

## **PLANS BOARD**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 10 March, 2010 at 6.00 p.m. in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire**

**PRESENT:** Councillors I.T.W. Fletcher (Chairman), N.A. Dugmore (Vice-Chairman), J.A. Francis, G.M. Green, Y.C. Hicks (substitute for Councillor F.R. Picken), C.P.R. Mollett (substitute for Councillor R.G. Chaplin), H. Rhodes and M.J. Smith

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor K.S. Sahota (for planning application W2009/0914) and Councillor J.M. Seymour (for planning application W2009/1067)

#### **PB-94      MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on 27 February, 2010 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

#### **PB-95      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillors R.G. Chaplin and F.R. Picken

#### **PB-96      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

#### **PB-97      PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION**

(a)    W2008/0799 – Land at Castle Farm Way, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought planning permission for the erection of 32,484sq.m. of Class B1 floorspace together with associated roads infrastructure and landscaping on the former Celestica site adjacent to Castle Farm Way. It was the applicant's intention to provide a high quality development comprising commercial units to accommodate a mix of uses whilst developing a strong sustainable identity. The scheme utilised a secondary steel framework of brise-soleil and timber panels offset from the actual building envelope, which would serve to create a blurred definition between public and private spaces and enable the mass of the actual building envelope to be less obvious behind its permeable outer façade. Officers considered that the scale, massing and design of the development were in accordance with parameters set in the outline application (W2006/0966) and was of a nature anticipated for commercial development in this important location. The scheme would also provide a gateway feature and entrance to the Telford area as it was approached from the east.

In determining this application, the Board's attention was drawn to the background, as detailed in the main report. The applicant's overall scheme was submitted as an outline planning application for 51,095 sq m of Class B1/B2, hotel, 550 dwellings and open space (W2006/0966) together with an associated outline application for construction of a new access, internal roads and other infrastructure (W2006/0968) in June 2008. Planning permission for these two applications was granted by the

Board at its meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2007 subject to a S106 Obligation. The applications were reconsidered by the Plans Board on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2010 and it was resolved that W2006/0966 be referred to the Government Office for the West Midlands for consideration and, if the application was not called in, to grant delegated authority to the Head of Planning & Transport following consultation with the Chairman of the Plans Board to grant planning permission subject to clear design principles and a S106 Obligation.

The purpose of this related full application was to enable the developer to deliver a large portion of the proposed employment development at Castle Farm on an early basis without the need to submit a reserved matters application. Approval of full planning permission would provide certainty to the funders of the development and enable an early start to be made on providing the necessary infrastructure for the wider development scheme. Members were reminded that, under the resolution to grant outline planning permission, the applicant was committed to providing a scheme in accordance with the approved masterplan, which included major benefits, particularly the provision of significant employment opportunities on a previously developed site formerly in employment use.

This application fell within the West Midlands Regional Assembly's (WMRA) criteria upon which it was to be consulted as a statutory consultee. As detailed in the main report, the WMRA had expressed concern that a large scale office development in this location could prejudice office development within Telford Town Centre and that no site specific justification had been provided to relieve these concerns and remove the risk. In conclusion, the WMRA stated that the proposed development was in general conformity with the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) but that this position was subject to the imposition of a condition limiting Class B1(a) office development to a maximum of 5,000sq.m. to accord with WMRSS Policy PA11.

The main report also set out the responses of the non-statutory consultees, including that of the Council's Head of Economic Development. In support of the proposal he had stated that, in the current market, a restriction to 5,000sq.m. of B1(a) use could deter commercial investment and have a negative impact on achieving the full development potential of the site to contribute to the Borough Economic Strategy. However, the current market also suggested that the development would need to be brought to the market in phases and the advise of the Head of Economic Development was to support a condition limiting use class B1(a) use to 20,000sq.m. In his view this would be sufficient to enable the development and marketing of the site in the current commercial climate whilst not unduly impacting on the development of the Town Centre and would balance permission granted for a similar use at the Wolverhampton Business Park i54. He has also supported the proviso that this could be varied by written agreement at a point in the future where commercial conditions could be re-assessed.

This site was clearly out-of centre and, as such, officers had sought to limit the amount of B1(a) floorspace, firstly to comply with regional guidance (5,000sq.m) and later, as a compromise, to 10,000sq.m. However, the applicants had maintained that a minimum of 20,000sq.m. was necessary to secure continued funding investment. Officers, being mindful of the advice of the Head of Economic Development were, on balance, prepared to recommend that a limitation be imposed for B1(a) offices of up

to 20,000sq.m. The conditions of any approval would need to be worked to ensure that later phases of employment development did not lead to the total of 20,000sq.m. of B1(a) floorspace agreed at Plans Board on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2010 in respect of W2006/0966 being exceeded. However, it was brought to Members' attention that by setting a limit that had little planning policy basis, it would be extremely difficult to resist future requests for additional office floorspace at this location irrespective of how the condition was worded. A list of the recommended conditions, which would be subject to amendment, was set out on the update report tabled at the meeting.

Under PPS4 'Planning for Sustainable Economic Development', as published on 29 December 2009, the Government no longer required applicants to demonstrate "need" for the development at edge/out of centre locations instead giving additional emphasis to sequential analysis and town centre impact considerations, providing for a 'town centres first' approach to retail developments that promoted vitality and viability of centres. This was an important additional material planning consideration for Members and needed to be given full weight. The applicants had undertaken a sequential analysis but officers were of the view that the analysis undertaken was not particularly rigorous and the application, at least on the face of it, could prejudice the bringing forward of more central sites for office uses.

In addition, the Central Telford Area Action Plan currently had no weight in terms of development control decisions. However, the Council was investing heavily into its town centre, with the Southwater Core offering a substantial office floorspace opportunity. PPS4 advocated a 'town centre first' approach and this proposal, if left entirely open ended in terms of B1 (a) office use, had the potential to undermine efforts to promote genuine town centre locations. In addition, Members needed to balance the economic development opportunity at Lakeside with the risk of establishing an undesirable precedent.

Officers recognised that this proposal was a significant regeneration, investment and job creation opportunity at a time when few genuine economic development proposals were coming forward. Members were reminded that this site competed head on with the i54 Business Park on the edge of Wolverhampton, which had also faced similar policy implications with regard to out of centre office accommodation and for which there had been some support from the respective authorities to accepting larger office floorspace than RSS policies would normally tolerate subject to stringent conditions. Telford was also directly competing with other out of centre business parks, such as Shrewsbury, where, due to historic planning permissions, there were no restriction in terms of volume of office floorspace. Under these circumstances, officers considered that Telford must remain competitive and continue to be able to offer a selection of sites both in-centre and out-of-centre.

It was clear that the viability of the scheme had been threatened by the recent economic downturn and officers wished to avoid a situation where the development placed undue strain on public services. Therefore, the planning obligation package had been reduced from the level originally envisaged. A viability assessment had been undertaken and independently assessed by the commercial arm of the Valuation Office Agency (DVS). This had shown that the viability of the scheme was in the balance at present, although with a modest upswing in residential values, the situation could change.

The planning obligations and infrastructure improvements offered by the developers now included the following:

- Contribution to public transport - £150,000
- New junction serving the employment land - £1,323,000
- New residential junction - £912,000
- Priorslee Avenue junction - £776,000
- M54 junction 4 improvements - £603,000

It was also recommended by officers that the Section 106 Obligation contributions should include a further £10,000 towards monitoring the Travel Plan and a contribution of £10,000 towards the ongoing monitoring and administration of the Agreement

An e-mail had been received from Telford Friends of the Earth on 9<sup>th</sup> March, 2010 which noted that the proposal had *“the potential for a low carbon site development capable of being a replicable best practice example of a low and zero carbon mixed use development site for the West Midlands area and further afield.”* It was the view of officers that this matter could be dealt with by condition.

In conclusion, having considered the evidence put forward by the applicant, notwithstanding the policy considerations regarding location of office space and requisite planning obligations, it was felt on balance that the benefits of the scheme to the Borough as a whole in investment, regeneration, best use of previously used land and job creation were considerable and constituted significant material considerations. Therefore, the scheme was recommended for approval with a limiting condition restricting the amount of B1(a) floorspace to a maximum of 20,000 sq.m. in association with other B1 proposals on the wider Castle Farm site in order to help safeguard the future of the town centre as the primary focus for office development. Given recent appeal decisions and the advice given by the DVS, it was also officers' firm opinion that strict review (to be carried out by DVS for continuity purposes and paid for by the applicant) clauses on planning obligations tied to the phasing of the proposal should encourage development of the site now and safeguard the public purse should the market improve.

The Board welcomed the application which would allow work to commence on the site and so provide employment opportunities for the surrounding area.

**RESOLVED – that planning application W2008/0799 be referred to the Government Office for the West Midlands for consideration and, if not called in, delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning & Transport following consultation with the Chairman of the Plans Board to grant full planning permission subject to the receipt and written approval of clear design codes/rules/principles and the signing of a S106 Agreement to provide financial contributions for sustainable transport, travel plan monitoring and a S106 Agreement monitoring together with terms to ensure that the 9 viability related objectives for the Section 106 Agreement as mentioned in the main report were achieved and subject to appropriate conditions to be prepared by the Head of Planning & Transport.**

(b) W2009/0911 – 26 Quarry Lane, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire

This planning application related to extensions and alterations to an existing two-bedroom bungalow, dating from the 1930s, to create a two storey house. The existing property, of brick design with a hipped and tiled roof, was in a poor state of repair and had been empty for some considerable time. Ketley Parish Council had requested that the application be considered by the Plans Board.

The proposed development would entail a small single storey extension on the southern side of the property and a larger two-storey extension on its western side, which would be possible due to the change of ground levels within the site boundary. The proposed eaves height of the building would remain as existing and the overall height of the dwelling would only increase by 0.5m. The two-storey extension would have a hipped roof which matched that on the existing bungalow.

The proposed dwelling would have three bedrooms, a bathroom, snug and living room on the ground floor, and a kitchen and dining/family room on the new lower ground floor. The existing bungalow had a floor area of 98 sq.m. and the proposed dwelling would have a floor area of 196sq.m. and the proposed external materials would match those used on the existing dwelling. An existing flat roof single garage would be replaced by a new double garage which would be set into the garden embankment and the existing driveway would be widened to allow vehicles to turn round and exit the site in a forward gear.

One letter had been received from a neighbouring resident which, whilst welcoming and supporting the application, made a number of comments, as summarised in the report, relating to the fact that the property had been unoccupied for almost twelve months. The Parish Council had expressed concern that the proposed building was out of scale with the existing dwelling and its surroundings and was, therefore, inappropriate.

Given the current condition of the existing property, the proposed development would improve its overall appearance and provide modern facilities for the future occupants. It was considered that the proposal was sympathetic to the appearance of the existing bungalow and that the size of the resulting dwelling would be commensurate with that of the application site. As the present bungalow possessed no particular architectural quality, the extended dwelling would positively enhance the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The extensions and alterations to the dwelling would not adversely affect the residential amenities presently enjoyed by the occupiers of adjoining and existing developments by virtue of any undue overlooking, loss of light, or any overbearing effect.

Councillor H. Rhodes said she had concerns about the height and siting of the proposed extensions and recommended that the Members have a site visit before determining the application.

**RESOLVED – that determination of planning application W2009/0911 be deferred until the meeting of the Board on the 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2010.**

(c) W2009/0914 – Land at Southwater, St. Quentin Gate, Telford Town Centre, Telford, Shropshire

This was an outline planning application by Telford & Wrekin Council and the Southwater Event Group with means of access (part) for a mixed use development comprising offices and civic offices (B1a/sui generis); residential (C3) (up to 330 units); retail, cafes/restaurants, financial and professional services, drinking establishments (A1,A2,A3,A4); Learning and Media Centre (to include the replacement of Meeting Point House), leisure pool, cinema, hotels, energy centres, conference and event facilities including outdoor events space and a Medical Centre (C1, D1, D2 and sui generis); associated landscape improvements to the public realm, replacement and construction of Southwater Lake, boundary treatment and new and reconfigured access; construction of basement, undercroft, surface and multi storey car parking; and all associated and ancillary works. It further included the retention, refurbishment and extension of the existing Ice Rink building, the bowling and bingo building, retention of the existing hotels (the Holiday Inn and International Hotel) and the event centre facilities (The International Centre).

The site was split into two parts with a secondary area on the northern side of St. Quentin Gate. For the purposes of the planning application, the site had been divided into twelve 'Development Zones', the principal elements of which were set out in the report.

The application had been advertised in the local press and on site as an application the subject of Environmental Impact Assessment, as a departure application and of major significance. In addition, 107 immediate neighbours, including businesses, had been notified of the planning application. A Statement of Community Engagement had been submitted with the application, summarising the measures taken to consult and involve the community prior to the submission of the application. The report detailed the consultation responses and Members' attention was drawn to those from the Highways Agency, West Mercia Police, and Meeting Point Trust Limited.

The application site was located almost entirely within the town centre with the exception of the Hollinswood area located in the north-east of the site. The town centre was defined by the Adopted Wrekin Local Plan (2000), the policies within which, as summarised in the report, supported the principle of the proposals, which would contribute to the Town Centre's multi purpose sub-regional role. In addition, the retail, office, hotel and conference, leisure and commercial uses were all supported. The emerging policies within CTAAP also supported a vibrant mixed use scheme of retail and employment to be developed within the Southwater area. The principle of development was, therefore, entirely consistent with both adopted and emerging policy against which the proposals were to be assessed.

Although objections had been received to certain elements of the proposal, overall the principle of development had been well received with objections generally relating to further clarification or mitigation/compensation for suggested effects. As an outline application, it had been difficult to require the agreement of Design Codes for each Development Zone but, to achieve design quality, the applicants had agreed that the D&A and Public Realm Guide would provide the base requirements,

followed in turn and prior to the submission of Reserved Matters applications of individual Development Briefs. This sequence could be controlled by planning condition.

With regard to response from the West Mercia Police, substantial representations had been lodged in relation to this application but, in essence, as set out in the main report, the Police Authority was seeking a contribution of £5m. to provide new custody facilities at Malinsgate to compensate for potential impacts of the development: In response officers considered that such a request was premature and there was no planning policy requirement to insist that such contributions be made.

Meeting Point Trust had submitted an objection to the proposals and stated that any replacement for Meeting Point House would need to be a detached building and not part of a multi-occupancy/multi-use building. The tabled update report summarised a further letter from Eversheds on behalf of the Trust stating that it was unwilling to withdraw its objection for the reasons set out. The tabled update report also summarised the representations from the Telford Trustee No. 1 and Telford Trustee No. 2 through Drivers Jonas, which were generally supportive of the application and those received from the Rank Group and Telford Friends of the Earth.

The proposals showed retention of some existing access points to the site, alongside improved and new access points, as described in the report. The main access to the development in the early phase would be the existing traffic light controlled junction which served the Telford Ice Rink and the International Centre via Coach Central/St. Quentin Gate. The Transport Assessment had demonstrated that initial phases of the proposals could be developed without requiring improvements to this junction but any S106 Agreement would incorporate a covenant requiring the applicant to enter into a Section 278 Agreement under the Highways Act to undertake this work at an appropriate point. On site, pedestrian and cycle movements would be given high priority and a high level of permeability and connectivity were proposed in response to the current issue of physical barriers that limited movement through the site.

The Highways Agency had objected to the proposals and sought clarity on a number of detailed points. At the meeting the Planning Officer informed the Board that detailed discussions were continuing with the Agency on the level of mitigation required to the Forge Roundabout together with other planned growth. The Agency supported a plan-led approach but the issues of mechanism and timing remained to be resolved.

The Town Park was a dominant influence on the southern boundary of the site and a key issue had been to address this positively through design principles to ensure that the proposed built development did not encroach into the defined Town Park boundary. Part of the application site included land just within the Town Park, in Development Zones A and B. Zone A would include the remodelling and re-positioning of Southwater Lake, which would provide an opportunity for the integration of the edge of the Town Park and the new development. This would have an impact on the existing toddler play area to the south of the new Southwater Lake which it was proposed to relocate it to a new adjacent location to be secured through the Section 106 Agreement.

The Design and Access Statement provided a landscape strategy at the heart of which was a refinement of the physical relationship between the Town Centre and the Town Park. As one of Telford's most positive and cherished attributes, the physical relationship between the Park and the Town Centre required improvement. A series of new buildings along the edge of the Park, but not within it, would address the current poor spatial definition by creating an interface that 'fused' landscape with built form through 'fingers' of landscape which would interact with architectural elements to create a "serrated" edge. The response of the Council's Landscape & Recreation Service, in support of the application, was set out in the tabled update report.

The proposals included the removal of a number of elements on the northern edge of the Town Park including Spout Farm House, the public toilets, the play area, and the Ranger base. However these would either be replaced within the proposals or addressed by financial contributions secured through the Section 106 Agreement. An Environmental Impact Assessment had been undertaken and included the habitat and species surveys detailed in the report. The redevelopment of both the natural and built environment had been assessed within the Environmental Statement and, had identified the key issue of the potential for impact upon bat habitats and foraging areas, which would be addressed by way of a Bat Mitigation Strategy, to be submitted pursuant to a pre-condition on any planning permission.

The report accompanying the Environmental Statement aimed to identify background noise levels and proposed noise levels from the new development, as described in the report. Officers had met with the applicants and had broadly agreed that appropriate mitigation for the new development should be secured through a planning condition relating to Noise Management Plans. Whilst, ideally, a single Noise Management Plan would have been required for the site, given the scale and mix of the development being brought forward in discrete stages over a lengthy period of time, the applicants had suggested that this would not be feasible. Furthermore, it was recognised that the existing facilities within the application site had extant planning permissions under which they would wish to continue. However it was also recognised that cumulative noise impact could be problematical and noise from existing development might impact on the ability of new development to meet reasonable noise limits/reasonable amenity levels. But, on balance, officers accepted that it would be difficult and unreasonable to revoke existing permissions or introduce new or additional controls and noise emitted by existing operations would form the baseline noise data for new development and inform Noise Management Plan Zones.

The application included facilities for a night time economy and Environmental Health and Public Protection Officers had been closely involved in discussions on how best to design out potential problems. The Environmental Health Officer was satisfied that the Design & Access Statement, as revised, provided dedicated pedestrian routes as a way of mitigating noise from people participating in the night time culture. However, he had warned that it might not be feasible to locate residential development immediately adjacent to the proposed Event Cube at the TIC. This was a matter of detail to be addressed at the Reserved Matters stage and within the Noise Monitoring Plan(s).

With regard to affordable housing, the application included 330 dwellings spread across four areas of the site, as described in the report. The applicant proposed that a minimum of 10% be affordable dwellings provided on and off site to be secured through a Section 106 Agreement. However, officers considered that 20% should be sought as matter of principle and might well be achieved through HCA Social Housing grant funding.

With regard to retail impact considerations, the proposals for up to 5,000sq.m. of Class A1-A4 uses within the development were not considered to have a significant impact on the existing town, district or local centres. In respect of the wider impact considerations, the redevelopment of Southwater would add a new mixed 'quarter' to the Town Centre and provide leisure, community, employment and residential land fully integrated to create a new piece of townscape.

As joint landowner, the Council was an interested party so the traditional approach of a Section 106 Obligation under the Planning Act was not open to the Plans Board as far as the Council's land was concerned. Therefore, commitments would be made on behalf of the Council as landowner to abide by the planning 'obligations' and, should the land be transferred, to make it a condition of that transfer that the new owner would have to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to ensure that the obligations bound future owners. In relation to the other joint Applicant, Southwater Events Group, a straightforward section 106 Obligation could be sought. The matter then rested with the various landowners to apportion the contributions as necessary. Details of the recommended Section 106 contributions were set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

Members' attention was drawn to the two update reports as tabled the second of which included a request from the applicant that, following a review of the draft condition the previous evening, Condition 20 be revised so that Level 3 of the Code of Sustainable Homes was achieved. In addition, the update set out the revised recommendation together with full details of the conditions, subject to amendment of the precise wording.

This was an application submitted by two of the major landowners in partnership was commendable and would secure the future of one of the Borough's prestigious commercial operations thereby contributing significantly to economic development.

Councillor Kuldip Singh Sahota was invited to address the Board on behalf of the Meeting Point Trust. He told the Members that the Trust was not opposed to this project and was willing to co-operate with the Council as it had done in the past. However, the Trust had a number of specific concerns and he referred Members to the letter dated 5 March 2010 from Eversheds on behalf of the Trust. In particular the Trust was seeking a detached replacement building 30,000sq.ft. in size. Secondly, it considered that the development would not provide adequate access or parking facilities and, again, sought assurances that the building would have its own entrance and that car parking spaces for volunteers and tenants would be provided rather than them having to use an adjacent multi-storey car park. Thirdly, given the religious nature of the use of Meeting Point House, the Trust was concerned that its new location was not next to an inappropriate facility such as a nightclub. Finally,

although the Council was willing to pay the legal and surveyors costs of moving to a new building, the Trust was seeking to have all the costs of all its tenants met. In conclusion, Councillor Sahota said that Meeting Point House was a very well used community building and he wished this to continue when it had moved to its new location. These concerns were supported by Councillor G.M. Green.

Councillor Green also sought clarification of the term 'sui generis' in respect of the new Civic Offices in Southwater and the Planning Officer explained that because the new buildings contained civic functions, etc they could not fall within Use Classes Order Class B1(a) – office use – and, indeed, would not fall within any specific use class.

Councillor N.A. Dugmore raised concerns about the level of S106 contribution sought by West Mercia Police for new custody suite facilities, which he felt was extraordinary and could not be entirely attributable to this development. He considered that the demand for and provision of additional facilities would evolve to meet changing circumstances in the Southwater area.

In conclusion, the Head of Planning & Transport accepted that the Meeting Point Trust, which was a very important facility and service for the community, had concerns regarding the application. Some of them could be addressed through the planning process but others, such as the costs of moving, were not planning issues and would have to be dealt with by the landowning parties as part of their transactions. The application before the Board was at an appropriate outline level and more detailed proposals would be brought back to them at the reserved matters stage. Representatives of Meeting House Trust had met the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive and had been given assurances on the ways in which their concerns would be approached but no fundamental issues had been raised at the meeting which would affect the Board's consideration of the outline application.

With regards to the contribution sought by West Midlands Police the Head of Planning & Transport said that the Police Authority was an important member of the Local Strategic Partnership and, this body addressed security and safety issues for the Borough as a whole. He considered that the Partnership would continue to be the vehicle for debating the level of provision of security features necessary within the Borough. However, in this instance the requested level of funding could not be substantiated through the planning process.

**RESOLVED** - that having fully considered the Environmental Statement submitted with the application and the Statement of Conformity with the Environmental Statement, and provided that the Highway Agency had withdrawn its Holding Direction and subject to the Council as landowner agreeing that the land would be bound by the obligations in respect of the provision of affordable housing and financial contributions as outlined in the Table at the end of the tabled update report at Appendix A and the signing of a Section 106 Obligation by Southwater Event Group agreeing to the same (in both instances where appropriate apportioning the liabilities appropriately between the landholdings and development zones) and to the planning conditions as set out in the tabled update report (the detailed wording BOTH TO CONDITIONS AND OBLIGATIONS if required to be altered was delegated to

**the Head of Planning & Transport), the Head of Planning & Transport was authorised to grant planning permission.**

(d) W2009/0055 – 21 Bratton Road, Bratton, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought outline planning permission for the erection of five dwellings, including access, layout and scale, on the site of a now demolished bungalow. The central position of the site access and the layout, position and orientation of the dwellings had been designed according to pre-application discussions in order to resolve the reasons for refusal of previous applications. The site lay within the established residential area of Bratton and was accessed off the existing highway. To the north of the site was a private unadopted narrow track giving access to Moor Farm and rear access to a number of other properties that fronted Bratton Road.

The principle of five dwellings on the site had been established by outline planning permission (W2005/1419) and the repositioning of the site access to a central location on to Bratton Road had addressed the previous highways objections. The proposed access driveway would curve around the frontage of Unit 1 and continue running parallel to the private access road from Unit 2. 12 parking spaces were indicated to be provided by integral garages and front driveways together with a turning space.

Unit 1 would front both the main highway and the private access road, thus providing an active frontage and addressing the street, with the remaining properties being orientated north-south. The layout of development would be slightly staggered and comprise individual house types, with gable roofs. The position of the site access meant Unit 1 would be located 9m. from the shared boundary of the site with the adjoining property, No.22 Bratton Road, although the outlook of the new dwelling would be on to the garden frontage and garage of No.22, thus not adversely affecting its private amenities.

The remaining four units would be located at least 14m. from the southern boundary of the site, ensuring no detrimental impact to No.22 Bratton Road. Existing dormer windows on the rear elevation of Moor Farm Cottage would overlook the garden of Unit 5 but indicative planting of a boundary hedge would help to maintain mutual privacy. The indicative streetscene suggested Unit 5 would be designed to have minimum impact on light and outlook to Moor Farm Cottage, with a catslide style roof and low eaves adjacent to the shared boundary and with a similar ridge height to the adjoining property. Units 2 to 5 were indicated with accommodation within the roofspace and, as the distance to the boundary and the private access road would be some 12.5 metres, it would not lead to the overlooking of Nos. 18 to 20 Bratton Road.

Wrockwardine Parish Council had no objections but had raised concerns relating to the likely increase in traffic and the nature of the access to the property. Nine letters of objection had been received from residents on Bratton Road, as summarised in the report. However, the Council's Highways Engineer had no objections subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, in particular those relating to the visibility splays.

Councillor A.G.P. Williams had submitted observations stating that he considered there were discrepancies between the Land Registry plan showing ownership of the land and the application drawings, which had implications for the access to Moor House Farm Lane. However, the applicants had confirmed that they owned all the land within the application site.

The Applicant had requested that the time limit for submission of the reserved matters be extended from 3 years to 5 years but officers did not consider that sufficient justification had been submitted to recommend approval of this request.

Officers considered that the amendments made to the design would ensure the creation of a more appropriate scheme which better reflected the prevailing character of development along Bratton Road and on the adjacent modern residential estates. It was, therefore, considered that the revised scheme now met the criteria of both national and local planning policies and was an acceptable proposal.

Councillor J.M. Seymour, Ward Member, was invited to address the Board on behalf of the applicant. She referred to one of the points of objection made regarding the covenant relating to the provision of a stand for the milk churns at the end of the lane to Moor Farm and assured the Board that the applicant fully intended to retain this.

Councillor N.A. Dugmore said that his initial concerns regarding visibility onto Bratton Road and had now been addressed and he supported the application which would tidy up the site.

**RESOLVED** – that with regard to planning application W2009/1067 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(e) W2010/0055 – Telford International Centre, St. Quentin Gate, Telford, Town Centre, Telford, Shropshire

This application was for temporary planning permission for the extension and reconfiguration of the parking arrangements at and adjacent to Telford International Centre (TIC) including new fencing, footpath link and lighting. The existing parking provision comprises 547 spaces over the two car parks and coach parking and this proposal was for 734 spaces with 15 accessible spaces. The update report tabled at the meeting informed the Board that additional amended plans had been received which would ensure that the development did not affect the extent of land provision at the existing junction deemed necessary for any future development relating to the wider Southwater Scheme. Furthermore, the existing footpath link across St. Quentin's Gate from the site and the Town Park to the Cherry Pink Car Park and beyond would be maintained.

Temporary planning consent was sought following the continuing success of the International Centre and to meet future requirements arising from its extension, as detailed in planning application W2009/0914. Consent would provide a solution to current parking issues in advance of the changes proposed under that application, which would include a number of multi- storey car parks and the car parks relating to this application would be retained with one being undercroft to a new hotel or office

development and the other having multiple uses as an outdoor events area and parking.

The design and layout of the parking proposal had taken into consideration the long term aims of the Southwater Core, including leaving adequate land for any potential alteration to the junction on St Quentin's Gate. The proposal would create a larger car park to the front of the TIC by incorporating the existing coach park and reconfiguring the parking spaces. This area would be enclosed by a landscaping strip including fencing to create a visually attractive, whilst secure environment. A number of trees within the site would be removed but sufficient numbers would be retained and subject to an appropriate condition and would be supplemented by new planting. Therefore, officers considered that, overall, the character and appearance of the area would be retained and the approach up the access drive enhanced.

The other car park would have a new entrance created off the existing road to reduce queuing of traffic on busy event days and retain adequate traffic flows. An existing embankment would be cut back and regraded to allow for a reconfiguration of the parking spaces and to increase the parking capacity of the site. An existing landscape strip would be retained to ensure that the softened green corridor into the Town Park was retained and enhanced the visual amenities of the area. There was an existing footpath link to the TIC across the coach park which would be relocated to run adjacent to the road and would continue to provide and reinforce pedestrian linkages from St Quentin's Gate/Coach Central and the wider Town Park as well as the TIC. The extent and level of the new lighting was considered acceptable and would ensure that the ambience of the area was in keeping with the surrounding area and would not have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Telford Town Park.

The tabled update report informed the Board of the solutions being put forward to compensate for the loss of the existing coach park as part of this application and the Southwater application. It was considered that these alternative arrangements had been adequately considered and addressed to ensure that users of facilities arriving by coach could access the area and park adequately with no prejudice to highway safety. However, the lack of a long term solution at this juncture should not be used to oppose the development.

Originally, the proposal had included moving the security cabin and entrance barrier but, following concerns about access to the park and the potential queuing impacting on the St. Quentin's Gate Junction, the applicants had now omitted this element from the scheme and would implement an alternative method of payment collection for parking provision.

The update report tabled at the meeting informed the Board that, following receipt of amended plans which addressed highways concerns relating to the ability to improve the existing junction as necessary and the realignment of the existing footpath link to the Town park, the Highways Engineer had no objection to the proposals, subject to the imposition of two conditions to ensure that the car park layout was to an appropriate standard and that the proposed footpath link replacement would be available prior to the new car park being brought into use.

The scheme, as amended, would create an integrated layout which would be compatible with any potential future redevelopment as part of the wider Southwater Scheme. Accordingly, the proposal would positively influence the appearance and use of the local area in accordance with Policy CS15 of the LDF Core Strategy. Furthermore, it would respect and integrate with the setting, protect and enhance pedestrian movements and produce a safe and secure environment in accordance with Policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application W2010/0055 the Head of Planning & Transport be authorised to grant temporary planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report and to the two additional conditions as set out on the update report tabled at the meeting.

**PB-98            SITE VISITS**

**RESOLVED** - that a Site Visit be made in respect of planning application W2009/0911 at 4.30 p.m. on the 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2010.

**PB-99            PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

The Board received for information details of the planning applications that had been determined under delegated power.

The meeting ended at 7.04 p.m.

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....