 HIGHLEY PARISH COUNCIL

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Minutes of the Highley Parish Council Planning Committee Meeting held in the library of The Severn Centre on Tuesday 4th February 2025 at 5.45pm**

**Present:** Cllr T. Pinches (Chair), T. Quinn, A. Edwards, P. Vinall, A. Hancox, H. Hancox.

**Clerk:** Alison Palmer

**Parishioners:** sixteen members of the public in attendance

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**01.Apologies for Absence:** D. Thakrar

It was **RESOLVED to ACCEPT** these apologies.

**02.Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Vinall declared an interest in agenda item 5 and will leave the room during this item.

**03. Parishioners Question Time**

Mr S represented the views of the residents of Greendale Close regarding the application of 8 Greendale Close, explaining that correct procedure should be followed, and requested that planning should not be granted due to the many irregularities and inconsistencies within the application. Issues regarding the application included amended documentation being continuously uploaded. Statements relating to another property (Elysium Lodge) and referrals to being located in Telford and holding discussions with Telford & Wrekin Council that are also inaccurate. Further inaccuracies over the number of children where documentation ranges from 4 children to one child and two children, as well as complex needs contradictions on the level of need of the children. The applicant states that the property is not vacant, and it is vacant and has been for some time. It also lists s 4 parking spaces, the drive MAY accommodate 3 small vehicles, and the garage cannot be used due to an internal wall, it references upstairs yet it is a bungalow. Numbers of children in business plan and statement of purpose is different. Other inaccuracies include a dental practise, A442, Kidderminster station, and lack of footpaths or bus services. The crime statistics in the report also seriously under-reported. The Open water section does not mention Borle Brook which is within 5 minutes’ walk, or the emergency water capture section 2-minute walk away. The application states there is no administration facility at the site but also shows a “managers office” and at the minimum during shift changeovers, there will be six vehicles on site. Based on other statements, that could be up to 10 vehicles at one time. This does not take into consideration other specialist welfare staff who may be attended during the day. Other key workers may also be on site during the day. Far exceeding the capacity of the property resulting in on road parking causing issues on the narrow section affecting other residents for refuge collection/oil deliveries etc. Concerns around noise impacting on residents of Greendale. Likely need for police attendance impacting on quality of life for those living around the property – no local police station, would require police attendance if child went missing without authority etc. No experience running this type of facility and the directors run other types of business. Safeguarding concerns proximity to Highley primary school. This application would result in the loss of a property which could otherwise be an accessible property used for elderly residents.

**04. Minutes**

It was **RESOLVED to ACCEPT** the minutes of the meeting of Highley Parish Council Planning Committee held on Tuesday 7th January 2025 as a true record.

**05. Members are requested to feedback regarding the Land at Woodhill Devt regarding:**

1. **The building of accessible dwellings, suitable for ageing residents/ disabled and the need for such accommodation in Highley. (Bungalows.)**

Members summarised that bungalows would be preferred, and younger adults would also need to be considered for accessible properties. Landscaping and ecological issues need to be met. Members views differed regarding need, with councillors stating that the site would be ideal for over 55s but also contrasting opinions that younger residents could be accommodated rather than isolating the elderly in one location.

 **2 The provision of affordable, and social housing of this type.**

Members felt that these properties would not have a huge impact on the vista.

It was asked if local people would get priority, and what restrictions there would be regarding purchasing and transforming a property e.g. would a covenant be in place to ensure they remained bungalows and not altered or extended.

1. **The provision of a Community Hall facility in this part of the village.**

All members agreed that a community hall is already in that end of the village (Wilkins Close) and may not be required, other suggestions included a café or other social space. Or it was suggested that the S106 payment used to improve facilities elsewhere within Highley.

1. **The overall number of units proposed. Bearing in mind the new emerging allocation for Highley.**

The number of properties must suit the size of the site.

The architect was thanked for attending and working with the Parish Council to meet the housing needs of Highley residents.

**06. Members are requested to make comment on the following applications**

**25/00171/COU** Mr Meka Madumere 8 Greendale Close Change of use of building from dwelling house C3 to residential institution C2

The Planning Committee had no objection in providing a safe loving home to a child who needs it, but principles that need recognising are the location, the state of the application, relaying those concerns to Shropshire Council, we would need assurances on the nature of the child’s needs. It was **PROPOSED to OBJECT** to this application due to the inaccurate and inconsistent information submitted on this application. Examples of which are as follows:
\* Number of children in business plan and statement of purpose is different.
\* the statement relates to different property "Elysium Lodge" which is based in Telford.
\* the documentation references local council to be Telford and Wrekin and not Shropshire.
\* states the property is currently NOT vacant and it is - and has been for some time.
\* the application states that no administration facility will be based at site although a manager’s office is on the plans.
\* the shift patterns show at least three changeovers plus additional specialist welfare staff, yet a further document states 2 days on and 4 days off rotas in contradiction to this.
\* This could lead to a minimum of six cars at any one time up to a possible ten vehicles with only 3 car parking (the garage area is not functional due to an internal wall)
\*This will lead to on-street parking causing issues in the narrow section of the cul-de-sac affecting other residents having refuge collections or oil deliveries (9 properties local have oil)
\* Further inaccuracies state a dentist/taxi service within the village which is not the case
\* Safeguarding issues surround the needs of the children - claiming they will not house children with complex needs yet, the business plan states otherwise

**25/00173/TPO** Mr & Mrs Rodgers Oaklands Removal of deadwood and reduction of lower and overhanging branches.

Following discussions, it was **PROPOSED to SUPPORT** this application.

**07. Members are requested to follow up the rejection of the retrospective application 24/03882/FUL** for the 44 unlawful secure storage shipping containers. The application was rejected in Nov 2024 (as recommended by the Parish Council) and there appears to be no sign of any enforcement action by the Council.

The Planning Committee requested that the Clerk report this planning breach and copy MP Stuart Anderson in regarding the issues - due to previous applications

Signed:

……………………………………………………. ………………………………………….. (date)