



**NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF THE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR LAND ADJACENT TO EGREMONT HOUSE, EDMOND**  
**Planning Application Reference: TWC/2021/0599**

**Date:** Thursday, 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021 **Time:** 7.00pm

**Present:**

<b>Nick Combes</b>	<b>Jane Basley</b>	<b>Cllr S Bentley</b>
<b>Keith &amp; Sue Edwards</b>	<b>Cllr Y Brunger</b>	<b>Cllr K Arbuthnot</b>
<b>Pam</b>	<b>John Hill</b>	<b>Paula Doherty</b>
<b>Anne Furniss</b>	<b>Cllr A Wilson</b>	<b>Jack</b>
<b>Mike Turner</b>	<b>Ed Pugh</b>	<b>Rod Roman</b>
<b>Cllr G Jones</b>	<b>Cllr S Burrell</b>	<b>Sue</b>
<b>Chris Lord</b>	<b>Andy Hancox</b>	<b>User</b>
<b>Gav</b>	<b>Kerry</b>	<b>James</b>
<b>Bussey</b>		

**In Attendance** **Stuart Thomas, Berrys – representing the applicant**  
**Katrina Baker, Clerk to the Parish Council**

The meeting was held on zoom to enable all members of the community of Edgmond an opportunity to attend.

Councillor Allan Wilson, Chairman of the Parish Council, opened the meeting and thanked everyone for attending. Allan gave a short presentation, mentioning the commitment of the Parish Council to hold a public meeting whenever a significant planning application was submitted and this had been agreed at the time of the making of the Edgmond Neighbourhood Development Plan. This application is for 7 homes and associated garages and is within the Edgmond Conservation Area. This site is adjacent to Egremont House, a Grade II Listed Building. There had been previous applications for larger developments including more homes, but these had been refused by the Local Planning Authority.

The application has been submitted by Montague Property Group.

For clarification, what is the provision of garages?

ST There are only two garages on the site. No garages with the bungalows.

The Chairman invited questions from local residents and Stuart Thomas was asked to respond.

There was a clear view that Edgmond is a rural village in beautiful countryside and the TW Local Plan, Edgmond Neighbourhood Development Plan and the Conservation Area Management Plan all shared the view that this village should be protected from unacceptable over-development.

ST An ecological survey had been undertaken and accepted that this was agricultural land. However, they believe that it is a well thought through application. The

submission includes a tree survey and the design is such that it will enhance the natural environment.

The Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) is situated on the Shrewsbury Road Playing Field. Regulations state that any new development should not be within 30m of a MUGA – this development has included that a boundary is only 5 to 10m away from the MUGA. Residents commented that there is significant noise from the facility and the playing field, and whilst it is far enough away, it is not a concern, however if only 5 to 10m away, this would result in complaints.

ST A pre-application consultation took place and this was flagged up by the planning officer at the time, however Matt Thomas has now left the authority. Therefore we are looking to discuss this in further detail.

These proposals are contrary to the Local Plan and Edgmond Neighbourhood Development Plan. The community, and the applicant, must be aware of the history of applications on this site. What makes Berrys now think that this proposal is acceptable, when development has not been supported previously?

ST We have engaged with TWC through the pre-app process, we have sought their advice and this scheme has evolved from those conversations.

The three bungalows will be affordable and therefore a public benefit – this is in accordance with the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

It is clear on the plans submitted that the road layout could allow for a future application to come forward.

ST There are no proposals at this time. We are aware of the field access.

The Tree report included in the application is incorrect and has omitted important points including a 10' high Hornbeam hedge being described as Privet and a Rowan Tree totally missing. The location of these are significant, not only because of their importance to wildlife, but also in that they are close to the route of the proposed footpath and drainage system. Any development within 1m of these could cause significant damage – the roots of these should be protected.

The site is a wildlife corridor and this development will have a significant detrimental affect on ecology.

ST Apologies for the inaccurate tree report, this needs to be looked at and revised. We will pick up the issue of the path route. However, the Council has strict requirements and if they are minded to grant permission, they will look for details of a sustainable drainage system.

Will this system be for 7 properties, or will it be constructed for many more, bearing in mind future plans?

There was no response.

Concerns were raised about the private drive, currently serving three properties and owned / maintained by those three properties. For vehicles from an additional 7 properties to use the route, the owners may look for the drive to be adopted.

ST I would suggest that you think carefully about this. An adopted highway can be used by more vehicles, a private drive is limited. If you have concerns about a further future application for more housing, an adopted highway would support this.

Thinking about the affordable bungalows, there is mention of Wrekin Housing Group. How would this be guaranteed in the future or even guaranteed to be included as we know of many

applications where the actual finished design and provision differs greatly from the original planning consent.

ST This would be subject to a legal agreement. I can give an absolute commitment that the three designated affordable homes (bungalows) plus the four open market properties are what are intended. The applicant will enter into a legal agreement in perpetuity. This would remain in place even if the site is sold on.

We have seen many times that an approval changes over time and what is built does not resemble the original application.

ST This will be built in accordance with what is approved. It is a full application not an outline indicative proposal. The Council would approve it based on the plans submitted. However, I cannot give an absolute assurance that it wouldn't change in the future.

Once the principal of development is established, there will be less control of what happens on the adjacent land.

Do Berrys and the applicant actually know the current approach being taken by Wrekin Housing Group? They are selling off properties, including bungalows in rural areas. If these are then sold off, there would be no guarantee that they would remain affordable or available for local people in the future. This proposal is at odds with the WHG intent.

ST I have worked on both sides of the fence. I agree a lot of housing stock has been sold off. The Council can have greater control with legal agreements remaining tight, and rightly so, but I can't guarantee – nobody can guarantee anything these days. It may not be WHG, but it is WHG that have provided a letter of intent (available on the website).  
PTCs ask for bungalows, not many developers will offer them – especially for them to be affordable.

The Parish Council needs to ensure that the landowner has put into place other conditions before this application is considered. The Enforcement Team needs to act.

How does this application respect the Conservation Area? Where are the principles of the Conservation Area within this application? It is adjacent to Egremont House – a Grade II Listed Building – are there any assurances from the applicant that this application ends at these 7 properties?

ST Applications in Conservation Areas need to be considered carefully. The evolution of this scheme is evidenced through the Design and Access Statement. It is sensitively designed, we think well designed and respectful of the Conservation Area. Look at the lower density, green spaces, high quality design – in line with the Edmond Neighbourhood Development Plan.  
We are renowned for heritage, we have included a heritage impact assessment which gives detailed in depth analysis – both documents need to be read if you haven't already done so.

Whatever is proposed at this location will destroy the village, the High Street, affect Egremont House, spoil the view and will have a negative impact. The views will be lost forever. It would be tragic.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their comments, encouraged people to go on the TWC website and submit their own comments and thanked everyone for attending, especially Stuart Thomas – his attendance to answer questions had been appreciated.

Katrina Baker – Clerk – 01.07.21