

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING OF
RUSHWICK PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY 24th JUNE 2015

AT 7.30 PM AT THE VILLAGE HALL

PRESENT: - Cllr Deakin (Chairman), Cllr Parker, Cllr Wigglesworth and Cllr Rowley

IN ATTENDANCE: - 22 Members of the Public

1. Apologies: Cllrs Bennett, Haywood, Williams and Elcock (Personal) – accepted.
2. Declarations of interest in items on the agenda
 - (a) Declaration of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests - None
 - (b) Declaration of any Disclosable other – None

Please note Cllr Deakin had completed a dispensation as Treasurer of The Village Hall Committee to allow him both to participate and vote on the planning application 15/00504/OUT

The meeting was adjourned for Public Question Time, notes of which are appended to these minutes
--

3. The following planning application was discussed:-
Application No: 15/00504/OUT **AMENDED**
Proposal: Outline application, with all matters except for access reserved, for a residential development of up to 41 dwellings of which 40% are to be affordable dwellings, with associated new access and car parking, on site bio diversity and SUDS area, and an extension to the existing Village Hall site.
Location: Land off Bransford Road (west of Village Hall) Rushwick
Comments: Rushwick Parish Council refuses the planning application on the grounds:-
 - Better mix housing – support MHDC Housing Officers Reports
 - Refusal no determination on the footpath
 - To include support for Children Services Education to both pre-school and primary provision.
 - Seeks clarification in respect of offer of extension to the Village Hall car park being separate to any visitor parking on the development site.
 - To ensure in determining appropriate measures to deal with potential flood risk within the development site or to existing residential housing within the area.

Meeting closed at 8.28 pm
Sharon Baxter
Cerk

Signed..... Chairman.....Date

Standing Orders were adjourned for Public Question Time

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Abigail Tilling

We found out yesterday that our Planning Application will be heard at the Northern Area Development Management Committee Meeting on Wednesday, 1st July at 6pm. We have sent an information pack to all the District Councillors for their consideration and would ask for everyone to please attend this meeting to show the strength of feeling that there is in Rushwick.

Tony Young, the Planning Officer has submitted his report recommending that this Planning Application be granted but we would like the Parish Council to question how this recommendation can have been reached when there is still outstanding time for submission of comments (2 days – amended outline planning / 8 days – setting of listed building)

We have requested a 3 minute slot for Rushwick Action Group to comment and we would ask that someone from the Parish Council takes this opportunity to speak as well in opposition of the proposal.

Flood Risk Assessment- We ask that you question this. The fifth Flood Assessment has just been produced and the flood Risk assessment ‘Ping Pong’ has been laughable with BWB making changes every time John Scott and friends come up with more arguments. BWB are supposed to be the experts but have made all these changes and still have a get out clause ‘The study provides no guarantee against flooding of the study site or elsewhere, nor the absolute accuracy of water levels, flow rate and associated probabilities’. Surely the residents of Broadmore Green with 10 years+ of water problems do deserve a guarantee. Strangely enough on page 119 of the Planning Officers report 7.3 ‘positives’ shows ‘Surface Water Drainage betterment’ as giving moderate weight to the Planning Application.

Setting of Listed Building – The Willows (Grade 2 Listed) – We still have until 2nd July for comments to be received but the Planning Officer has already commented on page 119 7.7. ‘A limited impact upon the setting of a listed building may result from the delivery of the proposed development. It is considered however that the public benefits of the development would outweigh this impact’. ‘The officers consider that a low level of harm to the setting of Willow House may result from the proposed development. P119 7.4 ‘Negatives’ Impact on the setting of adjacent listed building – great weight / limited impact. Kay Poole the owner was made to jump through hoops when converting the property recently so how can the same council be so blasé when it comes to dumping a modern housing estate next door? We only have a small number of listed buildings in the Parish of Rushwick, should we have to accept any impact or harm to them? The Conservation Office Graham Tite states ‘Submissions have been received in which it is argued both for and against the view that this setting is adversely affected by the proposals and these must be actively considered in the light of local policy QL13 when the case reaches determination’

Amended Application for Outline Planning Permission - The proposal has now added in ‘which includes **increasing the size of the existing car park**’, and it states that they will deliver an extension to the car park as part of the housing scheme.

We would like Rushwick Parish Council to confirm that they do not feel this amendment to outline planning application makes the proposal more attractive in planning terms when set against the serious concerns raised both by the Parish Council and the residents of Rushwick, in respect of this planning proposal.

As an aside – on P120 of the Planning Officers report, on the recommendation to grant planning subject toTransfer of land to Rushwick Village Hall. I can see no mention anywhere of the offer of Car Parking. The proposal did also seem a little woolly as to whether the car park was for the sole use of the village hall or whether it was intended as ‘overflow parking for the site’. This is another issue as the Claphill Lane site has insufficient parking so people are parking along Claphill lane, so we are making the assumption that they will do the same along Bransford Road which is not acceptable.

Amended Application for Outline Planning Permission – The proposal has taken ‘**accept for access**’ out of ‘**with all matters reserved**’. That didn’t mean that much to me until a letter from Mr Rawle arrived on the website this week stating ‘In the present case the applicant does not wish at this stage to fix ‘accessibility’ within the site, because this would necessitate details of the internal route layout, which in turn would more or less fix the layout of the development (and of course this is a reserved matter), so only the point of access into the site is fixed at this point. That does seem rather sneaky to me at this late stage as effectively all the plans that we have seen showing internal road ways could change as nothing is now fixed so does that mean the housing plans will also change?’

Emerging South Worcester Development Plan –We have told that certain weight can be given to emerging plans so please re-iterate that this site is not in the SWDP.

Annetta Rodway

Concerns raised concerns with the soil survey and the penetration of water.
She also referred to the visual impact and the effect this would have on the landscape.

Chris Mawby

Highlighted the village would lose its identity and village status.

Hazel Richards

Raised concerns extra usage of the village hall should the development go ahead. She had concerns about the noise and the environmental impact which would have .

Carl Lancaster

Referred to a new planning application for 11 Grange Lane.
He was advised no formal planning application had been received from MHDC as yet.

Ivor Oddy

Raised concerns with speeding and that the main road would be used as a rat-run.
These concerns will be addressed to the County Councillor.

John Hussle

Highlighted the problems with motorists parking half on road and half on the pavement impeding pedestrians.
Speeding issues will be reported to the police.

Pete Rosford

Asked the question should outline planning application be passed would parishioners be able to some input to fine tune details in a full planning application?

Standing Orders were reimposed