending the Green Belt boundary to provide scope for future development on the edge of Alcester?

Clarification is needed on what the green belt areas are. Should not town facilities such as play areas, allotments, green open spaces and ancient monument land be classed as Areas of Restraint rather than green belt. Concern was raised over the positioning and extent of Location 1 as detailed in Q159.

Response to other questions in relation to Alcester

Q17 - Do you consider that the water conservation policy is sufficient in requiring Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4? Yes.

Q18 - Do you consider that the policy contains sufficient measure to safeguard against flooding and adapts towards the impacts of climate change? If not, what changes do you think should be considered? Yes - in accord to PPS25.

Q19 - Are there any other points the draft policy should address? Section 7 District Designations: No.

Q40 - Is the principle of designating Areas of Restraint still justified? Yes.

Q41 - Are the existing Areas of Restraint as defined in the District Local Plan Review still appropriate? Yes.

Q42 - Should the boundary of any existing Area of Restraint be amended in any way? No.

Q93 - Do you agree with the estate sizes proposed? If not, what changes would you suggest? Should the District Council use this approach to protect the character of existing settlements? Developments should be holistic and based to accommodate associated infrastructure development.

7. Stratford Road Land

The Clerk would contact Morgan Sindall with instructions for the finish to the land.

8. Town Plan/Housing Needs Survey

Neighbourhood Plans would carry more weight than Town Plans, and one could be completed within a year, maybe sooner. The neighbouring Parishes need to come on board.

The Housing Needs Survey analysis was due in 3-4 weeks.

9. Correspondence

None received.

10. Propositions to a full Council meeting

None received.

11. Date and time of next meeting

Tuesday 10 April 2012 at 7.00pm