

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 30th March, 2011 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

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

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors A.G.P. Williams (for planning applications TWC/2010/0589 and TWC/2011/0084), V. Tonks (for planning application TWC/2011/0053) and K.S. Sahota (for planning application TWC/2010/0637)

PB-99 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meetings of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 9th March, 2011 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PB-100 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

PB-101 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor D.R. Chaplin declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application TWC/2010/0518 and stated that he would leave the room during determination thereof.

PB-102 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2010/0637 be deferred until the meeting of the Plans Board on 13 April, 2011 to allow Members to make a Site Visit.

PB-103 SITE VISITS

RESOLVED – that a Site Visit in respect of planning application TWC/2010/0637 be held on Wednesday, 13 April, 2011 at 4.15 p.m.

PB-104 PLANNING APPLICATION FOR DETERMINATION

(a) TWC/2010/0518 – 75a Regent Street, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension to the dwelling and car-parking on the existing front garden. The application site was a traditional inter-war, two-storey semi-detached house with bay windows, a gable on the front elevation, and a hipped roof. A 1.2m. timber fence acted as the side boundary with No. 77 Regent Street, which was further screened by a maintained mature hedge approximately 2m. in height.

Wellington Town Council had objected to the application on the grounds that the proposal would be too close to the property boundary. However, the Council did not apply a 'one metre' rule for two-storey side extensions, preferring to look at each case on its merits. Adjacent properties had been consulted and no comments had been received.

The proposed extension would be a little over 2.5m. in width and set back from the existing front elevation. Its proposed design would reflect the original architectural features of the dwelling, including a hipped roof at the same pitch, matching window and rendering details. Therefore, it was considered that the extension would be sufficiently subservient in its scale and massing and of a design that would respect the character of the existing house and of the adjoining semi-detached property. As there were no windows indicated on the side elevation, there would be no overlooking or unacceptable loss of privacy and, additionally, the proposal would not result in the loss of usable private amenity area.

The extension would adjoin the boundary with No.77, a detached two-storey property of a different design with a single storey element to the side with a flat roof, which was approximately 1m. from the boundary with No.75a. This, together with the existing hedge, would prevent any 'terracing' effect which would harm the street scene.

With regard to the provision of parking on the front garden, it was considered that the proposal would not significantly detract from the character of the street scene, the amenities of the area, or the residential amenities of adjacent properties. Approximately half of the existing front wall would remain, thereby retaining an element of enclosure in keeping with surrounding properties. Although the proposal would result in reduced room for manoeuvring vehicles on the site, the Council's Highways Officer did not consider this to be an issue due to the traffic calming measures on Regent Street and the fact that it was not a main road. Subsequently, the proposal would not prejudice the free flow of traffic or the safety of highway users. However, it was recommended that a condition be imposed to ensure that the parking spaces indicated on the submitted drawing were provided.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0518 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(b) TWC/2010/0589 – Little Dawley Snooker Club, Holly Road, Little Dawley, Telford, Shropshire

The application for the change of use of the existing Snooker Club (Use Class D2) to a convenience retail store (Use Class A1) had been deferred at meeting of the Plans Board on 9th March, 2011 to enable Members to make a Site Visit.

The update report tabled at the meeting informed the Board that a petition with approximately 180 signatures had been submitted to the Local Planning Authority in support of the proposal.

Following issues raised at the previous meeting of the Board, the update report set out further information from the Highways Engineer for the purpose of clarification, with regard to access, parking and rights of way.

The location of the access to the car park was acceptable although, when brought into use for the supermarket, it should be formed with radius kerbs including a tactile crossing across the bell mouth rather than the simple dropped kerb footway crossover access as at present. As these works would take place within the public highway, the details of the design and materials would require approval prior to construction. Members were asked to note that there were no visibility splay issues with the access.

There were no concerns with regards to the parking layout and the proposed parking space provision was in line with the Wrekin Local Plan guidance, although its parking policies had not been 'saved'. The submitted layout showed 19 spaces, which was acceptable, but an issue could arise with the space closest to the access depending on the nature of the kerbed works. If this space was likely to interfere with the operation of the access, then it should be omitted from the parking layout, leaving 18 spaces. A revised parking layout would be required but the details could be included in the drawings submitted for the access works.

Whilst there had been some local objection to the arrangement of parking immediately in front of the shop, the Highways Engineer had no objections, as the area had been used for parking for many years and had a full length dropped kerb to permit access. 3 of the parking spaces should be allocated as 'staff only' in order to minimise the movement of vehicles on and off the highway at this point and this had been agreed by the applicant. Members were asked to note that the extant use of the application site had no restriction on the use of parking across this area.

There were no concerns with the Right of Way across the site but further details would be required of the way in which it would be marked out on the site to clearly delineate it from the car park before the site was brought into operation. The kerbed access works would also better define the route where it met Holly Road by creating a clear desire line for pedestrians around the access and onto the footway.

Councillor A.G.P. Williams, Ward Member, spoke against the application and voiced his concerns of the impact this development, if approved, would have upon existing businesses in the area. He asked if a Retail Impact Assessment (RIA) had been carried out in respect of the application and made reference to the Covenant placed on the premises in 1979 to protect small businesses in the area from such a development as that being considered.

Mr. A. Scott, on behalf of local residents, referred to the likely increase in traffic and potential accidents that could occur if the application was approved. In addition, he requested Members to consider the impact approval would have upon the proposed development of Paddock Mount and upon local small businesses with a potential for job losses. As he considered there was little scope for further housing development in the area, he did not agree with the need for another Convenience Store.

Andrew Rowson, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. He referred to the current poor condition of the building in which the applicant was prepared to make a significant investment to improve both its condition and access. Internal and external improvements would be made and the overall design was in accordance with planning policy. Improvements to the soft landscaping would increase visibility, the car park would be resurfaced, the Right of Way maintained and the existing lamp standard removed. There was local support for the application as shown by the petition with 180 signatures. In conclusion, the change of use would provide modern facilities, a wider ramp, a good range of services, and employment for local people. With regard to the Restrictive Covenant referred to by Councillor A.G.P. Williams, he stated that this could be challenged legally but was outside of the planning remit.

The Planning Officer responded to the comments raised by the public speakers. With regard to the question from Councillor Williams as to whether a RIA had been carried out, he explained that government guidelines did not require one for a store of this size. However, PPS4 did require a sequential assessment to be undertaken to ascertain whether there were any other suitable premises in closer proximity to existing centres and the applicant had demonstrated that there were none close to the local centre. In addition, officers considered that the size and floor space of the proposed convenience store would have no discernable impact on either the local centre or Dawley and would have positive regeneration and economic benefits. Whilst the proposed store would operate in direct competition to other local facilities, this was not a planning issue unless it was considered likely to undermine existing centres. He drew the Board's attention to the update comments of the Highway's Engineer, to the concerns expressed by the Ward Member and local resident, and to the Site Visit made by the Members. The proposal would rationalise the current car parking, delineate the line of the Right of Way, and address the untidy nature of the site and decline in the building's fabric, which was having a deleterious impact on the local community. Discussions relating to enhancing the wide tarmac area on the site had been held with the applicant's agent earlier that day and he had indicated that his client would be willing to accept a condition that the appearance of the site through appropriate hard and soft landscaping could be implemented. In conclusion, while the loss of the Snooker Club was regrettable, approval of the change of use would provide a local shop to the benefit of the local community.

Members considered that the application would address a site that was becoming an eyesore, a situation that would only worsen if no action were taken. Councillor G.M. Green asked for an assurance that an appropriate number of disabled parking spaces would be provided and the Chairman responded that this could be conditioned accordingly. With regard to the Restrictive Covenant on the premises, the Council's Solicitor advised the Board that this was not a relevant planning issue and could be dealt with through a separate process. Councillor G.M. Green suggested that, given the strong local feelings on this application, the Ward Members and the applicant work together to finalise the details of the design but the Head of Housing & Planning explained that, as the scheme was only for the conversion of an existing building, there was a limited amount that could be done other than to improve the frontage. Therefore, he advised the Board to determine the application on the basis of the scheme before them.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0598 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and to additional conditions relating to the upgrading of the appearance of the hard and soft landscaping of the tarmac and the provision of an appropriate number of disabled parking space.

(c) TWC/2011/0011 – The Old Lodge, School Road, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for planning permission for the erection of 2-storey side and rear extensions to an existing block of 4 flats to provide 4 new flats on a site within the grounds of the Donnington Recreation Ground. The existing building comprised three 1-bedroom flats and one 2-bedroom flat and the resulting 8 flats would comprise six 1-bedroom and two 2-bedroom flats, with shared laundry facilities, external amenity space, and a communal parking area. Vehicular access to the site was gained from School Road via a public car park which served the adjoining recreation facilities. 10 car parking spaces would be provided as part of the proposal.

Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council had objected to the application for the reasons set out in the report. The Council's Highways Engineer had no objections, subject to the provision of an additional visitor parking space. Originally 9 parking spaces had been shown for the 8 flats but this had now been amended to provide 8 residents' spaces and 2 visitor spaces, which was considered adequate for the development.

The application site was designated as Green Network in the Wrekin Local Plan, where residential development would not be permitted unless there were exceptional circumstances or the development brought community or environmental benefits. With regard to this application, not all of the Donnington Recreation Ground was shown within the Green Network and officers considered that the application site itself possessed very limited amenity, ecological, recreational or landscape merit and, therefore, did not fulfil any of the original aims of the Green Network. Furthermore, the proposed development would not take place outside the existing curtilage of the site or encroach into the surrounding open space. Therefore, officers considered that the proposal to provide additional flats within an existing residential curtilage was acceptable.

The site was large enough to accommodate the extension and additional flats, together with their amenity space and parking provision. The proposal had been designed to match the size and scale of the existing flats and complimented and enhanced their appearance. In addition, the contemporary design and appearance would respect the 2-storey dwellings on the adjacent School Road and the massing was intended to reflect the character of the original building with its low roof pitch. The external materials comprised contrasting facing bricks, white render, and red stained timber cladding for the walls, and matching concrete tiles on a monopitched roof.

It was considered that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the site and would not have an adverse effect on the playing facilities on Donnington Recreation Ground. Although the proposed

extension and extra parking would result in the loss of some amenity space within the curtilage of the plot, the resulting car parking and re-landscaped grounds would still provide amenity space of adequate size and function so as not to be detrimental to the residents living in the flats.

The application had been advertised as a departure from the Development Plan and this consultation expired on 7th April, 2011. Therefore, the recommendation would require delegation to the Head of Housing & Planning for approval, subject to no new issues being raised.

Members welcomed the scheme which would enhance the existing building and provide increased security for the area. Councillor D.R. Chaplin said that the site's location within the Green Network was unusual and asked if it was possible to limit any future development. The Planning Officer responded that any such application would be dealt with on its merits at the time of submission. In addition, the site had a well defined curtilage and any further development would encroach on the car parking, which was an important amenity. The Head of Housing & Planning added that the Council took Green Network land seriously and Members needed to be convinced that this application was a reasonable exception to the relevant policies when determining the application.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2011/0011 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to no new issues being raised and to the conditions as set out in the report.

(d) TWC/2011/0053 – 27 Heath Hill, Dawley, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for outline planning permission for the erection of 6 residential dwellings on the existing garden land and open space to the rear of the property, an approximately 'L' shaped site in an elevated position above the properties on Heath Hill. All matters were reserved except for access, which was proposed onto Heath Hill. Councillor V. Tonks, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

Whilst this was an application for outline planning permission only, the indicative plan submitted proposed a row of 3 terraced dwellings fronting Heath Hill between the existing access to Burton Close and the proposed site access, with a further row of 3 terraced units at the rear of No.27 Heath Hill. Rear private amenity space was proposed for each unit and 9 parking spaces for the 6 units with 2 parking spaces for No. 27 Heath Hill.

Great Dawley Parish Council had not objected to the proposal but did consider that there were sewage issues in the area. Councillor Tonks had raised concerns regarding drainage issues, whether the site could accommodate 6 dwellings, and the potential overlooking of Burton Close.

The application site had no formal designation within the Wrekin Local Plan and could, therefore, be considered for development. It was located within a highly sustainable location on the edge of Dawley District Centre in a predominantly residential area and, therefore, the principle of development was acceptable.

Existing dwellings in Heath Hill were traditional detached properties, although there was no distinct character of development in this part of Dawley. Therefore, whilst the addition of 6 properties would increase the density of development in the area, it was not considered that it would significantly or detrimentally alter its character. The proposal would lead to a loss of some open space but planning permission had previously been granted for change of use of part of the land to private garden area (W2007/0452).

The creation of a new access to serve the proposed properties and No. 27 Heath Hill was considered acceptable being a sufficient distance from the entrance to Burton Close and the Council's Highways Engineer had no objections subject to appropriate conditions. In indicative form, the proposal could accommodate on-site parking for both the new and existing dwellings and would not adversely affect highway safety.

Whilst the concerns of Great Dawley Parish Council and Councillor Tonks were noted regarding existing drainage problems in the Heath Hill area, officers had established that the site was adjacent to a main sewer system. Therefore, whilst the application was for outline consent only, it was considered that it could be adequately drained subject to appropriate drainage conditions.

With regard to ground conditions in the area, the Council's Geotechnical Engineer required a site investigation to aid the design of suitable foundations for the development, which could be dealt with by condition. As it was likely that the development would require the removal of some trees and shrubs within the garden area of No.27 Heath Hill and of adjacent land, details of suitable replacement trees and hedges would be required to address the loss of existing screening to protect character and amenity.

The proposed site layout plan made reference to 'possible access to open green area' and, as the remaining open area was outside the application site and in order to protect it from future development, it was considered that there should not be an access point into this area. As the layout of development was not being considered at this stage, it was suggested that a condition be imposed to state that such a layout was not approved and further details would be required at the reserved matters stage.

Councillor V. Tonks, Ward Member, spoke against the application and informed the Board that there was an ongoing sewage problem in this area, which would worsen if the application was approved. He considered that a full investigation of the sewage and drainage in the area was required to ascertain whether these problems were the result of a blockage or a capacity problem. In addition, the increased traffic arising from the development would be detrimental to the adjacent sheltered housing scheme. In conclusion, he objected to the use and loss of green space.

The Planning officer responded that Council Officers had sought further advice on the drainage and had acknowledged that there had been very localised problems. Therefore, the applicant would be advised to further consider this aspect of the scheme and he recommended that any approval be conditioned to require full details to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development to ensure that there was no exacerbation of the problems. He

accepted that there would be some loss of green space but the conifer trees and privet hedge that would be removed would be replaced by more acceptable species.

Members considered that the application was acceptable subject to the issues with the drainage being resolved to the satisfaction of the Council before development commenced. The Planning Officer responded that this could be addressed by the imposition of a standard condition.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0755 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and to an additional condition requiring full details of the foul and surface water scheme to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development on the site.

(e) TWC/2011/0060 – Tree Tops, 45 Paradise, Coalbrookdale, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought retrospective planning permission for the erection of a new front porch, balcony, and white cladding together with decking to the rear with fencing and the installation of replacement UPVC windows. Work to the front garden to provide hard standing for parking, landscaping and the erection of walls and railings had not been completed. The property was located within the World Heritage Site and The Gorge Conservation Area within a predominantly residential area. Due to its location and surroundings, the property, along with the majority of those on Paradise, was well screened from the main thoroughfare through the Gorge.

The property was a 1970s detached dwelling situated on a steep slope elevated above the road side with a partly buried detached garage on the front left hand side, adjacent to the road. Access from the highway was on the front elevation and the frontage had paving and an entrance through a recently built white cladded porch with a wooden effect UPVC door. The rear of the dwelling was accessed via steps at the side leading to a steep garden, bounded by trees and decking with railing and fencing. .

The Gorge Parish Council had objected on the grounds outlined in the report. Built Heritage Conservation had objected to the use of UPVC as inappropriate in a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site (WHS) and did not support the design of the windows as they appeared over dominant. However, PPS5 acknowledged that not all elements of the WHS positively contributed to its setting and, as the property was not located in an overlooked area and was a late 20th century build with no historical interest or architectural value, there was not a clear cut case for resisting in this particular case.

Cllr Louise Lomax, the Ward Member, had also raised concerns about the principle of UPVC windows in an Article 4 designated area but had commented that, whilst many houses in the street had such windows, most were in place before the designation thus setting a precedent for the future. Two letters of objection had been received from a neighbouring property, raising the issues listed in the report.

Application TWC/2010/0479 for similar work together with the erection of a two-storey extension had been withdrawn following concerns from the Case Officer, as set out in the report. This application had addressed those concerns by omitting the two-storey element and replacing the brick pillars with railings. The main issue, therefore, remained the use of UPVC windows within the WHS. Properties along Paradise were a mixture in terms of age, design and appearance and the majority had UPVC windows and doors, which were similar to those already installed in 'Tree Tops'. The Council continually resisted the installation of UPVC within the WHS but a recently allowed appeal was a material consideration in considering this application. In that instance, while the property was sited within the WHS and Conservation Area, the combination of the design, age and location meant that UVPV replacement windows would not be a prominent or materially harmful feature and out of keeping with the character of the existing property or the surrounding dwellings. Following this decision, the Council had been unable to apply a blanket refusal to UPVC windows within the Gorge Conservation Area and the WHS. This application had similar characteristics to the allowed appeal and, consequently, it was reluctantly considered that the proposal was satisfactory and would accord with local and national policies.

The applicant wished to form a balcony over the existing porch and proposed to remove the existing brick pillars and replace them with metal railings. As described in the report, other properties in the area had balcony designs to their frontage to take advantage of the views. The position of 'Tree Tops' meant that there were no properties to the front and the rear had a private outlook due to existing trees and hedges.

Part of the front garden would be dug back and a retaining wall erected of red brick to match the property to create a grassed area to provide an additional 2 car parking space. The driveway would be in grey patterned concrete to match the adjoining property and the existing corrugated sheeting covering the garage roof would be replaced with waterproofing covered by a green roof, which would lead onto a garden area. For safety reasons black metal railings would be installed around the perimeter of the garage roof and along the top of the retaining wall. This would not prejudice the safety of highway users and its proposed design was acceptable as there would be no adverse affect on residential amenities.

Fraser Lamont, the applicant, spoke in support of the application, and assured the Board that he fully appreciated the heritage aspects given the location of his property in a Conservation Area and World Heritage Site. However, the property was not sited on a main thoroughfare and he was of the opinion that UPVC windows and a door would be acceptable given the age of the property. The windows were of an identical size to the original ones and also to those at No. 44 Paradise and on many other properties within The Gorge. He informed the Board that the proposed work to the drive ways and landscaping would provide car parking spaces for his visitors especially in the summer when the area was busy with tourists. The new porch would provide space for an additional bedroom and the work to the roof of the garage would allow him to utilise a flat open space.

In presenting the application, the Planning Officer said that the application was acceptable with the only issue being the installation of UPVC windows. He referred

to the recent appeal decision described in the report and advised Members that it was necessary to take a pragmatic view in this instance given the age and design of the property and its relatively secluded position. .

Members considered that the proposed scheme would not be dominant in the area as it would be similar to the adjacent property. However, Councillor D.R. Chaplin asked if it was possible to ensure that the appearance of the property was not materially altered in the future and that it remained of its period. The Head of Housing & Planning responded that any future changes would have to be considered by the Board but, that as the property was not a Listed Building, the Board was not able to put in place any restrictions.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2011/0060 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(f) TWC/2011/0084 – Aqueduct Pharmacy, Majestic Way, Aqueduct, Telford, Shropshire

This application requested retrospective planning permission to remove condition 3 of planning permission W2006/0477 to allow the pharmacy to be converted into a convenience store and pharmacy to meet a demand from the local community. The application site was located within an area designated as ‘Green Network’ but planning permission had been granted as it provided a community benefit but, to ensure this was retained, a condition had been imposed to prevent the pharmacy from being used for any other purpose.

The pharmacy was located within the community centre/local centre of Aqueduct adjacent to a car parking area with approximately 15 spaces with an established convenience store, Majestic Stores, being located approximately 200m to the north of the application site. Two thirds of the Pharmacy building had recently been converted into a convenience store with an area towards the rear being used as a pharmacy with a private consultation area and storage beyond and also on the first floor. New signage had been added to the building with ‘Costcutter’ branding with a number of ‘A’ boards and smaller adverts around the building. The Ward Member, Councillor A.G.P. Williams, had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

Dawley Hamlets Parish Council had objected as it considered that insufficient evidence had been provided to indicate a material change which would permit the removal of condition 3. There was considerable local opposition to the application, mainly based on the perceived negative impact it would have on existing grocery outlets in the area. 50 neighbour letters had been received from residents in Aqueduct raising the objections as listed in the report.

Policy CS10 specified that doctors’ surgeries (in this case a Pharmacy) and local shops constituted community facilities which should be located within local centres where there was good accessibility by foot and public transport. Majestic Way was the route of several regular bus services and the Community Centre car park, which served Aqueduct Surgery and Pharmacy, could be utilised by the customers of the shop.

Whilst officers did not agree with the applicant's assertion that the Pharmacy was now the core service of the premises, as only a small area was assigned to that function and the main use was that of a convenience store, given these two uses the development would still meet the criteria set out in the Green Network policies. Therefore, the principle of development was acceptable and accorded with national and local planning policy.

Whilst the pharmacy was located approximately 200m from the existing Majestic Stores, it was the role of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to ensure that such facilities were located appropriately to ensure the vitality and viability of Town/District Centres. Furthermore, the proposal would not set a precedent for further changes of use of other premises, as the area was predominantly residential.

In response to the concerns raised by local residents, officers had discussed the issues of the reduced size of the pharmacy and availability of products with the General Pharmaceutical Council's (GPC) Standards Advisory Team, which had confirmed that there was no minimum area but that it was essential that the pharmacy provided an effective service. In this regard, one of the Aqueduct pharmacists had confirmed that an Inspector visited the site within the last month and was satisfied with the system of working and availability of stock, which he had stated has not significantly changed from when the premises was only a pharmacy.

With regard to the concerns expressed on the conflict between the sale of tobacco products and the role of a pharmacy, the GPC had confirmed that there were standards and a pharmacy should not be selling/displaying products that were dangerous to health. However, if such products were located outside the area registered by the GPC and the pharmacist was not involved in selling them, they could be sold from another part of the premises. Whilst there was a clear distinction between the role of the pharmacists/dispensers and the shop staff, Members were reminded that it was not the role of the LPA to control specific elements which were for sale and that appropriate guidelines and governing bodies considered it acceptable.

The approved application did not condition hours of use but the current opening hours of the convenience store were 7am – 9pm seven days a week, with those of the pharmacy being 9am – 6pm Monday to Friday closing for an hour at lunchtime. The proposed opening hours of the shop were later than the hours at Majestic Stores and, given the proximity of the pharmacy/shop to residential properties, it was considered that a more appropriate closing time would be 8pm on weekdays and Saturday and 6pm on Sunday. It was, therefore, recommended that the hours of operation be conditioned as 7am – 8pm Monday to Saturday and 7am – 6pm Sunday.

It was considered that existing parking provision at the community Centre was sufficient and, given that off-street parking was available within the existing car parking area, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

Officers did not consider that the shop and pharmacy would result in anti-social behaviour in the area, as there did not appear to be such problems at the Majestic

Stores. This had a litter bin at the front and it was suggested that a condition be imposed that details be provided of a litter bin at the front of the shop and pharmacy to address potential litter problems.

In conclusion, it was recommended that planning consent W2006/0477 be reissued with the removal of condition 3 to allow the pharmacy to be used as another use within A1, including as a shop. It was also proposed to add a new condition to ensure that the element of pharmacy within the shop was not reduced or removed, together with a condition regarding appropriate opening hours to protect adjoining residential amenities given the proximity of the site to residential properties.

The signage would require separate advertisement consent. However, the number and ad-hoc arrangement of signs was considered unacceptable and detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and area and would require amendment.

The update report tabled at the meeting informed the Board that officers wished to amend the conditions set out in the main report by the omission of the condition which stated that the Pharmacy element should not be reduced and removed from the premises and be replaced by the imposition of a standard condition stating that the development should be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans and details as the Pharmacy element was included on the submitted floor plan.

Councillor A.G.P. Williams, Ward Member, spoke against this retrospective application as he considered that the additional use of the premises as a grocery shop had already had a damaging impact upon local businesses. He also requested clarification of the wording in the officer report that 'The Council's Highways Engineer supports the proposal' and the Head of Housing & Planning advised that this comment be discounted and be interpreted as meaning the Highways Engineer had no objections to the application. He subsequently apologised to Councillor Williams for speaking during his allocated five minutes of public speaking.

The Planning Officer drew the Board's attention to the update report and the removal of Condition 3 of planning permission W2006/0477, as it was not within the power of the Local Planning Authority to impose it on the current application. With regard to Councillor A.G.P. Williams' comments on the impact upon local businesses, he said that it would be difficult to justify refusal of the application on those grounds given Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy, which had been adopted subsequent to the planning approval. In determining this application for a change of use, the Board needed to be mindful of both updated Policy and the value to be gained from an increase in community services and facilities.

Further to this point, Members referred to the map included with the officer report and considered that the distance between the application site and the Majestic Stores was acceptable as they were located in two small 'mini-centres'. The Chairman recommended that the proposed hours of operation should be amended to restrict the hours on a Bank Holiday to 7am – 6 pm in addition to Sundays.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2011/0084 planning permission be granted subject to the amended conditions as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

(g) TWC/2011/0101– St. Luke’s Catholic Primary School, Church Road, Trench, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application by Telford & Wrekin Council for the erection of an external freestanding glazed canopy measuring 11.5m x 6.5m x 3.83m in height over an external play area in a recess between the main school buildings. The curved roof of polycarbonate glazing panels would be supported by 6 steel uprights with 2 steel downpipes dark, ‘moss green’ in colour. The existing external play area served the Reception Class and there was a requirement to provide an external play area that could be utilised all year in all weather conditions.

The proposed canopy would not protrude beyond the line of the existing school buildings and, therefore, would have little visual impact and the colour of the steel framework would be sympathetic to the site. Nearby residential properties on Pinewood Avenue and Broadway Avenue were set well back and the proposal would not have a significant impact on amenities currently enjoyed by these residents.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2011/0101 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission following the expiry of the neighbour consultation period and subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The meeting ended at p.m.

Chairman:

Date: