

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

---

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7TH NOVEMBER 2013**  
**AT THE SHIREHALL, BROAD STREET, PRESTEIGNE**

**Present:** Cllrs. Ms B. Baynham (Mayor), C. Kirkby MBE ( Deputy Mayor), Ms. N. Humphreys, J. Matthews, Ms. F. Preece, B. Price, P. Robinson, P. Smith, J. Tennant-Eyles.

**Apologies:** Cllrs. H. Owens, .J. Wilding

**Absent:** Cllr. G. Banks.

**In Attendance:** Mrs T. Price, Town Clerk; Members of the Public.

**Declarations of Interest.** Members were requested to declare any personal and/or prejudicial interests they may have in matters to be considered at this annual meeting in accordance with the terms of the Local Authorities (Model Code of Conduct Order) (Wales) Order 2008.

*Personal*            *None*  
*Personal and Prejudicial*            *None*

Cllr. Ms. Baynham welcomed the large number of the public to the meeting.

**MIN 2746      PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**VAR/2013/0023** discharge of section 106 agreement attached to application PR3704/02 to remove occupancy restrictions at **Harley Meadows, Warden Road, Presteigne**. The Town Council did not feel qualified to comment on the legal arguments but felt that Section 106 agreements are necessary and should be binding. Members also noted that without this particular agreement the houses would not have been granted planning permission at all. The agreement protects homes for local people, homes which the Housing Survey carried out by the Town Council and the Rural Housing Enabler in 2011 showed to be needed

**P2013 1056** full, proposed lean-to extension to existing agricultural building at **Broadheath Farm, Presteigne**. **No objections raised.**

**P2013 1013** variation of condition, condition 1 of P2008/0711 to extend time for commencement of development at **the Builders yard, 25 Hereford Street, Presteigne**. **No objections raised.**

**P2013 1051** Householder: Demolition of existing single storey extension, double garage and outbuilding; and erection of replacement single storey extension and double garage with storeroom, **Stonewall Cottage, Stonewall Hill, Presteigne**. **No objections raised.**

**P2013 1026:** full, construction of 28 affordable dwellings and creation of vehicle and pedestrian access at **Development opposite playing field, Knighton Road, Presteigne**.

Cllr. Tennant-Eyles, as Member who lead on affordable housing for approximately 7 years, gave a brief history of affordable housing and exception sites with particular reference to Presteigne. He pointed out that was it not for the work of the Town Council over this time exception sites would not have been permitted outside an area centre such as Presteigne. At the time this policy change was agreed there were no available sites within the town, something which has now changed with

the vacant Kayes site in the town centre and was due to change further with the drawing up of the Local Development Plan.

Cllr. Tennant-Eyles then went on to outline issues he felt were relevant for consideration for the application and these were -

*Green Belt:* DAS 5.2.1 it was stated that this development is not affected by any designated green belt. Whilst this may be true technically the town's green belt is Went's Meadow and the application will be beyond this unofficial green belt, leading to social and visual impacts which may well undermine the enjoyment of Went's Meadow, the setting of the town and its tourist potential.

*Precedent:* The development sets a precedent for further development to the West something which needs very careful consideration and the future impact of this needs to be assessed.

*Dispersion of Dwellings:* The affordable housing to be provided will not be dispersed around the community as MWA had previously indicated it would be and will place all the homes on one site.

*Community Engagement:* DAS 4.1 talks about community engagement being exceptional. There was one presentation to the community and many people had said they did not know about it. Based on the numbers in the DAS 4.1 16 out of 2500 population expressed a written opinion although more actually attended. This was 4 in favour, 2 against, 10 neutral.

*Visual Impact:* In considering the visual impact it is noted that the height of development is higher than shown by about 2 metres at the west end, and will thus be more obtrusive than the drawing suggests.

*Previous Rejection of Site:* development on this site was rejected in 1998 by a Public Enquiry as being an unsuitable site.

*Sustainability:* The development appears weak on sustainability and is only designed to code 3 standard, the design of the site does not allow for full use of solar gain via photo voltaic panels etc. It was felt that affordable homes to rent also needed to be affordable homes to run.

*House Size:* It was felt that the development had too many one bedroom properties and did not provide enough family accommodation.

*Potential Section 106 Agreement:* This would need to ensure that the properties were for local residents and to be drawn up with full consultation with the Town Council.

*Traffic Calming:* the measures to be taken were not clear and traffic on the road was already considered to be too fast. Should the development take place then it would be important to ensure that all possible steps are taken to address this.

*Ecology Recommendations:* These must be made a firm commitment.

Members discussed the implications at some length and also received a small number of comments from the public.

It was agreed that as many residents did not seem to be aware of the planning application and the response to the consultation carried out by Asbri Planning was very small it would be best to see if a public meeting could be arranged and to ask for an extension of time in which the Town Council could make its comments. In the meantime the Clerk was asked to forward the concerns listed above to Powys County Council as an initial response.

The Meeting closed at 8.50 pm.