

**Cyngor Tref Llanandras a Norton
PRESTEIGNE AND NORTON TOWN COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9th JANUARY 2008 AT THE SHIRE HALL,
BROAD STREET, PRESTEIGNE**

Present: Cllrs H Owens (Mayor), F. Evans, J. Wilding, G. Graham, Mrs E. Davies, C Kirkby, P Gerrard, Mrs S. Frazer

Apologies: Cllr. Mrs P. Fraser-Scott.

Apologies Due to Restrictions on Attendance (Code of Conduct) – Cllrs. Tennant-Eyles, Kendall and Ms. Simpson

In Attendance: Mrs T. Price, Town Clerk

Declarations of Interest. Members were requested to declare any personal and/or prejudicial interests they may have in matters to be considered at this meeting in accordance with the terms of the Model Code of Conduct Order 2001 issues under Section 51 Local Government Act 2002.

The following declarations were made:-

H Owens (Mayor)	Planning Application - Progressive Products
J. Kendall (Deputy Mayor)	Planning Application - Progressive Products
J. Tennant-Eyles	Planning Application - Progressive Products
Ms. J. Simpson	Planning Application - Progressive Products

Cllr. Owens opened the meeting and explained that due to the Code of Conduct neither he nor three other Councillors could be present or speak at the Meeting due to a conflict of interests. He handed the Chairmanship of the meeting to Cllr. Kirkby and left the Meeting at this point.

The date of the next Town Council meeting was re-arranged to Thursday 24th January.

MIN 1869 PLANNING APPLICATION

PR460739 - Progressive Products Ltd., off Joe Deakins Road, Presteigne – Outline, erection of 2 no. retail units comprising 1 no. 1115 sq. m convenience store and 1 no. 748 sq. m comparison good store, together with petrol filling station and associated car parking, access and servicing. SO 36 SW.

Cllr Kirkby dealt with the each of the issues surrounding the application in turn.

- 1) Timescale** – He confirmed that the original very short timescale had now been extended and that PCC had confirmed that the application was unlikely to go before Committee any earlier than March and that in all probability it would be the April Meeting.
- 2) Arguments in Favour as Stated by the Applicant** – Cllr, Kirkby read paragraphs 5.3 to 5.7 to the meeting.
- 3) Written Submissions** – A number of letters had been received, both for and against the application and these were read to the meeting.
- 4) Town Council Opinions** – Those members present were asked for their views/comments at the present time. All the Members confirmed that they had spoken to or been contacted by a large number of residents both for and against the project. Cllr. Mrs Davies reminded those present that the Planning

Authority would make its decision on planning grounds not opinions and that all representations were public.

5) Consultation with the Town – A discussion was held to determine the best way to obtain the town's views on the application. The relative merits of a public meeting versus a ballot were debated and it was agreed to hold a ballot. Cllrs. Kirkby, Wilding, Gerrard and Graham agreed to meet to draw up the ballot question(s) and decide how best to carry out the procedure.

6) Technical Questions/Highways Issues – These were considered and questions to be raised with PCC Planning Dept. were to be as follows:-

Para 15, Technical Advice Note 4 – This refers to the need or otherwise of having to refer applications to the Secretary of State for retail proposals in excess of 10,000 sq.m. This scheme is smaller than that but given the significant impact that a development of this size and nature will undoubtedly have the Town Council feels that such a referral should happen and would like to know, in the view of PCC, if this could be requested?

Highways Issues – the present entrance would be unsafe for use by a greatly increased number of vehicles, particularly given the number of HGV's already using it. From a safety point of view the entrance would be extremely unsuitable. What measures/conditions would be imposed to correct this if an application were to be successful?

Car Parking – The site chosen would mean that the new unit would have free car parking whilst the High Street would have fee paying car parks. The impact of this does not appear to have been taken into consideration.

Heavy Traffic – Consideration needs to be given to the use of an access to the rear of the industrial site for access to HGV's. Presteigne is only served by B class roads. Will these be adequate to the needs of increased traffic flow?

The land is presently designated for industrial use (B8). What procedures need to be followed to change this for retail use? Is this likely to be permitted and if so what measures (if any) could be taken to prevent the remainder of the site also being lost to industrial use?

Has an environmental impact assessment been carried out and if so could the Town Council please have a copy. If not, should this not be done?

Does PCC have a copy of the original 'Presteigne Retail Core Outlet Survey – September 2007' and the full results as carried out by the developer?

What consideration is being given to the impact similar developments have had on communities comparable to Presteigne?

It is considered that the issue of secondary spend has not been adequately addressed by the applicant.

The application is presently for outline only. This makes it very difficult for not only the Town Council but also everyone in the town to comment objectively on the application. At present no detail is known – the proposed store could include a pharmacy, newsstand, fish counter, cafe etc. These would obviously have a greater effect on specialist stores on High Street. The Town Council feels that only a full planning application should be submitted so that all the detail will be known and a more accurate assessment of the impact can be made. This speculative outline application raises fears amongst a section of the community when in fact at the end of the day it may come to nothing even if granted.

Finally the Town Council would like to request a meeting with the responsible planning officer as soon as possible to discuss the application in detail.

The Clerk agreed to submit these questions to PCC as soon as possible.

7) Planning Gain – This issue was discussed at length and it was decided that the Town Council would like further information on how to maximise the possible planning gain for the town if the application were to go ahead. It was agreed to ask PCC if it would be possible to ‘future proof’ this gain so that if the site were to be sold to a large concern the gain could be increased accordingly. In particular the possibility of planning gain being used to remodel the road around the site or to seek contributions towards a New Memorial Hall that the town needs was to be explored.

8) Public Views – At this point the meeting was opened for the public to express their views and a large number of comments were put forward.

The matter was then deferred until the next Town Council Meeting.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting closed at 8.55 pm.