

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 1 June 2011 at 6.00pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chair), N A Dugmore, K R Guy, A S Jhavar, R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, S A W Reynolds and C R Turley

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Cllr S Davies (for planning application TWC/2011/0201), M B Hosken (for planning application TWC/2010/0715), A A Meredith (for planning application TWC/2011/0820) and Cllr A J Stanton (for planning application TWC/2011/0192).

PB-001 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on 13 April 2011 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

PB-002 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

PB-003 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor J C Minor declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application TWC/2010/0667 and indicated that he would leave the room during determination thereof.

Councillor R T Kiernan declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application TWC/2011/0183 and indicated that he would leave the room during determination thereof.

Councillor N A Dugmore declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application TWC/2011/0164 and indicated that he would leave the room during determination thereof.

PB-004 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Members were asked to accept proposed changes to the published Calendar of Meetings which sought to rectify scheduling difficulties due to the Christmas and New Year period.

RESOLVED – that the meetings on 7 December 2011, 4 January 2012 and 25 January 2012 be cancelled and meetings be held on 14 December 2011 and 18 January 2012.

PB-005 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED – that planning application TWC/2011/0261 be withdrawn for consideration at a later date.

PB-006 SITE VISITS

RESOLVED - that a Site Visit be made in respect of planning application TWC/2011/0243 commencing at 4.00pm.

PB-007 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

(In accordance with his declaration of interest Councillor J C Minor left the room during determination of the following application.)

- (a) TWC/2010/0667 Land to side and rear of 81 Freeston Avenue, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9EP

This was an application for outline planning permission, with all matters reserved for consideration at a later date, which had been amended and sought for the erection of a detached dwelling fronting Freestone Avenue and 1no. detached dormer bungalow fronting Stafford Street on land adjacent 81 Freestone Avenue, St Georges. As the Applicant was related to a Member of the Council, it was required that this application be determined by the Plans Board.

The determination of the application had been delayed due to various inaccuracies and errors on the application form which had necessitated reconsultation with the neighbours. The original proposal was for four dwellings on the site and Officers had considered this to be unacceptable over-development of the plot, hence the submission of amended drawings for two units and a subsequent further round of public consultation.

Seven representations and a small petition containing seven signatures objecting to the proposal had been received. The issues raised were alleged inaccuracies on the application form, the proximity of the development to the common boundary, that the differing ground levels between properties required a retaining wall to be built to ensure there would be no land slippage or damage to neighbouring foundations, that the entry and exit was very close to a fast busy road, bollards and bus stop, that school children cross the road adjacent to the site, there were existing parking problems and congestion, there would be a loss of privacy and queries regarding the Council's intentions with regard to the local road system together with a suggestion that a Section 106 agreement may be appropriate.

The report addressed these concerns, referring to the access to Plot 2 being drawn as required by the Council's Highway Engineer, that the design of the dwellings were subject to reserved matters which would address privacy and amenity issues together with the provision of a retaining wall.

The Head of Housing & Planning advised the Board that although the Applicant was related to the Chair, Councillor J C Minor had not had any involvement in the scheme.

Councillor N A Dugmore noted from the report that further comments were awaited from the Geotechnical Engineer and was advised that these had not yet been forthcoming; the Head of Housing & Planning advised that he understood the

comments would take the form of Informatives. Councillor S A W Reynolds stated that she knew the site which was an eyesore and felt that residents would approve of appropriate development on the site to improve its appearance. However, Members expressed some reticence to approve the application without the Geotechnical Engineer's comments.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0667 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to satisfactory comments being received from the Council's Geotechnical Engineer.

(b) TWC/2010/0688 Land Adjacent to, 53 Maslan Crescent, Tibberton, Shropshire, TF10 8PB

This was a full application for the erection of a 4 bedroomed detached dwelling on a corner site which comprised a former garage court with 6 garage lock-ups in an established housing development. The site was enclosed with timber panel fencing to the sides and rear with wire mesh fencing to the front. Tibberton Primary School, Sports Pavilion tennis courts, and Sports Pavilion lay beyond the application site. Tibberton & Cherrington Parish Council had requested that the application be determined by the Board.

Following officer concerns regarding the size, scale and height of the proposed dwelling and the existence of an extension to No.13 Maslan Crescent, which had not been shown on the location/block plan, the scheme had been amended showing a reduced ridge height of 7.81m, which was comparable with that of neighbouring dwellings, and a slightly reduced footprint to provide a 1.0m gap around the northern boundary of the site. Neighbours had been re-consulted as a result of the amendments.

Tibberton & Cherrington Parish Council had raised a number of issues, as detailed in the report, and the Case Officer had met with Parish Councillors, a Governor of Tibberton Primary School, and the owner of No.13 Maslan Crescent on site to discuss the amended scheme. The Council's Highways Engineer had no objections to the proposal. Two representations had been received from neighbours raising the issues set out in the report.

Outline planning permission for a dwelling on the site, W2008/1054, had previously been approved by the Planning Inspector on appeal and, therefore, the principle of a dwelling on the site had already been established and that decision was a material consideration when assessing this application. The Inspector had considered there to be three main issues with planning application W2008/1054.

With regard to whether the proposal would meet the Council's housing location policy, the Inspector had opined that the site was brownfield, in a sustainable location, and in one of the three key settlements where the majority of rural development was to be focussed. The Inspector had, therefore, concluded that one additional dwelling would not harm the underlying objectives of the Council's housing location policy, in particular policies CS1 and CS7.

With regard to the effect the proposal would have upon the character and appearance of the area, in particular, the future need for ball-stop fencing, the Inspector noted that the existing dwellings adjoining the sports facility did not have such fencing. Although these dwellings were further away from the playing field, the Inspector did not consider the difference in distance was material and that, additionally, the Pavilion and 3m high fence would provide an effective physical barrier. As the result, the current application did not include ball stop fencing. The design of the dwelling had been amended to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling in Maslan Crescent by reducing the ridge height and the detailing on the gable end matching that found on the estate. The imposition of a condition would require a brick sample panel to be built on site for inspection to ensure that the best match possible with the existing dwellings was achieved. Accordingly, the proposal complied with policy UD3 of the WLP and Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy.

Thirdly, as to whether the proposed dwelling was likely to result in the removal of the adjoining sports facility, the Inspector had commented that it was common for dwellings to back on to Recreation Grounds and Parks and was, therefore, not convinced that an additional dwelling would put pressure upon the Council to remove the facility. Accordingly, the proposal was compliant with policy CS10 of the Core Strategy.

Finally, the Inspector had noted comments from third parties in respect to highway safety and residential amenity but had concluded that one additional dwelling would not be harmful to highway safety and could be designed so that residential amenity was not compromised.

Sufficient on-site parking and manoeuvring space was provided to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear, which was superior to the situation with the existing houses in Maslan Crescent, some of which had no off-street parking and few of which had on-site manoeuvring space. The Council's Highway Engineer considered that a single dwelling house would generate fewer vehicular movements than the previous use of the site as a garage court. However, a condition would require details of where vehicles would be parked during construction and the loading and unloading and storage of materials to ensure that the free passage of traffic and any disruption was kept to a minimum.

The footprint of the proposed dwelling was slightly larger than the indicative layout shown for the approved outline application and was now a 4bedroomed rather than a 3 bedroomed dwelling. However, the room sizes were modest with 2 bedrooms being double and 2 being singles and therefore, the size of the dwelling was considered appropriate for the site and locality.

As set out in the report, the separation distance between the proposed window of bedroom 3 and the common boundary with No.13 Maslan Crescent was considered to be adequate given that the proposed dwelling would not directly face the windows of No.13. There would be no significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of No.13 by way of over-looking or loss of privacy and, therefore, the proposal was compliant with policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan and CS15 of the Core Strategy.

Whilst the comments raised by neighbours were noted, the principle of residential development on the site had already been approved.

Determination of the application had been deferred until this meeting to enable Members to make a Site Visit. Although Members were mindful of the Inspector's decision which was circulated in an update report prior to the meeting, they considered that the application in its current form represented overdevelopment of the site and considered that the applicant should be requested to revisit the plans.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/0210/0688 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission subject to no changes regarding size, scale or design being made during further consultation with the applicant but that any amendments be referred back to Plans Board for consideration.

(c) TWC/2010/0715 349 Holyhead Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 2EZ

This application sought planning permission for the erection of a detached dwelling within the amenity area of 349 Holyhead Road. The proposal comprised a 2 storey detached property with asymmetrical shallow-pitched roof with a ridge height of 7.6m. and an attached single storey element of store, plant room and double garage creating an 'L'-shaped form. The dwelling was 20.5m. x 11.95m. with the garage and plant element measuring 6.1m x 9.55m. The proposed dwelling had been designed as an 'eco-home', and was intended to have very low carbon usage whilst meeting the applicant's accommodation requirements. The dwelling's principle elevation was south-facing and would be predominantly glazed to maximise solar gain and had been designed to maintain appropriate levels of heating and ventilation. The building would be constructed in terracotta coloured render with grey window frames and an artificial slate roof. Councillor M.B. Hosken, Ward Councillor, had requested that the application be considered by the Plans Board and its determination had been deferred until this meeting to enable Members to make a Site Visit.

349 Holyhead Road was a large detached 2 storey property built in 1930s and orientated to the south with no road frontage and served by a private access drive between No.s 343 and 345 Holyhead Road and adjacent to the rear of properties in Barnfield Crescent. No. 349 was backland development and was located some 150m. from Holyhead Road. The application site was part of the large open front garden area to the south of the dwelling. It tapered slightly to the south and currently comprised lawn, a vegetable patch with greenhouse, summerhouse, chicken pen and parking for a caravan, with mature trees and shrubs on the boundary. The surrounding residential development comprised a combination of 1930s and mid-late 20th century semi-detached and detached properties. All the adjoining properties were 2 storey except No.46 Barnfield Crescent, which was also set back in the plot. No other property in the vicinity of 349 Holyhead Road was of the same substantial size and footprint.

Wellington Town Council had raised no objections to the proposal. 5 neighbour letters, the comments of which were summarised in the report, together with a petition containing 18 names. Following re-consultation on the amended plans, 5

further neighbour letters had been submitted, with the additional comments being set out in the report.

The application site had no formal land allocation within the Wrekin Local Plan and could, therefore, be considered for development. In June 2010, PPS3 was updated and private residential gardens reclassified as no longer constituting previously developed/brownfield land to enable councils to protect gardens from inappropriate development by rejecting planning applications for development that were objected to by the local community and spoilt the character of neighbourhoods. However, given the scale and siting of No.349 Holyhead Road, which was backland development with no street frontage, it was considered that this plot was not out of character in principle.

The new dwelling would utilise the existing shared access drive on to Holyhead Road and would comprise 4 bedrooms at first floor and 1 at ground floor level together with large reception rooms at ground floor. The entrance to the building would front No.349 around the central access and the garden area would be located to the principal, southern, elevation of the property, with additional landscaping proposed.

Following discussions between the agent and the Local Planning Authority, the plans had been amended and the length of the proposal reduced from 27.4m to 23.5m and relocated to be a minimum of 22m. from all surrounding dwellings. It was now located further from the eastern boundary with properties in Barnfield Crescent and the mature oak tree in an adjacent rear garden at Avondale Road. It was, therefore, considered that there would be a sufficient separation distance between the existing and proposed dwellings. The site could be adequately accessed having adequate amenity space and parking, and with sufficient amenity space being retained for NO. 349 Holyhead Road. Therefore, the principle of a dwelling on the site was considered acceptable.

Officers acknowledged that No. 349 Holyhead Road was a substantial property with a large garden area and that the footprint of the proposed development was of a comparable size. Whilst, it would be significantly larger than the other dwellings in the vicinity, it would be located at the end of the shared access drive, could be accommodated within the substantial site area, and would not be visible or prominent in the streetscene. Therefore, whilst the dwelling was larger than the majority of properties in the area, it was considered to be acceptable in this location.

The design of the proposed building ,with its largely glazed south elevation, did not reflect the prevailing character of the area but the design had been dictated by the applicant's requirement to build a low-carbon family home. The creation of a low-carbon property met sustainable criteria but this needed to be assessed against design principles. In this regard, given the property's siting at the end of the shared drive, not being prominent in the streetscene, and the orientation of the building with the glazed southern elevation facing away from the site entrance and not overlooking other properties, it was considered that the design of the development would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.

There was a significant difference in ground levels between the application site and the adjoining properties in Barnfield Crescent, and there had been a number of local objections regarding the impact of the building on adjoining residential amenities. However, there would be a separation distance of 22m. between the rear of the dwellings in Barnfield Crescent and the side gable of the proposed property. In addition, there were no principal windows on the side gables of the building to minimise overlooking and loss of privacy. Given the position and orientation of the dwellings, the development was, therefore, unlikely to reduce levels of light to the properties in Barnfield Crescent. In addition, permitted development rights could be removed to control additional windows, extensions and outbuildings to protect adjoining amenities. It was recommended that a condition be imposed to control the height of proposed landscaping on the boundary to Barnfield Crescent properties to protect light and outlook.

With regard to other issues that have been raised by local residents, the agent had resolved the issue regarding ownership issues of part of the land adjacent to the access and had omitted this on amended plans. The position of the dwelling at the rear of other properties and its elevated position was not ideal; however given the position and orientation of 349 Holyhead Road, and the revised and more appropriate scale and mass, officers considered the development was acceptable. With regard to access and vehicle movements, the Highways Engineer had no objections and the Council's Arboricultural Officer had assessed that the oak tree in the adjacent garden would not be adversely impacted by the development subject to appropriate conditions during construction

Councillor Hosken spoke against the application, drawing attention to the consultation comments of local residents which were detailed in the report. In particular, he considered that the development would result in considerable overlook into properties at Barnfield Crescent, that the application represented overdevelopment of the site and that the size, height and materials were not in keeping with the local area which had a historic reputation for majestic homes with spacious gardens. He feared that granting the application would set a precedent in the area for developing garden land.

Mr B Heeley, agent for the applicant, reminded Members that this application was for an eco-friendly family property which the applicant intended to reside in themselves. He considered that with regard to overlook, the due south orientation of the property would be heavily glazed and would be 21m away from properties at Barnfield Crescent and 44m from the nearest property at Avondale Road. He argued that the development represented 18% of the plot rather than the 25% found at Avondale Road and that the applicants were making good use of under-utilised land. He pointed out that vehicular access was intended from the existing private drive and that the Emergency Services had raised no objection to this. He conceded that some small trees would be lost during development but that they would be replaced and that the Oak tree would be protected during works. He drew attention to the fact that nearby properties at Barnfield Crescent were similarly rendered or slated as proposed in the application which, therefore, could not be considered out of character, particularly as it would be set behind houses fronting Holyhead Road.

Following the site visit that afternoon, Members welcomed the eco-friendly approach to this development, considered that there would be minimal overlook from the site which would be better utilised by the development. Whilst some concerns were expressed about the slow growth rate of the proposed beech hedge, it was pointed out by Officers that an existing hedgerow was present and that there was capacity for this to be allowed to flourish and grow further.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0715 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(d) TWC/2010/0764 Rosebay, Lincoln Road Wrockwardine Wood, Telford, Shropshire. TF2 6LF

This was an outline planning application relating to the erection of three terraced houses, following the demolition of an existing bungalow, at Rosebay, Lincoln Road, Wrockwardine Wood. Approval was sought for the access into the site but all other matters – layout, scale, appearance and landscaping – were reserved for subsequent approval at the reserved matters stage.

The applicant had stated that the existing bungalow, which had been vacant for some considerable time, was structurally unsound and it was proving to be uneconomic to renovate the property. A notional layout had, therefore, been submitted with the application to demonstrate how 3 two or three bedroom terraced houses could be accommodated within the site. This involved one central shared access into the site from Lincoln Road, and the lowering of existing front boundary walls to 900mm high to improve visibility for drivers when exiting the site. The layout showed two allocated parking spaces per dwelling, with the end properties having a single integrated garage and one space on the front shared courtyard, and the middle dwelling having two courtyard parking spaces. The existing high rear boundary wall along New Road would be retained, with a pedestrian gate formed to serve the middle property.

Wrockwardine Wood and Trench Parish Council had raised objections to the proposal and 4 neighbour letters had been received the comments of which were summarised in the report.

The site was shown as ‘white land’ on the Wrekin local Plan where residential development was acceptable in principle. The site lay within a predominantly residential area in the built-up area of Wrockwardine Wood.

There were a number of short terraces of Victorian houses in the surrounding area, including opposite the site, and it was proposed to adopt a comparable pattern of development on this particular site.

A notional layout had been submitted with the application which demonstrated how a terrace of three dwellings would reinforce the existing street pattern by reflecting and responding to the scale and form of the Victorian terraced houses on the opposite side of Lincoln Road. The suggested frontage widths of the proposed dwellings would be comparable with the aforementioned properties and would respect the

established character and appearance of the existing street frontage. It was considered that the development of three dwellings on this site would also reflect the prevailing density of the existing development in this part of Wrockwardine Wood. The applicant felt that it would be possible for all the habitable rooms of the proposed dwellings to face either Lincoln Road or New Road and therefore avoid any overlooking of adjoining houses or garden areas. Each dwelling would have two parking spaces, which should be sufficient for two or three bedroom houses of this type. There was adequate room to allow all vehicles to turn around and exit the site in a forward gear.

Lincoln Road was effectively a minor 'no-through road' where the amount of traffic was relatively small. It was considered that the net increase of two dwellings would not increase the volume of traffic in the road to any significant extent, or have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

In short, the report suggested that the removal of the bungalow and its replacement with a terrace of three dwellings offered an opportunity to enhance the character and appearance of this part of Wrockwardine Wood. The proposed development would reflect the existing density, street pattern, and form of development in the vicinity of the site without adversely affecting the residential amenities of adjacent dwellings.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0764 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(e) TWC/2010/0820 Land off Queens Drive, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 7EU

This was an application for the erection of a pair of 4 bedroomed semi-detached dwellings with integral garages on a vacant 0.16 acre site situated between the rear gardens of nos. 4 and 6 Station Road and 1 Queens Drive. Determination of this application had been deferred until this meeting to enable Members to make a Site Visit.

Since the previous Plans Board two further representations had been received. The representations advise that clearance work had already begun on site and concerns were raised as to the effect this had had on the evidence of the appearance of crested newts on the site, damage to the roots of the ash tree fronting the site and damage to an old wall within the curtilage of a listed property and which would, therefore, have been protected.

The Report detailed the Officer's response to these responses, noting that the works were undertaken to address overgrown hedge growth and the removal of the soil/rubbish spoil mound from the front of the said site. The works were undertaken with the full knowledge and support of the neighbours and the developer was able to facilitate moving several shrubs etc into the adjoining gardens at the request of the occupiers. The developers were aware of legislation offering protection to wildlife and had taken steps to ensure that no nesting birds were disturbed or harmed. The Council's Ecologist had confirmed that it was unlikely that any Great Crested Newts would be harmed as a result of the hedge trimming.

The report detailed the results of a survey which had not revealed the presence of Great Crested Newts, however, Informatives were recommended to the effect that should Great Crested Newts be observed during development, works should cease and advice be taken.

Whilst clearing the site could have been considered premature given that the application had not yet been determined, planning permission was not required and the LPA could not have stopped the work under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). In fact, the works had revealed that an established but unprotected tree at the frontage of the site was unsafe and the developer had undertaken felling works and offered to plant a replacement tree at his own cost.

The report indicated that Council's Conservation Officer had no objections to the proposal.

A copy of the Inspector's Appeal Decision had been circulated to Members of the Board prior to the meeting.

Councillor A A Meredith, Ward Member, spoke against the application on behalf of local residents and stressed their concerns that the application was largely the same as an application for the site which had been granted by the Planning Inspector and urged Members to take account of a report by Mr Hatchet of Humphrey & Co which claimed that the Planning Inspector's decision was flawed.

Mrs R Borsley spoke against the application, noting that although the earlier application had been granted planning permission on appeal, the reasons for refusal remained the same, in that it constituted over-development, did not reflect the character of the area and subjected neighbouring properties to overlook. She further argued that the application was in contravention of the Wrekin Local Plan policies UD1, UD2 H6 and H12, raised issues surrounding visibility and parking and expressed concerns as to how any conditions could be monitored and what recourse was available in the event of breach.

Mr R Jones also spoke against the application on the basis that the legal advice he had commissioned and which had been referred to by Councillor Meredith, argued that the appeal had been granted by the Planning Inspector without knowledge of the listed status of neighbouring properties. He was of the view that the decision was not binding and that, since 2007, only a small percentage of refusals contrary to the Inspector's advice had resulted in charges being levied. He believed that the application lacked respect for the Wrekin Local Plan, the local environment and the status of listed buildings which had been built in 1840.

In response to Members' questions regarding the basis for refusing the previous application and why the current recommendation was for approval, the Head of Housing & Planning advised that the Planning Inspector's decision represented a material planning consideration which changed the position; he suggested that Members should decide whether their site visit had convinced them whether the location was unacceptable or that there were failings in the Inspector's case which justified continued refusal. Furthermore, he advised that despite any figures to the

contrary, this Council had previously been subjected to costs in cases where the Planning Inspector's decision had been set aside. The Legal Advisor advised that the Planning Inspector had taken his decision on very similar facts and his judgement should be respected. In the event of an appeal, as very little had changed, the decision could reasonably be expected to be the same.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0820 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and additional condition requiring side elevation windows to be obscure glazed.

(f) TWC/2011/0125 The Mount, 1 Haygate Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1QX

This application was considered in conjunction with Planning Application TWC/2011/0126. The application sought planning permission and associated listed building consent for the partial demolition of the existing building and Change of Use to form 11no. residential units, with associated internal and external alterations and construction of 12no. new residential units, with associated access parking and landscaping.

The Council as Applicant was seeking to release this site for residential development to enable wider improvements to the Civic Centre within Wellington District Centre, providing better community facilities (planning permission granted, ref: W2009/0505 and W2009/0515). The Council was seeking to release the necessary funds through the rationalisation and disposal of some of its land assets, such as the site, subject of this application.

The application site comprised the Grade II Listed Mount which was located in a prominent position on the corner of Haygate Road and Wrekin Road in a highly sustainable location within Wellington District Centre. It was an early 19th Century 3 storey property constructed in red brick with hipped slate roof. It had been extended and altered with a substantial 3 storey extension and more recent 2 storey flat roofed extensions to the side and rear and single storey elements. The Mount was currently used by Telford & Wrekin Council for its Children and Families Services.

The building was set back in a central position within the site with a large area of open space and tree planting to the front and substantial car parking area in an elevated position to the rear. The site was bounded by a substantial feature red brick wall including recessed brick bus shelter, and mixed trees/ shrubs to the north (front) of the site. The boundary treatment to the east comprised a dwarf wall and metal railings, with a grass verge area between the site and Wrekin Road, as well as hedge planting. The site was relatively open to the north and northeast and the Listed Building along with its modern 2-storey side extension was a prominent feature in the streetscene. To the south and west of the site, adjacent to residential properties/gardens was approximately 2 metre high chain link fencing and planting, with timber garden fencing beyond. Given the site's location within the District Centre, the area comprised a mix of uses, with residential and commercial development adjacent to the application site.

Wellington Town Council had raised no objections to the proposal. 5 neighbour letters, the comments of which were summarised in the report, had been received together with comments from Parks and Open Spaces, the Arboricultural Officer and Sustainability, all of which were also detailed in the report.

In response to these comments the report advised that Parks & Open Spaces referred to 24 units with 2 beds or more; however the scheme actually comprised 21 units and, therefore, the contribution towards upgraded recreation facilities would equate to £7875. In regard to Sustainability comments, the Code for Sustainable Homes requirements could be added as an informative and would also be addressed at Building Regulations stage. The neighbour concerns were also noted. The report indicated that other sites in Wellington may not have been within Telford & Wrekin Council's ownership or at its disposal. The development was principally to convert the building, however, this would not be financially viable or utilise the site area sufficiently. There should be a positive impact on wildlife and nesting birds as the proposal included the retention of existing trees and shrubs and additional planting on site. A loss of view and adverse impact on property values were not material planning considerations. Officers did not know the context and could not comment on another Council Department's decision to reject an application to purchase land adjacent to the site. The application did not propose new street lighting to St James Court.

Built Heritage Conservation had stated that the premises were listed but had suffered somewhat from inappropriate alteration and extension in the past. The application proposed to largely remove these inappropriate extensions and replace with moderately better extensions with more appropriate detailing. The overall appearance to the main listed property would, on balance, be an improvement and would result in a significant reduction of the footprint, reducing it much more to the core of the original building. To ensure that the detailing was appropriate, conditions were required re: door and window details, heads and cills, rain water goods, external services and bricks. The proposed new build types were typically bland, though some effort had been made to keep the buildings closest to The Mount itself, more in keeping. However, further details on windows were requested. The layout afforded a reasonable space to the listed building even given the two properties located nearby. The applicant had reduced the number of units from pre-application discussions, which made for a much better site layout.

The update report tabled at the meeting stated that the Council's Highways Engineer had requested that the applicant entered into an agreement to secure £1500 to enable the implementation of double yellow lines across a length of Wrekin Road between the mini roundabout with Victoria Road and the junction with Haygate Road. This was required to deter any on street parking on this length of road which may be associated with the development.

The update report also advised that the applicant had provided further information to Strategic Housing outlining that the release of the site with the maximum capital receipt was required in order to fund the new Wellington Civic Centre. In this regard Strategic Housing had confirmed that given the funding position, the scheme cannot provide any affordable housing, and that it be waived in this instance.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0125 the Head of Planning & Housing be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the update report and subject to written confirmation being received from the Head of Property & ICT to provide a financial contribution of £7875 towards upgrading of community use recreation facilities and £1,500 to enable implementation of double yellow lines on Wrekin Road

(g) TWC/2011/0126 The Mount, 1 Haygate Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1QX

This application was considered in conjunction with Planning Application TWC/2011/0125. The application sought partial demolition of existing building, and Change of Use to form 11no. Residential units with associated internal and external alterations and construction of 12no. new residential units, with associated access parking and landscaping.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0126 the Head of Planning & Housing be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the update report and subject to written confirmation being received from the Head of Property & ICT to provide a financial contribution of £7875 towards upgrading of community use recreation facilities and £1,500 to enable implementation of double yellow lines on Wrekin Road

(h) TWC/2011/0152 Netto Food Stores Ltd, Turreff Avenue, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 8EA

This was an application for variation of condition 7 of planning permission W2009/0272 to allow the premises to open to the public between the hours 08:00 to 22:00 Monday to Saturdays and 10:00 to 16:00 on Sundays.

Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton Parish Council had objected to the application and a local resident had also made objections all of which were detailed in the report. The update report tabled at the meeting indicated that the Applicants had submitted information in support of their application and in response to the Parish Council's objection which addressed potential disturbance to residents by way of noise on the basis that any potential noise disturbance that may arise through the extension of time which the store was open would not take place during the most sensitive period, and would end one hour before the 'night time' period began. In relation to the potential to cause disturbance by way of light pollution from signage, the Applicant had stated that the site was located on the edge of Donnington District Centre and did not occupy a 'dark skies' location with street lighting along Wrekin Drive and Turreff Avenue helping to diffuse the perception of light spillage from the site. Notwithstanding this, mitigation measures to prevent any potential increase in light pollution, for example turning off fascia signage and car park lighting when customers had left the store could be the subject of agreement. The Applicant also considered that the application proposed amendments to permitted trading hours only and would not impact upon the permitted delivery hours to the store. With regard to the fear of crime, the Applicant considered that extending the store opening

hours was likely to reduce any incidence of crime and anti-social behaviour, given that the Applicant was a responsible retailer and would ensure that the car park was properly managed during store opening times.

Councillor N A Dugmore considered that the application site was within a residential area with the nearest property in close proximity to the premises and he considered that significant disturbance could be caused to neighbouring properties. Although it was noted that the nearby Co-Operative Supermarket opened until 10pm and there were Takeaway premises in the locality which opened later, Councillor S A W Reynolds also argued that noise from trolleys could cause significant disturbance to nearby residents and, with advice from the Head of Housing & Planning, Members considered that the applicant should be approached to consider revised opening times.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2011/0152 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission following agreement being reached with the applicant to amend the application to reduce the variation to the hours 08:00 to 21:00 Monday to Saturdays instead of 08:00 to 22:00 Monday to Saturday, or refuse planning permission if no such amendments are made.

(In accordance with his declaration of interest Councillor N A Dugmore left the room during determination of the following application.)

(i) TWC/2011/0164 The Fields, Donnington Wood, Shropshire

This was an application made by Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton Parish Council relating to the change of use of a large area of flat grass to form 26 allotments on land at The Fields, Donnington. The allotments would range in size from 50 to 160 square metres. The site, which extended to 1.45 hectares, was designated as Green Network on the Wrekin Local Plan.

The application also included the erection of associated sheds, a storage container, and security fencing and gates. Each allotment would contain a shed which would be approximately 1.8 metres long, 1.3 metres wide and 1.98 metres high. The container, which would act as a communal tool storage facility, would be 6 metres long, 2.4 metres wide, and 2.6 metres high. The proposed boundary fencing would be 2.4 metres high, apart from along the eastern boundary, where it would be 1.8 metres high. Car parking for the allotments would be available in the existing car park adjacent to the Recreation Ground ball courts and would be shared with the users of the bowling greens and ball courts. Allotment holders would then access the site on foot along an existing public footpath. These arrangements were designed to prevent any potential increase in vehicular traffic along the narrow unadopted road to the south of the site.

The Parish Council had a long waiting list of people wanting an allotment in Donnington, and it had been searching for a suitable site for several years. This particular piece of land at The Fields had been identified as the only feasible site within this part of the Parish that could be used as allotments. Although it was located within the boundary of the Donnington Recreation Playing Fields, and was

freely available for anyone to use, it was not actually utilised for any formal recreation purposes. As the site was currently under-used, the Council's Outdoor Recreation Officer had no objection to it being used for allotments. The report stated that he felt there was ample room on the remainder of the recreation ground to adequately cater for all the recreational needs of this part of Telford.

The site was well screened along most of its boundaries and it was considered that the proposed use would not have any significant impact on the visual amenities of the area. With this in mind it was felt necessary to impose a condition to retain all existing boundary hedges. It was considered that the existing car park adjacent to the Recreation Ground ball courts was large enough to accommodate all the needs of the allotments, bowling greens, and ball courts. Although the site lay close to one of Telford's frequent bus routes it was believed that many allotment holders would take the opportunity to car-share with each other. Additionally, there was also good accessibility for people arriving on foot or by cycle.

The application site lay within the Council's Green Network where new development would not normally be acceptable. However, Policy OL4 of the Wrekin Local Plan permits development in the Green Network provided that the proposed development demonstrated that there were exceptional circumstances; it contributed to or was complementary to the aims of the Green Network; or environmental and community benefits were an integral part of the proposal. Although the proposal would result in the loss of recreational open space it was considered that the proposed use complied with Policy OL4 on the basis that it provided community benefits of a different kind for the residents of Donnington and the wider area. The proposed allotments would still offer a community provision according with the aims of the Green Network and other open space policies. Whilst the nature of the community facility would change, a community facility would remain.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0164 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(j) TWC/2011/0182 Land off, Cedar Close, Overdale, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 5BN

This was a part-retrospective application relating to the erection of a one metre high timber fence along the site frontage, and on the top of a retaining wall along part of the site boundary at Cedar Close, Overdale.

The fencing would comprise one metre high support posts and vertical pickets, spaced at equal intervals, and attached to two horizontal rails. The picket-style fence would be erected in two locations:

(a) to the right hand side of the entrance to a cul-de-sac of eight recently constructed dwellings, and adjoining No.7 Cedar Close – approximately 15 metres in length; and
(b) on top of a low wall, opposite six of the dwellings, alongside the private drive towards the top of the cul-de-sac – approximately 48 metres in length. The total height of the wall and fence would be approximately 1.5 metres.

Lawley and Overdale Parish Council had objected to the application as detailed in the report.

The report advised the Board that in normal circumstances the erection of a one metre high fence would be classed as permitted development which would not require planning permission. However in this particular case permitted development rights had been withdrawn from this development, and therefore all fences in and around the site required planning permission.

It was considered that the proposed fence along both the site frontage and above part of the side boundary was acceptable as it would relate positively to its context, and would respect and respond to the urban location. Furthermore, the fencing would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the site or the surrounding area, or adversely affect the residential amenities presently enjoyed by the occupants of the dwellings in the vicinity of the site.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0182 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(In accordance with his declaration of interest Councillor R T Kiernan left the room during determination of the following application.)

(k) TWC/2011/0183 Land Adjacent To, 17 Charlton, Telford. TF6 5EU

This application, which sought outline planning permission for the demolition of existing redundant greenhouse and erection of two detached dwellings, was a departure from the Local Development Framework Core Strategy. All matters were reserved for a further planning application, however, indicative plans of the layout, access arrangements and appearance and form of the dwellings had been included with the application.

The application site was formerly a plant nursery and still comprised large greenhouses which were located parallel to the highway and extend to the back of the modern bungalow at No.17 Charlton, with c.1.5m high hedge and grass verge between the greenhouses and the narrow highway. The existing drive access was located between the existing bungalow and the greenhouses. Charlton was a small linear settlement located within the rural area and comprised predominantly residential development surrounded by agricultural land. Residential development in Charlton comprised a mix of ages and types of properties. Adjacent to the greenhouses, there were 2 pairs of modern semidetached houses, which were set back from the highway with driveways and front garden areas. Opposite the site were also modern detached dwellings with substantial gardens to the front of the properties.

The report considered the application against Core Strategy Policy CS1, CS7, H9 of the Wrekin Local Plan (which had been superseded by Policy CS7 in the Core Strategy in 2007) and H10 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

The Design & Access Statement asserted the commercial greenhouse has been disused for more than 10 years and was an eyesore within the local community. The disused nature of the existing buildings was a material consideration.

The report concluded that in this particular case, the replacement of the greenhouses at the former nursery with residential development comprising 2 detached properties was acceptable as it would constitute an infill site and remove the existing structures which were disused and were becoming an eyesore. There was strong local support for the site to be redeveloped to residential dwellings to the benefit of the character and appearance of Charlton. Furthermore, there would not be a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities or highway safety. Accordingly, the proposal was considered an exception to local planning policy in the Core Strategy.

One neighbour letter of objection, the comments of which were summarised in the report, had been received and seven signatures in support had been appended to the application.

The Applicant's agent spoke in favour of the application which he considered would remove derelict eyesores from the land, contribute to the Council's housing policies and schemes and add to the vitality of the settlement. The proposed development had strong local support and he did not believe there would be any detrimental impact. As the application was for outline permission only, there was opportunity to address any potential issues during consideration of reserved matters, and it was intended that development would be built to high environmental standards.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2011/0183 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission following the expiry of the advertisement of the departure from planning policy and subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(l) TWC/2011/0192 Land adjoining, 1 Farm Grove, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 7PX

This was an application for the erection of two single garages in a single building with the remainder of the site surfaced with hardstanding, the provision of a new dropped kerb and double gates. Councillor A J Stanton, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

The application site was formerly garden land to No.16 Longford Road; however the property was sold off into separate ownership, (as the size of the rear garden appeared to be deterring potential purchasers of the property when it was originally for sale). The site was now entirely enclosed by timber boundary fencing, substantial Conifer hedge to highway (Farm Grove). There was an existing flat-roofed garage and driveway fronting Farm Grove. The existing garage was attached to the neighbour's garage at No.1 Farm Grove. The plot narrowed towards the rear and a culvert ran diagonally under the site with the adjoining properties experiencing flooding problems. Telford & Wrekin Council had previously carried out work to resolve the issues and rerouted the culvert through the Farm Grove development.

The application site had a long planning history with a number of proposals having been previously refused including renewal of the first outline application. Potential purchasers had been advised by the Local Planning Authority that it was unlikely the site could be developed for residential purposes although advice had been given that a mobile home (providing it looked like the neighbouring bungalows and not like a mobile home) or garages on the site would be most appropriate in principle.

Newport Town Council had objected to the proposal due to concerns regarding the impact of traffic over the culvert which was considered to be in a poor state of repair and eight letters of objection from local residents had been received raising issues detailed and addressed in the report.

The Ward Member, Councillor Stanton spoke against the application, drawing attention to the planning history of this modestly sized site with four other applications being considered in the previous 18 months. The current application appeared to represent a fresh way to extract revenue from the site by an owner living over 150 miles away who had not approached any local residents to gauge interest or demand for the proposed garages. He expressed concern that the design could encourage the groups to congregate at the site and queried the form of gating access and whether the structure, fixed to the garage at 1 Farm Grove, would be structurally sound. However, his primary concern was to secure the integrity of the culvert which was the main water course under West Newport and he feared that just as building above it could cause damage, the flow of heavy vehicles to and from the garages could have a detrimental effect. He pointed out that flooding had previously affected several properties at Farm Grove and, whilst he appealed to the Board to refuse the application, should planning permission be granted, he requested a condition that the land could not be transferred to residential property as it was not a suitable location for inhabited property.

Members noted the previous planning history, that the culvert was prone to flooding and the concerns raised by Councillor Stanton that there may be the opportunity for groups to congregate if the site was not secure and that the possibility of conversion to residential use in future should be ruled out. Furthermore, Members were anxious to ensure that the importance of the culvert to the area was highlighted.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0192 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and the addition of conditions requiring details of gates and that garages not be used for residential use and addition of Informatives regarding the status and location of the culvert to advise against damage.

(m) TWC/2011/0196 Land Off, St Matthews Road, Donnington, Telford.
TF2 7RB

This was an outline application, with all matters reserved for later consideration. A zoning plan had been submitted which identified the maximum areas for built development, no build areas incorporating green spaces and parking. The indicative layout demonstrated that 28 properties with a mix of scale size and style could be accommodated, which could be flexible to address the local need which had been identified for the area. The scale of development was from single to three storeys.

The plan showed a mix of parking arrangements for the dwellings with on plot parking, garaging and small parking courts, with at least 200% provision. The plan also demonstrated the provision of replacement parking for the lifelong learning centre and primary school.

Details of consultation responses were set out in the report, including details of a letter from a Head Teacher generally supporting the application with some reservation regarding use and location of secure car parking. The update report tabled at the meeting advised that a letter of concern had been received from the vicar of St Matthews Church opposite, regarding the design of the buildings not detracting from the Church and parking provision for the church congregation at regular services and events.

The report detailed planning considerations focussed on the principle of development; highways issues; design principles; drainage and ground conditions; open space, trees and ecology; and planning obligations, culminating in the conclusion that the scale and layout of the development was in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The indicative master plan demonstrated that the site could accommodate an acceptable mix of dwellings, with adequate parking provisions for the proposed dwellings. The site could be adequately drained; issues of land contamination and stability could be addressed and mitigated through conditions. There was adequate level of open space retained within the development, with management to be controlled by the developer. Accordingly, the proposal was acceptable in principle and complies with local and national policies.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0196 subject to the Council as landowner agreeing that the land would be bound by the obligations in respect of £33,000 for highways enhancement and £2,000 for Traffic Regulation Order for St Matthews Road that the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject further to the conditions as set out in the report.

(n) TWC/2011/0201 Former Shropshire Lad, Malinslee Local Centre, Brunel Road, Dawley, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 2HZ

This was a Council application which sought planning consent for the erection of three retail units in the form of a local supermarket (241.1sqm), a hairdressers (52.3sqm), and a hot food takeaway (39.3sqm). The proposal also included a dedicated service yard and the creation of 37 parking spaces including 4 dedicated disabled spaces. The application formed part of a wider master plan for the redevelopment of the local centre which was approved in June 2007. The masterplan included the erection of a new doctor's surgery, a child development centre, 4 retail units, residential development and a local equipped area of play following the demolition of the existing shops, community centre, surgery and public house.

The application site was predominately an area of hardstanding where the Shropshire Lad Public House and associated parking was previously located. The site had been cleared, and temporary fencing erected around the perimeter of the

site. The newly constructed Primary Care Trust building, a modern two storey flat roof building, abutted the western boundary of the site, sited on higher ground to the proposal. Further west of the site, the redeveloped Langley and St Leonards School, now Old Park School and Childrens Centre was located. This was a modern two storey and single storey flat roof building. Brunel Road abutted the eastern boundary of the site, acting as a link road through Malinslee, separating this area of community facilities with the wider residential estate. The site was well served by existing public transport links.

Great Dawley Parish Council raised no objections to the proposal subject to adequate lighting provision to the car park and one letter of objection had been received from a local resident, the content of which was detailed in the report.

The Planning Officer drew attention to the Highways Officer's concerns, detailed in the update report, relating to the contrived access for delivery vehicles to the access yard at the rear of the site, which crossed the pedestrian rights of way to the school, the nursery and the PCT. However after lengthy discussions with the applicant and the potential adjacent land user, it was considered there was no suitable alternative. The Highways Officer's suggestion to maintain a right of access to the land at the proposed Doctors Surgery had been strongly objected to by the doctors and, in addition, it still crossed over the pedestrian route to the school access and the Highway Officer had conceded this point.

Further information had been gained from the potential supermarket regarding deliveries which were confirmed as only 3 per week and the peak usage considered by the Highways Officer had been further investigated. The nursery confirmed approximately 20% of the 92 nursery places were part time, having only some movements into and from the site during lunch time. The PCT had a constant staggered flow of customers through appointments and it was subsequently agreed that the peak hours of use for this access were considered to be school drop off and pick up times. Taking this into account, in addition to the lack of objection from the adjacent school, nursery or PCT, and the few deliveries, the Highways Officer had considered that whilst the solution was far from ideal, the access to the service yard was acceptable subject to a restriction on hours of delivery. This was considered to be an enforceable condition, as the land was retained in Council ownership and could be reinforced through tenancy agreements. The Highways Officer requested that the hour restriction was increased to one and a half hours at both the start and end of the day, limiting delivery to the hours of 8am to 9.30am and 2.30pm to 4pm. This was considered acceptable by all parties.

The applicant had also requested that due to an issue with the costs of the proposed materials, the materials of the scheme were amended to a render finish, respecting that of the adjacent school and PCT. This was also considered acceptable by the Planning Authority, subject to a suitable finish and colour.

Councillor S Davies, local Ward Member, spoke in favour of the application, welcoming the development, identifying the shopping facilities as being a pressing need for local residents and looking forward to the additional community facilities offered by the masterplan. He urged the Members of the Board to grant planning consent for much needed facilities.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0201 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the update report

(o) TWC/2011/0212 27 Broomhurst Way, Muxton, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 8RG

This was an application for the erection of a two storey rear extension including a single storey conservatory, a first floor front extension and alteration of ground floor front window to a bow window. The property was a detached, 4 bedroom house situated within an established residential area. The property sat on a good sized plot with a reasonable sized rear garden. There was an existing rosewood upvc conservatory to the rear. Sufficient parking space was available to the front of the property. The rear garden was bounded by 2m high timber fencing and looked out to the side elevation of No.7 Sweet Briar Close. Neighbouring properties were of similar design and proportion and both neighbouring properties (No.25 and 29) had existing rear conservatories, both projecting similar to the one of the applicant's – approximately 3m.

On balance, the proposed development was considered to be acceptable. Despite a loss of rear garden space, adequate amenity space would remain. There would not be a significant impact on the neighbouring properties by virtue of any undue overlooking or loss of light. The proposed development would not have a significant detrimental impact on residential amenity or on the existing streetscene.

The applicant spoke in favour of the development noting that the local area showed a mix of two and three storey developments which led to his feeling that the development was not uncharacteristic and did not represent an overdevelopment at the site. He further pointed out that over look would only occur on one side of the property which would be from a small glazed window to an ensuite bathroom. Furthermore, there had been no objection from immediate neighbours who he understood were happy for the development to continue.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0212 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(p) TWC/2011/0230 Dawley Regeneration, Dawley, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for the installation of a 15m high telecommunications mast with ancillary development, including 6 cabinets (4 cabinets measuring 770x750x1940mm, 1 cabinet measuring 770x750x2000mm and 1 cabinet 770x645x2069mm) with a 1.8m high security fence with a 1.5m wide access gate and three protective bollards, given the location in a service yard.

The application site was currently a vacant site undergoing extensive earthworks to treat for contamination and create development platforms for the wider regeneration project. The site is to the north east of the former Lord Hill Public House and approx 40m south of dwellings in Lancaster Court. The approved masterplan for the outline consent indicated that this site was part of the supermarket site in the delivery area,

with the new supermarket to the south, and buffer planting on the embankment to the north and west, with parking and planting to the east.

Great Dawley Parish Council had objected to the application due to the location proximity to a proposed new school and residential home and to residential properties in Lancaster Avenue. One third party letter of objection on the grounds of health and safety of people living and working in the vicinity of masts had also been received.

The proposed monopole and ancillary equipment was considered an acceptable installation in this district centre location, where the appearance of a slimline monopole would not detract from the character of the area. The siting and design of the proposed development would ensure that there was no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the locality and the general street scene. Furthermore, proximity to dwellings was not a planning issue provided that the application included an ICNIRP Declaration regarding emissions, which this application did, and that the installation satisfied normal planning considerations regarding the siting and appearance of development.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0230 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(q) TWC/2011/0243 The Wellington Arms, 3 Whitchurch Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 3AG

This was an application which sought to erect a 900mm high rendered block wall to create an area to the front of the premises for outside dining and drinking. This area was to include a shelter comprising a black 3mx4m Jumbrella with integrated heaters. The removal of an existing low wall to the side of the premises and the erection of a 1.1m chain link fence to provide access to the designated smoking area from the rear drinking area.

The application site was a vacant public house sited on the junction of Whitchurch Road and The Lawns. An early 19th Century detached building, it was registered as a building of local interest, but outside the Wellington Conservation Area. There were currently 5no. parking spaces and bollards on the front, additional spaces were also located to the side and rear. In total the site had provision for 26 car parking spaces around the perimeter. The north side had car parking spaces bounded by high fencing with residential flats (Eagle Court) beyond. There was also a sizeable amount of land to the rear with existing tarmac area but unfortunately this land appeared unkempt due to the premises being closed.

Wellington Town Council had objected to the application on the grounds of road safety and highways issues with health hazards for potential users. Six letters of objection had been received from local residents, whose concerns were detailed in the report, together with details of 3 letters in support of the application from 4 neighbouring properties which welcoming the development and investments due to take place at the site.

Although Highways had raised an issue with regard to car parking spaces, the level of car parking remains unchanged and spaces would remain at 26. The site was considered accessible as it abutted Whitchurch Road which was on a bus route and within walking distance of the Town Centre, and the residential community which surrounded it. Consideration had also been made to there being external seating areas, and therefore use being naturally limited to fair weather, in addition to the application site being a public house where customers may not be driving to the facility. There was no change to the vehicle access to the site. As there was no change in internal accommodation, and the level of parking remained the same, it was considered the proposal will not have an adverse impact on highway safety.

The applicant stated that there was increased demand for outside dining. They had carefully designed the alfresco dining area to minimise noise break out and impact on amenity and no music would be played outside. This would be adequately controlled through condition; furthermore hours of use could be restricted.

With regard to other comments raised by objectors, customers would not have to walk through the smoking area, as this would be sectioned off at the side of the building. The use was already existing and subsequently it was not considered that the proposal would negatively impact anti social behaviour. With regard to doors being propped open during summer months, this was not a planning consideration, however the issue could be controlled through fire regulations.

Since the preparation of the report to members, additional comments had been received from a local resident and Councillor M G Ion, Ward Member. Councillor Ion objected on the grounds of the effect on nearby residential properties, particularly for the residents of Eagle Court, potential noise nuisance caused by customers using the 'Jumberella' late at night. road safety issues that may ensue from an overspill of drinkers onto pavement and main road and the detrimental impact on the aesthetics of this locally listed building caused by the proposed wall and chain link fence. He further commented upon the applicant's assertion that there was increased demand for outside dining, arguing that no data had been offered in support of this assertion, and further stating that a significant number of local residents had expressed their opposition to this application in the past weeks.

The update report noted that there was no data to support the statement that there was increased demand for outside dining, but that Punch Taverns had seen increased demands for eating outside and, therefore, Public Houses were trying to facilitate this trend.

The local resident had commented that they would be pleased to see the premises occupied once more but without the addition at the front of the premises, issues which had been addressed in the report.

Mr R Vickers, Chair of Wellington Civic Society and College Ward PACT and a member of other local organisations spoke against the application, expressing surprise that the Licensing Authority and Environmental Health were not consultees to the application and were also not aware of previous problems at the site. He considered that the application would affect the aesthetics and character of the historic and locally listed building, that the site would be prone to littering and the

provision of tables for al fresco dining would encourage customers of local takeaway premises to congregate and cause noise after opening hours. He expressed further concern about road safety and traffic management.

Given the concerns raised with to road safety, alfresco dining and the impact on the character of the site, in order to ensure that a secure and reasonable decision was made on the application, it was considered that a site would give some context to these issues.

RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2011/0243 be deferred to allow the Board Members to make a Site Visit.

(r) TWC/2011/0249 News Express, Land adjacent, 90 Trench Road, Trench, Telford, Shropshire

This application was for the renewal of an extant planning permission for the erection of a two storey house on land at the junction of Trench Road and Wombridge Road, in Trench, on what was currently part of the car park of the Stars Convenience Store. The land was located in the centre of Trench, at the junction of Trench Road and Wombridge Road, and is at present a large flat tarmac area which was used for car parking for the Stars Convenience Store at 90 Trench Road. There were approximately 20 parking spaces within the car park.

The proposed house would comprise a lounge, kitchen, dining room, hall and cloakroom on the ground floor, and three bedrooms and a bathroom on the first floor. The external materials of the house would comprise traditional bricks and tiles. There would be an attached garage to the south of the house, with one parking space in front of it. The driveway for the house would be approximately in the same position as the existing access into the car park from Wombridge Road. A new vehicular access for the shop car park would be provided from Wombridge Road into a smaller car park which would adjoin the existing retail shop. The car park would accommodate six public parking spaces, and one space for the residents of the flat above the shop.

Wrockwardine Wood and Trench Parish Council had objected to the application and one letter of objection had been received from a local resident, both objections related primarily to highways and road safety issues and were detailed in the report.

The report considered that the proposed house would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities presently enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent dwellings by virtue of any undue overlooking, loss of light, or any overbearing effect.

It was acknowledged that the existing car park was under-used for most of the time, and the Council's Highways Engineer considered that the future capacity of six spaces was sufficient to accommodate the parking needs of the Stars shop. In addition, the report addressed the concerns of the Parish Council and advised that the Council's Highways Engineer did not consider that there had been any material changes over the past three years and the comments he had made at the time of the previous application still applied. He reiterated the fact that he had no objections to

the application and that he did not consider that the new dwelling and vehicular access would jeopardise highway safety.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0249 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(s) TWC/2011/0254 23 Queen Street, Wellington, Telford, TF1 1EH

This was an application for planning permission for the erection of a two storey building attached to No.23 Queen Street, an existing House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) to create a 5-bed HMO, with communal amenity space to the rear.

Former Councillor Mrs R G Chaplin, the previous Ward Member, had requested, prior to the local elections in May 2011, that the application be determined by the Plans Board as she considered the proposal represented an overdevelopment of the site and appeared to be a 3-storey development rather than 2-storey. Although these comments were noted, the report advised that the site area was substantial and could accommodate the development. The building was of a similar form and scale and represented a subservient addition to the adjoining terrace. Furthermore, the proposal related to the adjoining property which also comprised HMO accommodation over 3 storeys although it appeared as a 2-storey dwelling when viewed from Queen Street. There were other box dormers on properties in the vicinity creating 2nd floor accommodation in the roofspace. Accordingly, officers considered the proposal was not overdevelopment and the 3 storey element was acceptable.

Following initial adverse highways comments regarding proposed access and parking arrangements on to Ten Tree Croft (narrow geometry and poor visibility), the proposed parking provision (3 spaces) to the rear of the site had been omitted, and the proposal did not include any onsite parking. Accordingly there were no highway objections to the proposed HMO as the site was located in a sustainable location within the District Centre and close proximity to the railway station and bus station. Thus it was considered that parking provision for the 5 bedsits was not required and its omission would ensure there was no adverse impact on highway safety in terms of additional vehicle movements on to Ten Tree Croft and exiting on to Bridge Street.

The report concluded that the principle of an attached building comprising an HMO with 5 bedsits was acceptable in this highly sustainable location and adjacent to the existing HMO. The scale, design and form of the development were in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing property and the area. The proposal comprised sufficient amenity space which was acceptable in this instance there was no parking provision given the sustainable location and proximity to services and public transport. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities. Accordingly, officers considered the proposal complied with both national and local planning policies.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0254 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(t) TWC/2011/0302 Telford & Wrekin Register Office, The Beeches, 29 Vineyard Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1HB

This was a Council application which sought consent for the conversion of the existing registry office (B1) to conversion to two dwelling houses (C3). The registrar's office would be relocated to the new Wellington Civic Centre upon completion in autumn 2011. There were minor external alterations which included the creation of two doors and one window and a number of blocked windows would be reopened.

The subject of the development, a late 19th Century gable property was not listed, nor recognized on the local list. Furthermore the unit was not within the conservation area. The building was originally erected as one dwelling, being converted in the early 1980s and it was considered the proposed use could easily be accommodated within the existing structure, without adversely effect the character of the traditional property. In fact, the property would benefit from the reopening of some windows, restoring the building to its former glory and as the property had only been subject to some limited alterations and possessed architectural merit, consideration was being made to place the property on the Councils Local List, as a building of local interest.

In addition, the update report tabled at the meeting advised that the Arboricultural Officer had confirmed the importance of six trees within the site, and had subsequently placed a Tree Preservation Order on those trees. Although he had raised no objections to the development, he did require further detail for the proposed fence and its installation which were within 1metre of the trunks of two TPO'd trees, an issue which could be dealt with through condition.

It was considered that the restoration of the existing building to residential use was acceptable; the proposed subdivision to form semidetached units could be adequately accommodated within the existing building and the curtilage of the site, providing adequate amenity area, and parking facilities. The proposal would not be overlooked or adversely affected by adjacent uses. Subsequently the proposed alterations complied with both local and national planning policy.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0302 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the update report.

The meeting ended at 8.14pm

Chairman:

Date: