

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 2nd June, 2010 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

PRESENT: Councillors N.A. Dugmore (Chairman), R. Aveley (substitute for Councillor D.R. Chaplin), J.A. Francis, R.T. Kiernan, G.M. Green, F.R. Picken, H. Rhodes and M.J. Smith

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor A.J. Eade (for planning application W2009/1023)

PB-1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chairman welcomed Councillor R.T. Kiernan, Vice-Chairman, to his first meeting of the Board and said that he looked forward to working with him and to the experience he would bring to the Board.

The Chairman also wished to record the Board's thanks to Councillor R.G. Chaplin for her sterling service whilst a member of the Board and to Councillor I.T.W. Fletcher as Chairman of the Board.

PB-2 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on the 12th May, 2010 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PB-3 APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE

Councillor D.R. Chaplin

PB-4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor R. Aveley declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application W2010/0146 and stated his intention to leave the room during determination thereof.

PB-5 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2009

The report of the Head of Governance informed the Board that, on the 26th November, 2009, a provisional Tree Preservation Order was made in respect of an Oak tree, designated as T1 on the map included in the Order.

A letter of objection, dated 11 December, 2009 was received from the occupier of 76 Hadley Park Road, Leegomery, Telford and on the 21st December, 2009 an objection was received to the Order from the owners of 74 Hadley Park Road, Leegomery.

The report set out the objections submitted by the owners of 74 Hadley Park Road. When purchasing the property, the solicitors acting for the vendor had confirmed that the tree was owned by and the responsibility of the Highways Department and since purchasing the property the owners believed that the tree had been maintained by

the Council, as they have removed branches from it on several occasions. In addition, following damage to the property caused by a falling branch, the Council had instructed its insurers to deal with the matter.

In response the Arboricultural Officer had stated that it had been confirmed by the Council's Geographical Information System and the Adopted Highways that the tree was not within the ownership of Telford & Wrekin Council but it had been confirmed by the Land Registry that the tree was within the curtilage of 74 Hadley Park Road. The Arboricultural Officer had issued a provisional Tree Preservation Order in response to what he considered was a perceived threat that it might be felled.

The report detailed the objections received from the occupier of 76 Hadley Park, Leegomery, Telford. They were of the opinion that the tree had been excessively cut back several times leaving it as an eyesore which was now not worth preserving for its visual amenity value. In addition, they considered that it had no significant impact on its surroundings. In response the Arboricultural Officer explained that the tree had been cut back previously at the expense of the Council following requests from residents of neighbouring properties. However, it was now starting to make a full recovery as could be seen from the pictures attached at Appendix B of the report. Whilst the tree has no significant impact on the local surroundings because its original appearance had been lost, it clearly had an impact on the visual amenity and bio-diversity of the area having reached an age of around 150-200 years, thereby offering both cultural history and an established wildlife habitat. The pruning carried out to tree would prolong its life as it had lessened the sail area of the canopy and shortened the lever arms of the branches making wind throw and branch breakage less likely. Given its species type, cared for correctly the tree could survive into the next century and beyond. When heading north from Leegate Avenue down Hadley Park Road, the Oak was the first prominent street tree and when travelling south down Hadley Park road from Okehampton Road, the tree was the third prominent Oak, the other two being under the ownership of the Council.

Member' attention was drawn to the point that the ownership of the land on which the tree was located was not a material matter when issuing or considering the confirmation of a Tree Preservation Order.

Councillor M.J. Smith stated that this was a prominent tree within its location and, as an English Oak growing alongside a road, was worthy of retention.

RESOLVED – that the Borough of Telford & Wrekin (74 Hadley Park Road, Leegomery, Telford, Shropshire) Tree Preservation Order 2009 be confirmed without modification.

PB-5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

(a) W2009/0905 – Land at Mere Park, Stafford Road, Newport, Shropshire

The chairman informed the Board that this application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

- (b) W2009/0934 – 5 Audley Avenue Retail Park, Audley Avenue, Newport, Shropshire

The Chairman informed the Board that this application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

- (c) W2009/1023 – Land at Mere Park, A41, Stafford Road, Newport, Shropshire

This was an outline application for the construction of a new unit of 1,556sqm gross on land east of and fronting the Newport By Pass (A41). The net retail floorspace would be 1,286sqm plus 270sqm given to offices, storage and staff accommodation. There would also be a dedicated car park for the retail unit to accommodate 90 vehicles. Access would be off the spine road that led to the Mere Park Garden Centre from the A41 by-pass, which, in turn, connected to the Stafford Road (A518). There was no occupier specified for the retail unit, but the applicant had assessed the proposal as for a “*discount retail food store*”, which would include the likes of Netto, Aldi or Lidl.

The Design & Access Statement indicated that the proposed unit would be a modern, single storey building with an overall height in the order of 7.5m. The design and its energy credentials could be considered in any reserved matters application, should planning permission be granted.

The applicant, Growing Enterprises Ltd, had appealed against the non-determination of this planning application within the prescribed 13 weeks, which expired on 2nd March 2010. A Public Inquiry was scheduled to commence on 10th August 2010 and it was necessary for the Local Planning Authority to determine what its position would have been if the appeal had not been made. The report before Members asked them to consider the application and make a recommendation on the basis that the Authority still had the powers to determine the application. This was necessary in order to inform the stance that officers would adopt in respect of the appeal. The applicant had also submitted a duplicate of this appealed application (W2010/0185) and, if Members were minded to resolve that they would have granted permission for the appealed application, it would facilitate an appropriate decision on that duplicate application at a subsequent Plans Board meeting.

The applicant had requested the current application be considered at the same time as a similar food store proposal (W2009/0934) via a S73 application at the Classic Furniture/Parkland House sites at Audley Avenue, Newport, to vary condition 21 of W2009/0312 to allow the sale of food with ancillary non-food goods from one of two retail buildings (1,394sqm gross) that had been granted outline planning permission. This application had been withdrawn prior to the meeting of the Board but the applicant had submitted a duplicate application for determination by a later Plans Board.

The Board’s attention was drawn to the current planning history of the Mere Park site, as detailed in the report, including a number of applications yet to be determined and several units that had planning permission but had not yet been built.

The consultation responses received, including objections from the Council's Highways Engineers, Newport and District Civic Society, Newport Town Council, the Ward Member (Councillor A.A. Meredith), Chetwynd Aston Parish Council, and two local residents were detailed in the report. A letter of objection had also been received from the applicants of the Classic Furniture food store proposal at Audley Avenue. Eight letters of support from local residents had been received, as summarised in the report.

Regional Planning Policy acknowledged that markets towns, such as Newport, had an important role and that new shopping development should be located within the centres but, if no sites existed, then advice in national guidance should apply (i.e. PPS4). At the local level, the Council's adopted Core Strategy also sought to support the regeneration of Newport and its role as a market town with specific policies CS6 (Newport) and CS8 (Regeneration).

When the application was submitted the relevant national retail policy was contained within PPS6 but this was cancelled with the publication of PPS4 in December 2009. This new policy removed the requirement that retail development outside town centres had to meet a "retail need" test. However, other tests remained, in particular, the sequential assessment of alternative sites with preference given first for existing centre sites followed by edge-of-centre. A further test was that relating to impacts on town centre considerations. Policy was to support town centres and to seek to avoid adverse impacts, as set out in the report, from development which was outside the town centre and PPS4 permitted other local town centre impacts to be identified. In the context of Newport, with its town centre conservation area and a number of listed shop buildings on the High Street, impact on these heritage assets would seem a relevant issue.

The Development Plan provided a similar policy basis for making decisions but PPS4 was an important material consideration affecting the weight that could be given to some policies that might conflict with its approach. However, in terms of the local dimension, most Local Plan and Core Strategy policies remained relevant. Both regional and local planning policy recognised market towns as playing a key role in providing services and other facilities to both the town and their rural hinterlands. Regional Policy RR3 expected retail proposals to be located within the town centre where sites existed and, where sites did not exist, it expected the development to meet the sequential site selection tests as set out in PPG6 (now PPS4).

One of the Council's long-term development visions was to support and strengthen the role of Newport as a market town acting as a service centre for the town and its rural hinterland, as endorsed by Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS8. Improving the six Borough towns (including Newport) was a key priority for the Council and funding had been secured in Newport to improve the public realm through the Borough Towns Initiative. This would help to realise one of Newport's regeneration strategies of improving the town's shopping environment to make it safer and a more attractive experience for shoppers and visitors, to increase the vibrancy of Newport's retail core, increase the viability of a number of small retailers which in turn would help improve the vitality of Newport's retail sector to retain Newport's position within the sub-regional retail hierarchy.

Because of the specialist assessment required, the Council had taken advice from an independent retail planning consultant and his report had reviewed the application against all of the PPS4 tests. In the context of a full review of local planning policy in both the Local Plan and Core Strategy, the Consultant's assessment of the health of Newport town centre had identified a number of key threats, namely:

- The limited stock of available premises;
- The size and shape of available premises;
- The cost of maintaining retail premises in a heritage asset;
- The relative lack of multiple retailers;
- The inertia in bringing forward potential development opportunities;
- The lack of recent private sector investment, and
- The risk of an ineffective "return" for the Council in terms of investment in public realm improvements.

His report then considered the retailing characteristics of the proposed development and identified how Newport town centre currently provided for the food discounter function. His analysis of the retail provision in Newport found that there was "*variety and choice of discount and other retailers selling goods at lower or value prices, often alongside respected brands. Our review indicates that a justification for the proposal on qualitative grounds, i.e. extending choice and/or competition, is therefore limited*". The report also identified the prospect that a much greater proportion of the proposed store's trade would be diverted from the town centre than was suggested in the applicant's Retail Impact Assessment. The Council's Consultant had relied upon the survey information which informed the Telford & Wrekin Retail and Leisure Study, 2007 (TWRLS) to identify limited use of existing food discounter stores in Telford and Wellington by residents of Newport and its catchment area. By considering the extent that such residents currently relied on town centre supermarkets, he was able to estimate a circa 10% impact on the turnover of existing convenience goods shops, as a whole, within the core part of the centre's shopping area, i.e. the area focused on the High Street.

Taken in the context of the fragility of the town centre identified in the Consultant's report and also considering the reliance on discount retailing (either in part or whole) that many town centre retailers relied upon; the generally high level of accessibility enjoyed by the town centre; the return that the Council's current public realm investment should be permitted to achieve (including helping to bring the prospect of other town centre or edge of centre sites forward) and the potential importance of protecting and enhancing the town centre's heritage assets, he had come to the conclusion that the food retail proposal at Mere Park would cause a "*significantly adverse impact*" on a range of important town centre considerations. The advice in PPS4 was that with such an impact, "*permission should be refused*".

The Council's consultant did not dispute that the proposal would bring some qualitative benefits relating to extended retail choice and competition to Newport. However, the additional choice provided would not be substantial bearing in mind the existing availability of discounted ranges across a number of stores and shops in Newport and within the market hall. The benefits of competition need to be weighed against the negative impacts on existing retailers and the importance of maintaining an effective and vital town centre. He had further advised that the applicant's Retail

Impact Assessment substantially overestimated the ability of the proposed store to claw back expenditure from Newport area residents that currently went to the Asda at Donnington Wood and other large superstores in Telford and Wellington and, in particular, had overestimated their use of the existing discounter food stores in Telford and Wellington.

The applicant's analysis had suggested that only £0.48m of trade was diverted from Newport's town centre food or convenience goods shops and stores out of a total estimated turnover of £22.5m, which represented only a 2% diversion of trade. This was a much lower impact than the Council's Consultant's figure of circa 10%, although that was based on different assumptions. Using the TWRLS survey information he had found that, because food discounters had a relatively local influence, more trade would be diverted from the Somerfield store in the town centre and other discount retailers, such as B&M Bargains as well as independent shops and market traders.

As advised by the Council's Consultant, it was not just the amount of loss of trade that the existing stores would suffer, in particular Somerfield as it had a more central location, but the loss of the number of people/shoppers frequenting this and other stores and hence a loss of people visiting other shops in the high street either on purpose or incidentally while passing. This would reduce the number of people making use of the retail offer in Newport as a whole, which would have an adverse impact on the town centre. The proposed development would be located in an out-of-centre and out-of-town location at Mere Park where it would be less able to offer linked trips, choice and competition with the town centre, even with the subsidised bus service between Mere Park and the bus station. Therefore, the proposed discount food store in an out-of-town location would adversely impact on the existing discount retail sectors in Newport and affect the town's overall viability by removing them from an accessible town centre. This would disadvantage many with consequential social exclusion issues which Council Policy CS9 sought to avoid.

With regard to the sequential site test, PPS4 required a sequential assessment to be done to fully explore alternative sites closer to the town centre, as set out in the report. If no town centre sites existed, preference should then be given to edge of centre sites and should look at site availability, viability and suitability. In looking at the sequential search the Council had also sought legal opinion in response to the applicant's concern that out-of-town sites had been wrongly discounted by the Council last summer when considering the Mere Park and Audley Avenue comparison retail applications. Legal advice had confirmed that it could not automatically be concluded that a site which was out of town was less preferable to one which was within the urban area.

With regards to alternative, more central sites on which the proposed development might be located, the applicant had considered 22 sites. The Council's Consultant had reviewed all the sites assessed and suggested that only two need detailed scrutiny, namely site 5, the concrete batching plant at Avenue Road, and site 22, Land off Water Lane.

The concrete batching plant had a Council resolution to grant outline planning permission for residential development dating from March 2009 subject to completion

of a S106 agreement. The applicant for this site now wished to progress the site having apparently found a developer but the likelihood of it being developed for residential purposes was currently unclear. The land off Water Lane could have scope for a retail development in a potentially mixed use scheme on what was an edge-of-centre location close to the centre of Newport, the public car park and the bus station. The Council had a desire to re-develop this area to help accord with its policy objectives of regenerating Newport to strengthen its role as a market town and had produced a Planning Statement indicating very broad mixed development aspirations. However, the land was in multiple ownerships that could make land assembly more difficult without owner co-operation.

In the context of the relatively fragile health of Newport town centre, the limited qualitative needs or benefits that supported the proposal and the prejudice that allowing the proposal could have on bringing forward part of this area for retail use, the Council's consultant considered it reasonable to adopt a longer term view of the site's availability beyond the usual 3-5 years given that the town centre was not strong. Therefore, the Council would conclude that there were other sites closer to the town centre that were available and sequentially preferable to the proposed site at Mere Park.

With regard to accessibility, shopping for food was an essential and more frequent activity than shopping for comparison goods and required a relatively high degree of accessibility particularly to those without access to a car. Whilst the site might benefit from a half hour inter urban bus service with a subsidy currently providing free travel between the garden centre and Newport bus station between the hours of 09:30 a.m. and 15:30 p.m., the majority of Newport's residential area was not particularly accessible by bus. In addition, access for pedestrians and cyclists was poor compared to the town centre. Even though there were pavement links from end of Stafford Street to Mere Park, pedestrians and cyclists would need to cross the busy A41 by-pass or negotiate the roundabout at the A41/A518 junction, which was particularly poor for the mobility impaired.

With regard to other relevant issues, the proposal would not achieve any local regeneration but would have adverse economic effects on the town centre. PPS4 recognised that job creation was economic development and, according to the applicant's Retail Statement, the new store would create approximately 25 new jobs. However, after allowing for related local job losses arising from retail impacts on existing outlets, the increase in jobs was likely to be modest and not significant.

The site fell outside the urban area of Newport being in the rural area. Core Strategy Policy CS7 limited development in the rural area to that which was necessary to meet the needs of the rural area. Whilst there might be some qualitative benefits associated with the proposal these were not seen as constituting the kind of needs that the Core Strategy intended in consolidating market town centres. The proposal was, therefore, an unnecessary extension into the countryside and beyond the curtilage of the garden centre. Granting permission would also consolidate a mixed use development in the rural area which would be undesirable as it would create an alternative focus to Newport's town centre.

In conclusion, in the context of the fragile health of Newport town centre, and the role that discount retailing played there, significant adverse impacts on the centre had been identified, concerning:

- prejudice to existing and future planned investment;
- effects on retail vitality, viability and diversity;
- a high level of trade draw, and
- risk of harm to the centre's heritage assets.

This would adversely affect efforts to regenerate Newport and strengthen its role as a market town and hence would be contrary to WMRSS Policy RR3, Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS8 and WLP S1. Assessment of the sequentially preferable sites had identified prospects to accommodate the proposed development but permitting this retail development would thus reduce the prospects of addressing the need to enhance and regenerate the town centre. It would, therefore, be contrary to WMRSS Policy RR3, Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS8 and WLP1.

The site was not accessible to the extent required to support food retail development. Discount food retail outlets ought to be easily accessible to most sectors of society, particularly those who did not have access to a car. The proposed development, therefore, conflicted with Core Strategy Policy CS9. Finally, the development site lay outside the built up area and did not comply with the Rural Area policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.

The Ward Member, Councillor A.J. Eade, was invited to address the Board. He said that he wished to reinforce the detailed officer report and its focussed conclusions before Members, and supported the recommendation that if the Board had been able to determine this application it should refuse planning permission. Councillor Eade wanted a clear message to be sent out that the regeneration of the Borough Towns was a key issue for the Borough and considerable work had already been done within Newport such as the improvements to Victoria Park and the repaving and additional car parking which aided shoppers and which was due to start that month. The impact of this proposal on existing food retail outlets would be detrimental and result in empty sites. Newport was a key market town which was just coming out of recession and the impact of the proposal and on the rural hinterland would be considerable. He felt that creation of 25 new jobs would not be a great lure and might not even be taken up by people from Newport. A further key issue was the fact that the Council did not wish to see development on greenfield, rural sites, as set out in Policy CS7.

The Council's Retail Consultant, Martin Robeson, was also invited to speak to the Board and reiterated the comments made in the report regarding the new guidance provided by PPS4 whereby quantitative need was no longer a key consideration. He accepted that increased choice and competition were still key but they were not sufficient to merit granting planning permission. He made reference to the sequential approach, which was a somewhat intangible concept, and advised that the permission should not be given in order to solve a short term issue which could prejudice the prospective of the right site adjacent to the town centre which could form part of the politically driven regeneration of Newport.

Members supported the recommendation as they were of the view that the existing businesses in Newport town centre needed to be protected. Councillor Green added that not all shoppers in Newport would be able to travel by car to Mere Park. Councillor Aveley added that, if approved, this proposal would result in Newport losing its niche market at a time when the Borough Towns Initiative was working to return these areas to what they once were.

RESOLVED – that had the Council jurisdiction to determine this application, it would refuse it for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on Newport Town Centre and threaten its role as a market town and undermine its position in the retail hierarchy of the Borough and hence was contrary to PPS4, Regional Spatial Strategy policy RR3, Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS8 and Wrekin Local Plan policy S1;**
 - 2. The proposed development was capable of being accommodated on a sequentially preferable site and hence the proposal was contrary to PPS4;**
 - 3. Notwithstanding the bus service close to the site, the location performed poorly (particularly compared with the town centre) in terms of access by a choice of means of transport. The proposed location was not reasonably accessible for food retailing, where good access for those without a car was key and where social exclusion issues were to be avoided. The proposed development was, therefore, contrary to PPS4, Regional Spatial Strategy policy RR3 and Core Strategy policies CS7 and CS9;**
 - 4. The proposed development would not meet needs limited to the Rural Area and where development is strictly controlled. It would therefore be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS7;**
 - 5. There were insufficient material considerations in favour of the proposal to overcome the identified significant adverse impacts and breaches of development plan policy.**
- (d) W2010/0066 – Holmer Lake County Primary School, Brookside Avenue, Brookside, Telford, Shropshire

This is a retrospective application by Telford & Wrekin Council for a new boundary fence which had been erected to improve security in the school grounds. It was of a metal palisade type, 2.4 metres in height and finished in dark green.

The school grounds were situated within the Green Network and the main issue related to the visual impact of the fence in the surrounding area. It was unobtrusive and had little impact on the existing vegetation and planting which surrounded the school. There was existing green-painted 2.4 metre metal fencing and security gates at the school entrance. The siting of the fence accorded with the general objectives of Green Network policy.

The fence was considered an acceptable boundary treatment for the school site and provided increased security. It was of a satisfactory appearance and did not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area and had little effect on the public footpath to the west of the school site.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application W2010/0066 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(e) W2010/0137 – John Randall County Primary School, Queen Street, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire

This application by Telford & Wrekin Council was for the erection of a single storey flat roofed extension to the rear of the building. It would be sited between the two projecting wings and would provide a conference room and additional teaching space. The proposed extension was of a relatively small size in comparison to the main site measuring approximately 6m by 8m with a height of approximately 3m. It would be entirely at the rear of the property and therefore be of a subservient nature to the main building and would not dominate the surrounding area.

The proposed development would retain the form of the existing building with a flat roof to a similar height and be constructed from rendered walls painted alongside grey trespa panels. Although this did not match that of the existing building, it would be sympathetic to that of the main building and the proposed development would, therefore, be in keeping with the character and appearance of the main building and surrounding area.

The proposed development would be over 50m away from the nearest neighbouring property. As the proposal was single storey and would be well screened by the existing building, it was not considered to be of detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. The school had extensive playground area and, therefore, the small extension would leave an adequate area of play.

The update sheet tabled at the meeting informed Members that comments had now been received from Madeley Parish Council. It had no objections to the application subject to any comments from Environmental Health relating to the loss of natural light and ventilation to the school kitchen adjacent to the extension. Informal preliminary discussions with the Environmental Health Officer had suggested that there were no concerns and the Building Control Officer had stated that this point would be assessed within a building regulations application.

Therefore as the scheme is considered to comply with planning policy and the issues are controlled under other legislation, the officer recommendation has not changed.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application W2010/0137 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(Councillor R. Aveley having declared an interest in the following application left the room during determination thereof.)

(f) W2010/0146 – Telford College of Arts & Technology, Haybridge Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This proposal was for the change of use of landscape buffer land to college use, construction of a full size 3G artificial football pitch and security fencing together with the erection of a new retaining wall, boundary fence and outdoor lighting. The application was part of a wider joint scheme between TCAT and AFC Telford for a new sports hall, artificial pitch and five a side football complex, for which funding from Sport England was being sought. Sport England had no objection in principle and considered that the proposed development had the potential to deliver significant benefits to sports participation which would outweigh any likely detriment to sport that would occur from the playing field loss. Whilst Football associations continued to prefer natural turf grass, artificial grass facilities did provide durable and flexible provision. The facility would also be for the college and wider community.

The Plans Board had previously resolved in October 2009 to grant planning permission subject to a prior Section 106 Obligation for significant development but this had failed to secure Government funding and the Section 106 remained unsigned and the planning permission had not yet been issued. However, it was reasonable to conclude that the principle of sports pitch development at this site had been largely established by the previous application. The application site was located within the Green Network but officers considered that the proposal would not significantly affect its function and would be compatible with the aims of Policy OL5 as the proposed pitches would increase the ability for recreational participation.

The proposal included the change of use of land currently forming part of the landscape planting buffer along Whitchurch Drive to enable the creation of the 3G pitch. This would require the removal of some semi mature trees and other planting but this was acceptable provided a programme of replacement was agreed and was a condition of the consent. A landscaping strip would be retained with Whitchurch Drive to create a buffer with this busy highway route.

The proposed pitches would be available for the wider public along with the College use and would add to the wider provision of sports and recreation facilities within the borough. The location of the site close to Wellington District Centre and with public transport links adjacent to the site comprises a sustainable location for additional community facilities in accordance with policy CS10 of the LDF core strategy and saved policy LR1 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

The design of the pitches, fencing and lighting were standard designs for these types of development and would be in keeping with existing characteristics of the site and reinforce the character of the area thereby satisfying the design requirements of policy CS15 of the LDF Core Strategy and saved policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan. The proposal would create a formal artificial floodlit pitch for use in the day and evenings but it would be located in excess of 130 metres from the nearest residential property, therefore issues of light pollution were not anticipated. An informative to ensure that installation resulted in no glare would be attached to the Notice of Permission. It was not anticipated that the proposal would result in adverse noise given its location and screening by other college buildings and,

therefore, it was considered that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the amenities of nearby residential properties.

It was not anticipated to increase usage at peak times during the day. There was adequate parking provision within the site and a current arrangement with AFC Telford United that permitted use of the Bucks Head car park by students etc. which it was believed would continue. Therefore, the proposed development would not have any highway implications.

In response to a question from Councillor H. Rhodes regarding the proximity of the proposed 3G pitch to Whitchurch Drive and concerns about balls being kicked onto the road, the planning officer confirmed that the proposed fencing between the two would be 4.5m in height.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application W2010/0146 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(Councillor R. Aveley returned to the meeting).

PB-6 SITE VISITS

None.

The meeting ended at 6.40 p.m.

Chairman:

Date: