

STRATFORD-UPON-AVON TOWN COUNCIL

PLANNING CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

31 August 2021 at the Town Hall

Present

Cllr D Curtis	Cllr J Fradgley
Cllr Dyer	Cllr Jackson
Cllr W Dowling	Cllr Lee
Cllr I Fradgley	Cllr Taylor

Planning Consultant: Mr Neil Pearce, Avon Planning Services

Minutes Clerk: Margo Galvin

Speakers: Andrew.Winstone representing Bloor Homes and Gary.Stephens and George Smith representing Marrons Planning

Not present: Cllr V Alcock, Cllr J Fojtik

50. Apologies for Absence

None received.

51. Declarations of interest on items on the Agenda

There were none.

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

None were received.

53. To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate.

None were received.

54. Consultation Presentation on Pre-Planning Applications.

Land south of Rosebird Centre, Shipston Road (SHMA-ACTIVE.FID2924334)

Gary Stephens from Marrons Planning and Andrew Winstone from Bloor Homes were invited to make a presentation in relation to this proposed mixed-use development (residential and commercial).

The broad proposal is for c240 homes and 3 hectares of employment land. This land has been identified for proposed commercial use for buildings relocating from the canal side. Jewsons wish to relocate to new premises on Shipston

Road and this is driving the application. They want to stay in Stratford but do not want to invest in their existing site and wish to move out of the canal area. They do not want to use all the land, meaning this land could be made available to other operators who wish to relocate from the canal side.

Jewsons would like to remain south of the town as most of their customers are in this area. Locating their premises here would bring several benefits, including a reduction in HGV movements over Clopton Bridge (away from the town centre). There are potential recreational benefits as the proposed development extends to the old railway line, part of which could be re-opened to provide walkers with new routes to the open countryside.

Potentially 240 homes could be accommodated. Bloor Homes are policy-compliant in terms of providing affordable housing on the site.

The area to the south of the housing development would be the employment area, although it was noted that plans for this have not been worked up in detail.

Timing: on the basis that an application is submitted in the autumn, the development could start in summer 2022. If reserved matters and a more detailed application were submitted next year, work would start in 2023 and Jewsons would relocate in 2024; they understand there is a planning process to go through.

The developers have been involved in pre-planning discussions with the Highway Authority to assess the effects of the work going ahead. It has been concluded that there would be no severe implications; potential benefits were noted for moving HGVs away from Clopton Bridge.

The Chairman invited questions from the Committee.

A Councillor asked the developers for their thoughts around PVs and insulation. She noted that a large warehouse would have a huge roof and it would seem preferable to locate PVs on the rooftops rather than in fields. She also asked if the developers are aware of the cycle infrastructure that the County is bringing forward. Mr Winstone replied that at the Shottery site that they are proposing, PVs would go on the roofs. He noted that building regulations are changing to increase energy efficiency and PVs are on the agenda for the developer's housing and commercial buildings.

A Councillor commented that the information provided about commercial vehicle reduction was appreciated but he wondered how the developers would view a potential increase in cars travelling over the bridge, given all the new houses. Mr Stephens replied that the modelling exercise would have considered car traffic and where it might route to.

The Chairman asked if the developers had spoken to Highways about transport since 250 extra houses could create issues. Mr Stephens replied that they have been having ongoing discussions about access with Warwick County Highways for some months.

A Councillor noted that there has been a lot of discussion about the impact of the development at Long Marston and was surprised that Highways do not seem more concerned. His understanding is that Long Marston was at full capacity and this should be taken into consideration. There will be increasing pressure on traffic movement on the south side of the town and there isn't the infrastructure to cope with it. Congestion is a significant issue on Shipston Road. Mr Stephens replied that they have used the County Highways model and consultancy and discussions need to take place about the effects.

A Councillor asked for the developers' thoughts about other infrastructure support for the proposed development e.g. schools. Mr Stephens replied that education discussions have not progressed yet. There would be green infrastructure (open space) to the north of the development. They would need to have conversations with the Planners before the planning application is submitted.

A Councillor noted that, although there would potentially be fewer lorries, there would still be c240 houses and many Jewsons customers driving cars onto the site, meaning that traffic would increase, not decrease. This should be taken into consideration.

The Chairman asked if the commercial part of the site would include retail units. Mr Winstone replied that Jewsons will have a trade counter only. The draft policy talks about small business units being provided to accommodate smaller businesses.

A Councillor noted that if there were to be retail trading on this site, the town already has the Maybird Centre. This was intended to be a centre for the sale of white goods and DIY items but had become a shopping centre and was having a detrimental effect on the town centre. Mr Winstone noted that the site allocation plan is very specific about the uses of the land.

The Chairman noted that the developers had spoken about the housing mix and that the housing mix in the core strategy is for the district, not necessarily for the town. For the Stratford plan there is a much tighter process. He suggested the developers look at the Neighbourhood Plan as the Town Council, will insist that the planning application is within the boundaries. Mr Winstone confirmed they are aware of this.

The Chairman noted that both Bridgetown School and Alveston School are full. Therefore, primary school children from the proposed development will have to go elsewhere, school journeys would not be local, and traffic would increase. Medical care would be another issue. The town has three surgeries (down from four) which are all stretched. Consideration should be given as to how people moving onto the development would get medical care.

The Chairman asked if each house with its own driveway would have an electric vehicle charging point and what open space provision had been made for young people, such as playing fields. Mr Winstone replied there will be charging points and public open space, including play areas. There is no provision for onsite sports pitches, but it is thought the developers could provide 1.8 hectares of open space. They would expect to pay a contribution elsewhere.

A Councillor noted that sport is an afterthought on new developments.

The speakers were thanked for their presentation and the Chairman noted the committee would expect to see them again in late autumn when they would be welcome to make a more formal presentation.

55. 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.

56. To approve the draft Open Minutes of the Planning Consultative Committee Meeting held on 03 August 2021.

The Minutes of the Planning Consultative Committee meeting held on 03 August 2021 were approved as a correct record. The Chairman requested that the Chairman's electronic signature be added to the minutes by the Clerk.

57. Town Clerk's Open Report

List of planning applications deferred from Chairman's Actions meeting on 25 August 2021 April 2021 with any additional items deferred from Chairman's Actions meeting on 30 August 2021.

The Chairman noted that planning applications 21/02176/FUL and 21/02279/FUL had been deferred from the Chairman's Action meeting.

57.1a - 21/02176/FUL Crown Buildings, Alcester Road – demolition of existing buildings and erection of 57 one- and two-bedroom retirement living accommodation apartments (Class C3) to include associated amenity space, landscaping, drainage, parking and access and all other associated works.

The Planning Consultant noted that a pre-application presentation for this McCarthy Stone retirement apartment scheme been made to the Planning Committee at the Planning consultation meeting held via Zoom on 22 June 2021.

The application relates to three and four-storey properties to be built on the former Job Centre site near Morrisons, providing 34 one-bed and 23 two-bed apartments. There are 47 parking spaces, which falls below the County Council standards of one space per unit. However, this should be weighed against the fact that not all residents may want to have cars. He noted that the developers had suggested residents could use the Morrisons car park as an overflow.

The Planning Consultant noted that McCarthy Stone do not provide affordable housing and that the company has stated that it will lose £2000 through this development and will, therefore, not be making a financial contribution to affordable housing elsewhere. The Planning Consultant noted that this needs scrutinising.

The Planning Consultant commented that these types of properties should be situated in sustainable locations; this one is next to the train station, on a bus route and within walking distance of the town centre. He noted that this site is an employment site and that there is a requirement for a marketing exercise to be carried out to ensure there is no need for employment use.

Need and Health: It was noted that this is not a care home but that residents would be able to buy in care packages. The developers had not explained whether this development is needed. Stratford is the main town within the district and it has a role to play in supporting its local residents. People would move to the town to be in a sustainable location. In terms of Health, an aging population in the town would place extra strain on the three surgeries and the submission is light on how it would deal with this.

The Chairman invited committee members to raise any Points of Clarification.

The Planning Consultant confirmed that the maximum height would be four storeys, like the apartments in the Arden Quarter.

The Planning Consultant advised that a RICS surveyor would need to review the financial data provided in the unredacted report included as part of this submission. The District Council should ensure that the financial viability of the scheme is scrutinised by an independent expert. It may be that the developers can afford to provide the affordable housing.

A Councillor noted that parking could become a major issue once all the units are sold and residents' visitors come onto site.

A Councillor asked if the parking allocation includes spaces for staff. The Planning Consultant confirmed that the 47 spaces will include parking for staff and visitors; four disabled parking spaces have been allocated. There is no indication of charging points for electric vehicles; this should be raised with the developers.

A Councillor asked if there are any details about access from the apartments to the town. The Planning Consultant replied that access would be via the existing footpath; no improvements have been suggested in the submission.

A Councillor asked if the scheme requires any trees to be felled. The Planning Consultant could not confirm this but felt that this would probably be the case; it may not have a significant impact. There are no TPOs on the site. The Councillor asked if trees can be planted elsewhere and the Consultant replied that the plans suggest there will be planting on the site.

The Committee then went into debate.

A Councillor noted the following major concerns about this submission: there are already 13 similar developments in the town; the £88,000 requested by the CCG seems low given the impact this development will have on the town's medical

facilities; the developers are flagging a deficit before they have started on the project; with Stratford being the main local town there is the potential for elderly people to move into the town who have not lived here before and that the town's medical facilities would be unable to cope; there is no indication if a biodiversity offset audit will be implemented to ensure that landscaping work will offset the trees being felled; there is concern that the developers have redacted information concerning other parties who may have been interested in building on this land. The Councillor stated they would be more sympathetic to having housing on this land.

A Councillor expressed concern about the financial viability assessment and that the developers are not prepared to contribute anything to affordable housing. He agreed that the potential additional strain on health services was an issue. He also noted that no thought had been given to how residents would cross the road.

The Chairman noted that there are three McCarthy Stone developments in his ward and they are not full.

A Councillor asked how the viability of each site is assessed. The Planning Consultant advised that it is based on the existing land value and the uplift (the value post-development). This assessment will be based on the value of the land and the profit at the end. 20% is not unreasonable for a developer's profit.

A Councillor noted that the committee was vehemently opposed to placing increased pressure on the NHS. The CCG states that a contribution of £88,000 is needed. If McCarthy Stone cannot pay this amount, they should not be able to build on the site.

A Councillor noted that when the application was submitted for the Western Road, all the surgeries stated they were at full capacity, but the development still went ahead. In the past developers had been granted consent with conditions, but had later come back with variations of conditions and did not pay.

A Councillor stated that planning applications such as the current McCarthy Stone one should not be allowed if the medical services cannot be provided and the developer is not prepared to pay a contribution.

There was a unanimous objection to this application, with the following comment:

Need: The town has a significant number of existing developments of this nature. Occupancy will principally be from residents outside of the town which will place considerable strain on local health care provision. The 88k contribution sought from the CCG appears low. The evidence on need is generic and district-wide. No local data has been submitted in respect of the number of existing developments of this nature already in the town, their occupancy rates and the current local demand.

Viability: The VA assessment submitted is heavily redacted but the conclusion is that the development will make a loss and therefore no contributions can be

provided. This must be interrogated by an independent expert such as the district valuer before an agreement is reached on viability. The results of this exercise should be made public for reasons of transparency. The long-term profits from the scheme must factor into the viability of this development due to its nature.

Pedestrian links: The Town Council would like to know what improvements will be made to pedestrian routes into the town given the very congested nature of this route from the railway station.

Parking: The level of parking is low and does not meet adopted standards. The evidence submitted to justify this appears inadequate. Overspill into Morrisons car park is not a solution to the under-provision of parking on the application site.

57.1b 21/02279/FUL 24-26 Bridge Street – Conversion of the rear of the retail unit and upper parts to create nine residential apartments.

The Planning Consultant noted that the development will include nine cycle spaces, six car spaces, with stair/lift access to the residential area, and an extension to the back overlooking Guild Street.

Points of Clarification

A Councillor asked if the parking spaces are allocated to the flats. The Planning Consultant could not confirm how they are to be allocated. It could be just for the retail unit on the ground floor. He felt there would only be room for four parking spaces.

A Councillor asked if there would still be delivery access at the back for the retail unit. The Planning Consultant confirmed this and confirmed there would be enough room for waste collections.

The Chairman noted that the Planning Committee is starting to see more of this type of planning application coming through (ground floor for retail and accommodation above), the former Hotters site being an example.

This application was unanimously supported, with the comment:

The TC is supportive of the principle of this development in accordance with Policy TC7 of the NPD. Exceedance of minimum space standards is welcomed.

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

57.1c 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.

The Planning Consultant made a presentation on this application, noting that a holding objection had been registered at the Planning Committee meeting on 03 August 2021. The developers have now provided a vehicle tracking diagram to

show that refuse collection vehicles would be able to access the site and there would, therefore, be no need for a bin store. The developers had also provided a more detailed tree survey, confirming nine trees would be felled. They also confirmed that cladding to the houses does meet safety standards. The scheme includes ground source heat pumps. It was noted that the developers had not prepared a Net Biodiversity Gain report and no information had been provided about the public open space contribution. The Consultant noted that the developers had addressed some, but not all, of the concerns expressed by the Planning Committee previously.

The Committee then went into debate.

A Councillor stated that if nine trees are to be felled, more information should be provided around what will replace them. Also, more information about the Net Biodiversity Gain is needed.

A Councillor stated that air source heat pumps would be welcome and should be a condition of the application.

It was agreed that a holding objection to this application should be made, with the following comment:

The Town Council is grateful for the additional information submitted in respect of tracking diagrams, SUD's details and welcomes the use of air source heat pumps. However, with the removal of nine trees and a substantial reduction of two other groups of trees an assessment of the Net Biodiversity Gain must be completed. Given the Climate Emergency Declaration made by the TC and SDC, this is imperative. Can the application also please comment on the request for a POS contribution.

The Planning Consultant left the meeting at 20.05.

57.2. To note action of the Town Clerk after consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman (or their substitutes) and Avon Planning Services on 25 August 2021.

1	21/02256/FUL	34 Holbrook Road	Single storey rear extension
2	21/02064/LBC	19 – 20 Henley Street	The proposal is to reduce the height of the parapet wall (Retrospectively due to safety concerns), provide structural support and re-build it as it was existing
3	21/02396/FUL	6A Rowley Crescent (Welcombe)	Refurbishment and internal alterations to two storey dwelling. Demolition of existing garage and utility room area to be replaced with garage front extension and first floor side extension. Proposed single storey rear extension and portico to front door. New conservation rooflights to rear side of existing pitched roof. Replacement of glass house and timber shed.

4	21/02347/VARY	Langley Farm, Birmingham Road, Bishopston	Application Reference Number: 13/00030/FUL. Date of Decision: 05/04/2013 Condition Number(s): Revision to condition 2 Conditions(s) Removal: The building was set out in accordance with the drawings using the adjacent property as a datum. However, this is not in the location shown on the site Plan, putting the foundations in the wrong place on the site. To revise the consent to match the foundations.
5	21/02176/FUL	Crown Buildings, Alcester Road	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 57 1- and 2-bedroom retirement living accommodation apartments (Class C3) to include associated amenity space, landscaping, drainage, parking and access and all other associated works.
6	21/02392/FUL	37 Blue Cap Road	Demolition of garage and single storey side extension to no 37 Blue Cap Road and the erection of a detached dwelling.
7	21/02444/FUL	King Edward VI School, Chapel Lane	Replacement of existing ribbon windows and tile hanging with full height double-glazed windows to the north facing dormer of the sixth form common room building and replacement of the existing roof glazing system with new patent glazing, all associated with works to form an upgraded conference and teaching room
8	21/02380/VARY	Land Off, Seymour Road	Vary Condition 4 of application 20/02343/FUL, date of decision: 18/12/2020. (Original description of development: Erection of dwelling and all associated works) Variation to approved boundary treatment
9	21/01271/FUL	Unit 25, Bell Court	AMENDED – A plant noise report 29087/PNA1 by Hann Tucker Associates has been received.
10	21/02409/FUL	47 Evesham Road	Conversion of a garage and workshop into an annexe / home office. The asbestos roof has been replaced with a new tiled trussed roof to match the main house, the walls have been dry lined, and the floor and vaulted ceiling insulated. The garage door has been bricked up and a small window put in its place. The side door to the garage has been bricked up and the side door to the workshop replaced with new. The building remains the same size and all materials match existing.
11	21/02503/FUL.	73 St Mary's Road	Single storey side extensions
12	21/02427/FUL	11 Halford Road	Two storey rear and side extensions, single storey rear extension and porch
13	21/02430/FUL	13 Wellesbourne Grove	Demolition of single storey rear extensions. Erection of single storey rear extension.
14	21/02431/FUL	The Close, Flat 9, Saffron Meadow	Single storey access link to side elevation.
15	21/02584/TPO	1 Jupiter Road	T1 – Beech – Crown reduction 1 – 2 metres.
16	21/02458/FUL	Lowlands, 3 Alveston Lane, Alveston	Proposed alterations and extension.
17	21/02461/FUL	58 Shottery	Front elevation alterations to include new red cedar cladding and living wall including red cedar louvres porch. Replacement windows and doors to the property. New single storey fullwidth extension to the rear comprising a sedum roof. New brick pier gabion cage wall to the front boundary.

18	21/02530/FUL	Windsor Place, Windsor Street	Proposed resurfacing of vacant site to provide temporary (12 months) car parking facility and associated boundary wall/level works.
19	21/02300/FUL	2 West Green Drive	Single storey rear extension, single storey front extension to lounge. Loft conversion to include rear dormer and rooflights to the front.
20	21/02470/FUL	33 New Street	Single storey rear extension.
21	21/02471/FUL	50 Slingsgate Road	Erection of rear extension (resubmission of application Ref: 20/01858/FUL)
22	21/00986/FUL	37 Greenhill Street	AMENDED – Amended proposed plans including inclusion of alterations to rear dormer roof extensions, an additional second floor rear extension, changes to flat sizes, car parking and bin store.
23	21/02460/FUL	Church Farm Barn, Seven Meadows Road	Change of use of barn to single dwelling and associated development.
24	21/02279/FUL	24 – 26 Bridge Street	Conversion of the rear of the retail unit and upper parts, to create 9 no residential apartments
25	21/02492/FUL	19 Scholars Lane	Formation of habitable room in roof space with rear dormer.
26	21/02600/FUL	88 Banbury Road	First floor extension over kitchen to form bathrooms.
27	21/01697/FUL	Hylands House Warwick Road	Proposed second floor extension to create 5no. bedrooms all with ensembles.
28	21/02521/ ADV	Unit 9B Avenue Farm	1. Illuminated Triumph pylon sign 2. Triumph brand fascia panel with illuminated text 3. Triumph badge wall mounted with illuminated text 4. Triumph dealer fascia panel with illuminated text 5. Illuminated Honda brand logo 6. Honda word mark fascia with illuminated text 7. Illuminated wall mounted Honda brand logo 8. Illuminated dealer fascia panels 9. Honda welcome pylon (non illuminated) 10. Illuminated free standing Honda totem sign
29	21/02490/FUL	33 The Willows	Single storey side and rear extension and internal alterations
30	21/02342/FUL	78 Shipston Road	Proposed single storey rear extension
31	21/02203/ADV	10 Henley Street	Proposed Non-Illuminated traditional fascia sign Amended design submitted
32	21/02205/LBC	10 Henley Street	Installation of new traditionally manufactured fascia and projecting sign Amended design of the signage
33	21/02485/COUC	27 Greenhill Street	Prior notification of change of use of existing hair salon (Class A1) to restaurant (Class A3) and installation of associated works
34	21/02661/TREE	Willow Bank, Tiddington Road	T1 oak: Crown lift by 2-3metres, where extending over highway, pruning off laterals, as identified in submitted photographs. Remove deadwood
35	21/02645/ TEL 28	Cemetery, Evesham Road	Proposed installation comprises the removal and replacement of 1 no equipment cabinet together with the removal and replacement of development ancillary thereto
36	21/02661/TREE	Willow Bank, Tiddington Road	Proposed T1 oak: Crown lift by 2- 3metres, where extending over highway, pruning off laterals, as identified in submitted photographs. Remove deadwood.

37	21/02682/TREE	1 - 8 Tanworth Court, 26 Elgin Gardens	T1:Silver Birch-Crown reduction by 25% approx. 1-1.5metre to give more light and prevent future damage to property - T2:Lime-Crown reduction by 25% approx. 1-1.5metre to give more light and prevent future damage to property - T3:Lime-Crown reduction by 25% approx. 1-1.5metre to give more light and prevent future damage to property
38	21/01190/FUL	1 Poppy Close	Formation of habitable room in roof space with front and rear dormers and raised ridge line. Further Comments due 13.9.21 The application site area extended to include 3rd off road car parking space within the red line area
39	21/01916/LBC	4 Guild Street	Demolition of timber garage Building and replacement of Vehicular entrance gates Amendment: Conversion of outbuilding Removed from proposed development and plans
40	21/01915/FUL	4 Guild Street	Demolition of timber garage building and replacement of vehicular entrance gates Amendment: Conversion of outbuilding removed from proposed development and plans
41	21/02555/FUL	27 Campbell Close	Erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the property, replacement brick garden walls and replacement shed
42	21/02503/FUL	73 St Mary's Road	Single storey side extensions, render to property and grey windows Amendment: Description of development changed - addition of render to entire property and grey windows
43	21/02247/VARY	Land South of Alcester Road and North of Evesham Road, Shottery	Response from Bloor Homes following holding objection (also see Appendix 'A'): The immediate context to the Phase 1 site is mainly one of post-war, mid to late 20th century modern development, and some very recent new estate housing, which characterises this part of Shottery on the periphery of Stratford Upon Avon. In terms of architectural style the houses we are proposing to build on the site are a deliberate Comments due: evolution of the traditional English 'Arts and Crafts' style, comprising simple and honest buildings using good harmonious materials without unnecessary or superficial ornamentation. There are references to the 'Arts and Crafts' style in the designs and detailing of earlier 20th century properties nearby, eg. in Alcester Road and Hathaway Green Lane. We consider that the architectural style of our houses is appropriate to the site's context as described above, mindful also that there is no specific architectural preference for the site in the approved Design Code. The consistency of the architectural style across the house-type range is key to ensuring high quality development. The houses embody traditional building forms, reflecting the building typologies set out in the approved Design Code. The attached street scenes drawing shows a mix of housing characterised by a variety of building forms, materials and detailing which will be complemented by landscaping including street tree planting along the main spine road through the development. The external materials proposed include a range of brick types, some render and Tudor boarding, as well as brown and grey roof tiles of different profiles; all of which will contribute to variety and interest in the street scene. We confidently say that our proposals constitute - and will deliver - high quality, visually attractive development. Needless to say that commercially it is not in Bloor's interests to build anything

			other than attractive, sustainable places where people want to live. The context to the site is also shaped by the approved Phase 2 development for 391 dwellings which will be built to the same architectural style. Furthermore, 77 plots on Phase 1 are already approved in the same ('Classics') architectural style. The new NPPF is clear that design expectations (in terms of high quality, beautiful and sustainable places and buildings) should be rooted in Design Guides and Design Codes; these being recognised mechanisms for delivering those design objectives. This is a very important point - the house-types we are proposing in application no. 21/02247/VARY have already been approved by the District Council across Phase 2 and on 77 plots on Phase 1, all under the umbrella of the agreed Design Code for this sit
44	21/01103/FUL	14 Burford Road	Two storey rear and side extensions, single storey rear extension and new porch Amendment: The rear extension at first floor level has been reduced in size and the design has been altered. Annotations have also been added to the proposed elevations to confirm the proposed materials. The development description has been amended to reflect the addition of a porch

01	21/02565/FUL	2 Flax Furrow	Proposed single storey rear extension, garage conversion into home gym, material change to front and side elevations
02	21/00352/FUL	Le Bistro Pierre Swans Nest Hotel Swans Nest Lane	External alterations to improve outdoor customer seating areas, including decking, fixed seating booth, pergola and planters (Withdrawn)
03	21/00353/LBC	Le Bistro Pierre Swans Nest Hotel Swans Nest Lane	External alterations to improve outdoor customer seating areas, including decking, fixed seating booth, pergola and planters (Withdrawn)
04	21/02622/TREE	54 Maidenhead Road	T1: Laurel - Cut back branch overhanging neighbours boundary fence by approx. 3 metres.
05	21/01266/LBC	Tapestry Cottage 5 Tavern Lane	Replacement of existing doublegarage block with linking thatched extension, accessible outdoor swimming pool and Victorian greenhouse in the grounds of 5 Tavern Lane.
06	21/01265/FUL	Tapestry Cottage 5 Tavern Lane	Replacement of existing doublegarage block with linking thatched See item 5 above (Shottery) extension, accessible outdoor swimming pool and Victorian greenhouse in the grounds of 5 Tavern Lane.
07	21/02717/TREE	42 College Lane	T1 - Holly - Fell
08	21/02511/FUL	3 The Willows	Demolition of an existing garage block. Erection of front, rear and side extensions together with alterations to facilitate the works.
09	21/02592/FUL	Wellingtonia House Tiddington Road	Provision of new gates to frontage onto Tiddington Road, vehicular and pedestrian.
10	21/02610/FUL	30 Dale Avenue	Erection of a sliding entrance gate
11	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.

12	21/02628/FUL	88 St Marys Road	Proposed first floor extension to form 4th bedroom with en suite.
13	21/02697/TREE	85 Albany Road	A1 - acer - Reduce height and spread from 5metres to 4metres.
14	21/02394/FUL	The Meads 79 Tiddington Road	Erection of a greenhouse
15	21/02638/FUL	69 Banbury Road	Proposed single storey part rear extension
16	21/02707/TREE T1:	50 Maidenhead Road	Hornbeam - Lop back ten small branches by approximately 1- 2 metres of our neighbours tree to our boundary fence.

The actions were noted. The Chairman's Actions meeting was attended by Councillor I Fradgley on 25 August 2021. The Additional Chairman's remote meeting on 30 August 2021 was attended by Cllr I Fradgley and Cllr Dowling.

57.3 Street Trading and Licensing Applications

There were none.

57.4 Notices of decision

The Chair noted that the Planning committee continues to be in line with the District Council with its decisions. Of 37 applications made recently, 32 were granted, 3 were refused and approval was not required for the remaining 2.

57.5 Street Naming and Numbering – Request for Road Name: Development of Land adjacent to 201 Loxley Road, Stratford-upon-Avon: the name put forward is 'Mackenzie Close'.

It was noted that the proposed street name "Mackenzie Close" had been rejected by the local community in accordance with APPENDIX ONE of official guidance: 'Where unofficial marketing titles are used by developers in the sale of new properties', as the developer is Mackenzie Miller. It was also noted that the District Councillor had deemed "The Hoot" an acceptable alternative, all other suggestions being deemed unacceptable. However, the Planning Committee felt "The Hoot" does not fit in with other street names in the town and it is also not on the list of agreed names that the Committee has drawn up. "The Sett" was proposed as an alternative.

"The Sett" was supported with a majority vote.

The Chair asked the Committee Clerk to send the list of agreed names to all Councillors for reference.

58. Chairman's Verbal Report

The Chairman advised that a meeting had taken place on 25 August between the Planning Committee, Town Trust and SDC. The original intention had been to discuss the objections to the current Riverside project proposal. However, the proposal has since been withdrawn while SDC addresses concerns about land

contamination, so a wider conversation took place at the meeting. The Committee Clerk attended to take notes and these will be distributed shortly.

59. Requests for Alterations of Recommendation

Union Street: The Town Council had supported this on the basis that it related to building residential properties above shops. However, the Planning Officer had stated that this application cannot be supported because the layout upstairs does not fit the spatial requirement; there is insufficient space for five flats. It has been agreed that the TC will withdraw support on the basis that a proper scheme is submitted.

60. To register, when necessary, a representative from the Planning Consultative Committee to virtually attend the Stratford District Council Planning Meeting on Wednesday 01 September, 2021.

The Chairman noted that there is one item for Stratford on this agenda Application No. 20/02489/FUL - Riverside Caravan Park, Tiddington Road, Tiddington, and the TC has responded with "No Reps". The Chair will attend the meeting on the 1st but will not speak. It is not yet known what will be on the list for 15 September 2021. A decision on whether a representative is required at the latter will be taken when the agenda is published.

61. To appoint substitutes for the next Chairman's Actions on 22 September 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 20.16

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 28 September 2021 at 6.30pm at the Town Hall.

*Signed:
Chairman of Planning Committee*