

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 8th December, 2010 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

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

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor A.A. Meredith (for planning application TWC/2010/0046), Councillor A.D. McClements (for planning application TWC/2010/0314 and Councillor A.J. Eade (for planning application TWC/2010/0428)

PB-57 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the Plans Board held on the 17th November, 2010 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PB-58 APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE

Councillor D.R. Chaplin

PB-59 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor G.M. Green declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application TWC/2010/0492.

PB-60 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

PB-61 SITE VISITS

None.

PB-62 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

(a) TWC/2010/0046 -Tudor Rose Cottage, 4 Chetwynd End, Newport, Shropshire

This application sought full planning permission for the erection of a small, single storey rear extension to provide a utility room and WC, the installation of two pitched roofs over the existing flat roofed extension and the proposed extension, and a detached sun room in the rear garden. The application was part retrospective as the detached timber sun room/shed had already been erected. Planning permission was only required for the single storey rear WC and utility room extension, the installation of the pair of pitched roofs and the retention of the sun room shed, as the other proposed alterations were permitted development and only required Listed Building Consent, for which an application had been submitted. Tudor Rose Cottage was a Grade II Listed Building within the Newport Conservation Area and was the end

property in a row of six dwellings. Determination of the application had been deferred at the previous meeting of the Board to allow Members to make a Site Visit.

There was a common boundary between the application site and the adjoining property, No 6 'The Honey House' comprising the rear wall of the kitchen and outbuilding belonging to that property. Representations had been received from the owner of No. 6. Some of the issues raised were in respect of an on-going neighbour dispute concerning the sandblasting of the boundary wall, which had resulted in the bricks becoming porous. The other issues raised were summarised in the report, including that of an ongoing damp problem.

The Council's Conservation Officer had no objections to the proposal subject to appropriate conditions. Representations had been received from the occupant of The Honey House on a number of issues, including that of on-going damp, as described in the report. The existing flat roof over the kitchen extension, which had Upvc windows, detracted from the character and appearance of the Listed Building. An earlier consent had allowed a pitched roof over part of the existing rear extension but this revised design, which included removal of the flat roof, would be an enhancement which would have a positive impact upon the character and appearance of the Listed Building, the street scene, and the Conservation Area.

The sun room, which had the appearance of a large garden shed, was not attached to the Listed Building or visible within the public domain and, therefore, would have no impact upon the character and appearance of the Listed Building or the Conservation Area. It was positioned close to the boundary wall with No.6, which the owner of that property considered would impede her access to the wall for maintenance purposes. However, there was no minimum separation distance required between the structure and the wall for maintenance access and it was not a material planning consideration and was covered by separate legislation. The Council could not insist that the applicant amended the proposal in this way and it was considered that the proposed development was acceptable in policy and design terms and would help to solve the existing damp issues.

Whilst the damp issue was not a material planning consideration, officers considered that the proposed extension would help to alleviate the problems experienced by both the applicant and the neighbour. Building the small extension adjoining the neighbour's boundary wall would allow the applicant's rainwater guttering and foul drainage arrangement to be altered. The guttering would be re-routed into the valley gutter between the two new pitched roofs and the extension sealed and lead flashed to the wall of no.6 with the box gutter adjacent to the neighbour's wall draining to a soakaway in the applicant's garden. The abutting of the new extension to the existing boundary rear wall would also cover the area of sandblasted brickwork and any damp proof membrane inserted into the neighbour's wall would further prevent ingress of damp. The extension would be constructed upon a raft foundation which would minimise the amount of excavation required and ensure the stability of the neighbouring property.

As the proposed extension would adjoin the neighbour's wall, their consent would be needed for this work to go ahead. Notice had been served on the owner but any subsequent refusal for any works on their land was not a planning matter. The

design of the proposed rear extension for the utility room and WC was considered acceptable and beneficial to the neighbouring property. The proposed development complied with the Council's 45 degree code, sufficient private amenity space would be retained and parking was unaffected.

Councillor A.A. Meredith spoke on behalf of the owner of No. 6 Chetwynd End. He said that she had no objections to proposed extensions but would wish there to be a 1 metre gap to allow access for maintenance purposes. She accepted that both her own and the applicant's architects were of the view that the proposed extensions would help to alleviate the damp problems but with only a 50% chance of success. In addition to addressing the Board, Councillor Meredith had circulated written information which included a comment made by the objector that, in the event of the application being approved and she no longer having access to her wall, she would have no option but to sue the Plans Board for negligence and seek damages.

Mr. T. Rowland, agent for the applicant, responded to Councillor Meredith's comments. He outlined the ways in which the proposed works would address the issues of damp and added that No. 6 itself did not have a damp course.

The Council's Solicitor outlined the relevance of the Party Wall Act with regard to this application and briefly outlined the process, which existed alongside the planning process, to provide a process in situations such this where the proposed wall was going to abut the boundary. He also referred to the threat to sue the Board made by the owner of No. 6 and informed the Members that, in the circumstances of this application, there was no realistic prospect of any liability on the Local Planning Authority should the permission be granted and the threat should be disregarded.

Councillors V.A. Fletcher and J.A. Francis expressed concerns regarding the issue of damp and, in addition, Councillor Fletcher considered that the new gables on the proposed extension would not enhance the character of the Listed Building. Conversely, Councillor F.R. Picken said that abutting the wall of the extension to the existing party wall would be the preferable option to resolve the issue of damp. Councillor G.M. Green said that she would abstain from any vote on the application as she considered that the application was the subject of a neighbour dispute over which the Board had no jurisdiction.

In response the Head of Housing & Planning informed the Members that the issue of damp was not a planning matter and that there were technical means available to address them should the owner of No. 6 be so minded. With regard to the impact of the new gables on the Listed Building, the Planning Officer responded that this was a matter of balance but the Council's Conservation Officer considered the proposal to be acceptable and it had been designed to address the current situation.

Councillor H. Rhodes proposed the recommendation to grant planning approval, as set out in the officer report, but there was no seconder. Therefore, Councillor V.A. Fletcher, seconded by Councillor J.A. Francis, proposed that planning permission be refused on the grounds that the application was contrary to Policies HE3 and HE16 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0046 planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The Local Planning Authority considered that the alterations and extensions to the Listed Building would result in the loss of architectural features and not maintain the essential form, character, or historic interest of the building and would adversely affect its setting. Accordingly, the application was contrary to Policy HE16 of the Wrekin Local Plan;
2. The Local Planning Authority considered that the alterations and extensions to the Listed Building would not be of the highest standards of design required to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, the application was contrary to Policy HE3 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

(b) TWC/2010/0093 - All Labour In Vain, Wellington Road, Horsehay, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for the demolition of the existing public house and the erection of 7 three bedroom and 2 four bedroom dwellings on a site of approximately 0.29ha in size. The wider area was predominantly residential in character and comprised largely two storey development. The site was designated as 'white' land in the Wrekin Local Plan and there was a presumption in favour of development which accorded with other policies within the Development Plan.

Objections had been received from the occupants of four properties, as set out in the report and Dawley Hamlets Parish Council had raised concerns regarding the loss of the existing pub as a community facility under policy CS10 of the Core Strategy. However, as set out in the report, the Council's approach to this had been supported by the Planning Inspector at the appeal for the loss of the Charlton Arms public house and hotel in Wellington and officers considered that the provision of other public houses and facilities was sufficient to meet the daily needs of local residents.

6y6

The proposed buildings would front the adjacent road with private gardens and parking to the rear, an acceptable layout which responded well to the surrounding context of development. The buildings would be two storeys in height and of an appropriate scale and massing to reflect residential development in the area. There was a change of ground level within the site, which the design of the properties had exploited to give a two storey front elevation and a three storey rear elevation. Amended plans had been received to alter the front porches to plots 5 and 6 and to remove the balconies proposed in the original plans, as set out in the report and, accordingly, the proposal complied with policies CS15 of the Core Strategy and UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

The neighbouring properties were situated on approximately the same ground level as the proposed front elevation of the dwellings with a separation distance of between 15 and 34m, given the shape of the plots. This was considered sufficient to ensure that the development would not have an adverse impact, in terms of privacy,

overlooking and outlook, on the residential amenities of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed layout had one plot with direct access off the road, the other 8 plots being served by a private drive, together with provision for 2 allocated parking spaces per dwelling, 5 visitor spaces and a turning facility. This level of parking provision was considered acceptable and the Highways Officer considered that there would be no detrimental impact on highway safety, subject to appropriate conditions to ensure these were laid out and available for use prior to occupation of the dwellings.

With respect to ecology, the proposal had been amended to include additional planting along the north boundary to increase the opportunity for biodiversity on the site and to protect the nesting birds which had been identified on the site. These measures could all be controlled through the imposition of appropriate conditions as set out in the report.

Neighbour objections had been raised regarding issues of noise and disruption during the construction period but these would only have a short term impact and could be adequately controlled through an appropriate condition. With regard to drainage issues, it was considered that a scheme requiring further details would be sufficient to ensure that the site was adequately drained.

Members expressed regret at the loss of this community facility but recognised that the application before them would provide housing for the borough and was a preferable alternative to the building becoming derelict.

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0093 be granted planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(c) TWC/2010/0314 - 45 Dawley Road, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought planning permission to change the use of the existing retail unit, which was sited at the end of a row of shops with two floors of residential accommodation above, from a delicatessen (Use Class A1) to a combined delicatessen and hot food take-away (Use Class A5). The application form stated that there would be 1 full-time and 1 part-time employee with proposed hours of opening of 10am to 11pm 7 days a week. Councillor A.D. McClements, the Ward Member, had requested that the application be considered by the Plans Board.

A communal car parking area was located to the front of the units, which was in a modern, flat-roofed building located within a predominantly residential area on the edge of Wellington. While not designated as a District Centre, it was a Local Centre. There were currently no take-away units within the row of shops, which had a mix of uses including a betting office, an off-licence, a motor supplies shop, a Halal butchers, with a convenience store located on Dawley Road. .

Wellington Town Council had objected to the application as summarised in the report and the Wellington Local Policing Team and the Wrekin Housing Trust, which owned the unit and residential units above, had objected on the grounds that the area

around the shops had historically been subject to anti-social behaviour, which they had worked hard to resolve. The Policing Team considered that the take-away would increase such problems by remaining open to 2300hrs and would result in concern and disturbance to local residents. Fifteen letters of objection had been received from local residents, as summarised in the report. There had also been a significant amount of support for the proposal on the grounds that there were no take-aways in the area and one would be of benefit to the local community. The update report tabled at the meeting clarified that the objections had been submitted by residents of the flats above the shops and in close vicinity of the application site with the letters of support being predominantly from residents in Arleston and Wellington, including Dawley Road, with some from the wider area of Telford and Shropshire.

Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy outlined Local Centres such as Arleston as the focus for accessible local services and small scale community facilities to meet people's day-to-day needs. The mix of uses within a local centre should be carefully managed and the development must assist in creating vibrant, safe and attractive places with a design that reflected and responded to the locality. As outlined in the report, the nearest take-aways were some 300 metres distant on Watling Street. Therefore, officers considered that the proposal would conform to this policy and would not result in a proliferation of such food outlets.

In regard to guidance in policies PPS23 and PPG24 and the concerns raised by objectors, officers had discussed the proposal with the Council's Environmental Health Officer and had sought amendments to the scheme. The Environmental Health Officer had no objections subject to conditions to ensure that the development was implemented in accordance with the revised scheme and noise levels were strictly controlled. The update report tabled at the meeting informed the Board that the Precautionary Principle referred to in PPS23 and PPG24 should be followed if there was a likelihood that a development would have harmful effects on health, in terms of pollution from noise and odour, etc., but not with regard to other aspects such as antisocial behaviour.

The Police had been requested to provide evidence of the problems at these shops and whether the suggested earlier closing time of 2200 hours would improve the situation. They had responded that in the past twelve months there had been 44 incidents of anti-social behaviour reported in the vicinity together with 8 recorded crimes. Consequently, there was a high fear of crime in the area, which local agencies had attempted to address. The shops were a community focal point and attracted groups of people which the police considered would be increased if the application was approved. Closing at 2200 hours rather than 2300 hours would make little difference and the opening of a late night take away at this location would result in increases in crime and anti-social behaviour in addition to increased volume of complaints to the Local Authority regarding noise nuisance and litter. Any community benefits arising from the application would be outweighed by the inevitable reduction in confidence and the increase in fear of crime that would be experienced by local residents. Should planning permission be granted, the Police had requested that a good quality CCTV system covering the inside and outside of the premises be installed and maintained and, if the owners were proposing to include a delivery service into their business model, consideration should be given to

how this operated, particularly if vehicles were frequently coming and going from the premises. Furthermore, there should be no gaming machines on the premises. Officers had noted these and the update sheet tabled at the meeting recommended that these points be addressed by appropriate conditions.

The unit currently had a metal vent on the side gable wall to provide extraction for food cooked in association with the delicatessen and the submitted scheme had been amended by the installation of a new extraction system whereby an external flue, extending 1.5m above the flat roof of the 3 storey building, was attached to the side gable wall in order to meet Environmental Health requirements. However, as the flue would be set back some 5.5m from the frontage of the shop unit towards the rear of the building, it would not be overly prominent in the streetscene. Neither would it significantly alter the character or appearance of the building and details of materials could be conditioned to ensure it was in an appropriate finish.

The revised scheme had addressed the concerns raised regarding noise and odour from the extraction system and it was considered that a reduction in the proposed hours of opening would reduce the noise and disturbance from customers and vehicles and minimise the adverse impact on adjoining residential amenities. Therefore, officers had suggested that a condition stating that the take-away must close at 10pm with staff vacating the premises by 10.30pm would be appropriate. In addition, the applicant had stated that an additional litter bin would be installed at the shop unit, the location of which could be agreed by condition.

With regard to other concerns raised, officers did not consider that approval for a take-away in this unit would set a precedent for further approvals as all applications were considered on their individual merits and with regard for the relevant national and local policies. The unit shared the existing communal parking area and it was considered that the proposal would not lead to parking problems. The site was in a sustainable location in an existing local centre close to Wellington District Centre within an established residential area. The Highways Engineer had no objections and there are no highway safety issues. On balance, whilst the change of use had caused concern for some local residents, there was also significant local support for the proposal.

Councillor A.D. McClements, Ward Councillor for Arleston, spoke against the application and stressed the concerns of local residents, the police, Wellington Town Council and the Wrekin Housing Trust, as owners of the property, relating to anti-social behaviour, crime, noise, smell and litter. These views were supported by Joanna Deacon, a local resident, who said that approval of this application would exacerbate the existing problems centred on the shops.

In response the applicant's agent, David Humphreys, referred to the amended scheme and proposed installation of a flue to address the issues of noise and smell, which had complied with the requirements of the Environmental Health Officer. He referred to other similar applications within Telford & Wrekin where the police had recognised the benefit of increased surveillance when a shop was open. He considered that the applicant had addressed and fully complied with all the issues which were within his control.

Members expressed support for the views put forward by objectors, particularly those of local residents. Whilst it was not possible to legislate against anti-social behaviour the Council did have a duty to prevent the environment that fostered such behaviour.

There being no proposer and seconder for the officer recommendation that the application be approved, it was proposed and seconded that it be refused.

RESOLVED - that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0314 planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. **The Local Planning Authority considered the proposed change of use to a take-away facility was unacceptable as it would result in the loss of a retail unit, leading to a proliferation of take-away establishments within the Arleston locality, and consequently would be detrimental to the character of the predominantly residential area. Subsequently the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS5, CS9 and CS15 of the Core Strategy;**
2. **The Local Planning Authority considered the proposed change of use was inappropriate in this location as it would result in an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance caused by customers and vehicle movements, to the detriment of residents in the flats above the shops, Dawley Road and the surrounding properties in a predominantly residential area. Furthermore the proposal would lengthen the opening hours of these retail units increasing the level of disturbance to existing residential properties in an area which was already subject to a high level of antisocial behaviour. Accordingly it was contrary to Policy CS9 & CS15 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained in PPG24 Planning and Noise;**
3. **It was also considered that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on highway safety caused by the increase in traffic and the existing parking inadequacies which were shared by residents and retail users. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and PPG13 Transport.**

(d) TWC/2010/0428 - Longford Cottage, Longford Road, Newport, Shropshire

This application sought permission for the demolition of an existing double garage and the erection of a double garage, garden store and shower with ancillary living accommodation over and an internal staircase on the ground floor. The proposed building measured 9m. wide, 6.3m. deep and 6m. high with walls of facing brickwork and concrete tiles for the pitched roof to match those used on the adjacent house. The existing flat roof garage was of no special architectural merit

Councillor A.J. Eade, the Ward Councillor, had requested that the application be determined the Plans Board. He considered that the proposed development was acceptable and that any issues relating to the future use of the replacement garage

could be dealt with by conditions. Determination of the application had been deferred at the previous meeting of the Board to allow Members to make a Site Visit.

The applicants had stated that the ancillary living accommodation would only be used as guest or overflow accommodation. When applications for double garages with living accommodation over were submitted officers endeavoured to ensure that the proposals were not overly large and only provided basic amenities so that the accommodation remained subsidiary to the main dwelling. The more conducive or advantageous was the accommodation the more likely it was to be used as a main residence or separate household, which could then lead to enforcement proceedings. Therefore, officers normally requested the omission of all dormer windows, although rooflights were acceptable, and the provision of outside staircases.

Officers had no objection in principle to the application but considered that the scale and size of the proposed development would be inappropriately large for an ancillary structure and that the dormer windows were too domestic in appearance and contributed to the over-size of the building. It had been proposed to the applicants that, if they were willing to replace the dormer windows with rooflights, the size of the accommodation and the internal staircase could be considered to be acceptable. However, the applicants were unwilling to agree to this change and the proposal, as submitted, did not relate positively to its context or respect and respond to the site and its surroundings. Therefore, it was considered that the new building would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding environment.

Councillor A.J. Eade, Ward Member for Church Aston & Lilleshall, spoke in support of the application. He said that the proposed development was at the rear of the site and, as it was not overlooked by any other property, would have no detrimental impact of neighbouring amenities and the barn sited to the side of the application site would dwarf the proposed garage. In conclusion, he considered that the scheme would respect and respond to the site. He referred to the concern that the garage could be used as a residence but assured the Board that this was not the applicant's intention, as the building would be too small, but such a use could be controlled by the imposition of an appropriate condition.

Several Members considered that, following the site visit and given the size of the site, the proposed garage would not be overbearing. In addition, the Chairman agreed that the structure would be too small to be used as a domestic dwelling. However, Councillor H. Rhodes drew the Board's attention to the fact that the application was contrary to policy.

On being put to the vote, the officer recommendation that the application be refused was not supported. A proposal, as seconded, that planning permission be granted was approved by a majority vote.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0428 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to a condition restricting the use of the garage to parking and storage

with ancillary accommodation above but not to be a separate unit of accommodation and to determine appropriate conditions.

(e) TWC/2010/0458 - 62 Wrekin Road, Wellington, Shropshire

This application from Telford & Wrekin Council sought full planning permission for the conversion of the traditional single storey, former school building, the erection of 4 terraced dwellings to the rear of the site, with associated parking, a new site access, associated landscaping and engineering works. The building currently provided offices for Council services which would be relocated to the new Wellington Civic Centre. The proposal also included a new roundabout to serve Wrekin Road and 'Roseway'. The application site was located in a predominantly residential area comprising Victorian and inter-war terraces together with modern semi-detached houses and flats.

Wellington Town Council had no objection to the proposal. The Highways Officer had no objection in principle subject to conditions regarding the construction of car parking and the mini roundabout. The Conservation Officer considered that, as the existing use was in itself a conversion, the principle of converting the building was acceptable. The Council's Arboricultural Officer, had prepared a tree survey, as submitted with the application, which acknowledged that retention of all the existing trees on the site might not be possible and recommended that a condition regarding replacement planting be imposed. The School Organisation Officer had advised that, as the capital receipt would be used to support the Borough Towns Initiative, a contribution towards educational facilities from this development would not be sought. The Parks & Open Space Officer had requested a contribution towards upgrading the offsite recreational facilities and, following negotiations with the applicant, had requested a contribution of £375 per dwelling. Three neighbour letters of objection had been received, as summarised in the report.

The development site was classed as white land and, therefore, there was a presumption in favour of development. The building did not benefit from any statutory or local protection and could be demolished without planning consent. However, the applicant had sought to protect and preserve the character of the site, which was in a highly sustainable location close to Wellington District Centre. Its development would help to provide community benefits in the area and, therefore, the proposal complied with policy CS5.

The conversion of the existing building would provide 8no. 2 bedroom duplex apartments with mezzanines to provide additional bedroom and bathroom accommodation for each unit. The proposal also sought to demolish the existing modern single storey elements including a flat-roofed extension which did not enhance or relate to the main building; this would create a central courtyard area. There would be a combination of small private garden areas to the north of the building and communal areas and a total of 8 allocated parking spaces and 8 visitor spaces would be provided. To the rear of the building a terrace of 4 new units comprising 2½ storey 3-bedroom properties was proposed with single parking spaces to frontages and amenity space to the rear, which was considered acceptable. The existing vehicular access would be replaced by a widened access

point in a central position directly opposite Roseway, with a new mini roundabout on Wrekin Road to improve highway safety, which would improve highway safety.

The layout, scale and design of the new properties were considered acceptable and in keeping with the existing building and the character of the surrounding area. The alterations to the building and removal of the modern extensions were also deemed appropriate and the Conservation Officer considered that the revised scheme, with a reduction in rooflights, was of an acceptable design and appearance. The scale and design of the terraced row was in keeping with the context of the existing building and adjoining development in Wrekin Road and the orientation of the new dwellings would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties. The existing boundary wall along Wrekin Road would be removed but other boundary walls would be retained and raised to 1.8m to maintain privacy to existing and proposed properties together with 1.8m timber fencing between the units. The proposal provided adequate amenity space which it was considered would not have a detrimental impact on existing or proposed residential amenity. However, it was suggested that a condition to remove householder permitted development rights would ensure that residential amenity to both existing and proposed residents was preserved. Therefore, it was considered that the proposal complied with H6 and UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

With regard to objections raised by neighbouring occupants, it was considered that security would be improved as continual use of the site would provide natural surveillance rather than only during office hours as at present. With regard to the impact on the existing retaining wall, the applicant would have to ensure such walls were adequately retained in order to comply with building regulations. With regard to the value of properties, this was not a material planning consideration.

Councillor H. Rhodes expressed concern at the possible loss of trees or damage to their roots but the Planning Officer referred her to planning condition B14 relating to landscaping design including replacement planting.

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0458 be granted planning permission subject to written confirmation from Property & Design to provide a financial contribution of £4,500 towards the upgrading of the community use recreation facilities and to the conditions as set out in the report.

(f) TWC/2010/0492 - Madeley Academy, Castlefields Way, Aqueduct, Telford, Shropshire

This application was in respect of planning permission for the erection of extensions, the creation of additional car parking and the formation of a new pedestrian access on the site.

The main extension was a two-storey building situated to the south of the main building on a site which had limited use due to a change in the ground levels at that point. It was proposed that the building would be built off the existing lower ground level of the Academy so that there was only a single storey visible from the key

north-west elevation from Castlefields Way. The location of the extension would not affect the natural light to the main Academy building and a new access would be provided via a ramp. The form and features of the extension would follow those of the existing buildings, with materials of a similar nature. The proposal to extend onto an existing hard standing was considered appropriate subject to conditions regarding materials.

The proposed restaurant extension was at lower ground level in the form of a concentric curve set at the centre of the existing restaurant. As the proposal was predominantly glazed and single storey, it would provide a stepped approach to complement the existing form of the buildings. The proposal would be sited on an existing hard standing and, given the proposed additional pupil numbers, it was a necessity and considered appropriate subject to conditions regarding materials.

The Vocational Learning Centre was a single storey pod-like building sat separately to the main Academy building and the proposal to extend onto an existing building and hard standing was considered appropriate subject to conditions regarding materials.

All these buildings would be fully accessible to the disabled and the two-storey extension would include a new lift. The proposed car park would provide an additional 20 car parking spaces for members of staff and was located on an area of hard standing adjacent to the tennis courts. It was considered to be acceptable subject to a condition regarding an updated travel plan prior to occupation.

The proposed pedestrian access was located at the southern end of the site through a belt of trees onto the footpath adjacent to Castlefields Way and was required due to the congestion at the main entrance at peak times at the start and end of the school day.

The Academy had, through the original planning consent, provided various mitigating measures to accommodate access to the site. Given the nature of the development, measures for pedestrians and cyclists were of paramount importance and included enhancements to the signal junction, the footway/cycleways leading to the site and the Public Right Of Way which provided an off-road link to Aqueduct. This latter facility was included in the original submission but its use was now being discouraged by the school. As a result there was a higher than expected use of the footway crossing the Ironbridge Bypass at the Castlefields Roundabout. The pedestrian survey provided suggested that 10% of pedestrians used this route and, with the proposed extensions and additional pupils, it was estimated that approximately 100 children would wish to cross in this direction to/from the Academy. Whilst this route did receive some improvements, it was on the basis of a relatively low level of use, which had not transpired, and measures such as an over-bridge or a signalised crossing would be too expensive and difficult to justify with the latter conflicting with the operation of the Bypass and the roundabout. As such, any further enhancements would be relatively limited in scope. The Council's Road Safety Officers had identified a range of improvements, as set out in the report, the combined cost of which would be £35,000. Given that the Council's Arboricultural Officer had made an objection to the route of the proposed footpath, as originally submitted, it was recommended that an alternative route be considered and

determined in conjunction with him on site in order to ensure that a mature tree in particular could be retained and to minimise the loss of trees generally.

Members welcomed the application particularly in respect of the proposed highways improvements. Councillor V.A. Fletcher queried whether the proposed speed limit of 40 mph should be lower. In response the Head of Housing & Planning said the Local Highways Authority would respond to any such views put forward by concerned Members.

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0492 planning permission be granted in consultation with the Council's Arboricultural Officer for the reasons mentioned in the report and subject to the signing of appropriate legal documentation for planning contributions for highway safety improvements and to the conditions as set out in the main report.

(g) TWC/2010/0527 - 4 Hiatt Avenue, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought planning permission for the erection of a single storey front extension, a side and rear extension, and a single storey side and rear extension measuring a minimum of 2.3m wide and 13.8m deep, to create a utility room, bed/sitting room and ensuite bathroom. The property was a semi-detached house situated in a quiet cul-de-sac and was set back about 1m from the neighbouring semi-detached property.

The small single storey extension to the front of the property would result in an alignment of the external wall with that of the neighbouring property and provide an entrance porch and extended lounge area. This was considered acceptable as it would have no detrimental impacts on the adjoining property (No.2 Hiatt Avenue) or other immediate properties and would be in keeping with the existing street scene. In addition, it would help to simplify the appearance of the existing elevation by removing the rather incongruous artificial stone panel to the side of the front door.

The single storey extension to the side and rear of the property, measuring 13.83m x 3.25m would be constructed of orange/brown brickwork with cream painted render panels and areas of horizontal timber boarding covered by a hipped pitched roof. It would provide a utility room and a bed-sitting room with en-suite facilities and a covered timber pergola lean-to would link this with the existing rear elevation. Four full height windows including two patio doors would be inserted into the side elevation facing the rear garden to No. 2 Hiatt Avenue with that serving the en-suite bathroom being obscure glazed. One of the patio windows would serve the bed-sitting room while the other would serve the utility room.

The proposed side/rear extension would require the removal of the existing garage and would extend out to the boundary line which, despite a shared driveway, was pinpointed by an old fence post which sat between the two garages. It was considered that the side extension would have a detrimental impact upon the neighbouring property (No.6 Hiatt Avenue) as one of their two kitchen windows would directly face the proposed extension, resulting in an overbearing effect on the residential amenities in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy.

The single storey extension running 13.83m along the side boundary was considered unacceptable due to the scale of development which was disproportionate in relation to the original dwelling and its impact on neighbouring properties. It would also consume approximately 35-40% of the rear garden area. Although single storey, it had the potential to overlook the neighbouring properties, 2 & 6 Hiatt Avenue and would have an unacceptable overbearing effect on them.

Members agreed that the proposal was too large and would constitute over-development of the site.

RESOLVED - that planning application TWC/2010/0527 be refused planning permission for the following reasons:

1. **The Local Planning Authority considered that the size, design and positioning of the proposed single storey side and rear extension would result in a cramped form of development resulting in an inadequate and unsatisfactory amount of private amenity space for both existing and future occupiers of the application site dwelling house therefore be contrary to 'saved' Wrekin Local Plan Policy UD2;**
2. **The Local Planning Authority considered that the proposed single storey side and rear extension by reason of its location and orientation, would be likely to have a detrimental effect on the amenity of the adjoining residential property in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy. Accordingly, the development would be contrary to 'saved' Wrekin Local Plan Policy UD2 and Government guidance contained in PPS1 and PPS3;**
3. **The Local Planning Authority considered that the proposed side and rear extension by virtue of its scale, mass and form would be disproportionate to the scale and character of the original dwelling house and would be likely to have a detrimental impact on the character and amenities of the local area which would be contrary to 'saved' Wrekin Local Plan Policy UD2 and Core Strategy Policy CS15.**

(h) TWC/2010/0564 - Southwater Regeneration, Telford Centre, Telford, Shropshire

This application by Telford & Wrekin Council sought approval of the reserved matters for the erection of a new purpose-built Civic Offices (sui generis) on a significant location at the south-east corner of the proposed Southwater Square incorporating local authority offices and flexible Use Classes Order A1 to A4 restaurant and retail development. It also included details of the public realm in the vicinity of the proposed replacement Southwater Lake. The proposed Civic Offices formed part of the masterplan to create a vibrant new heart for the town centre, integrating the International Centre, the existing leisure complex and other existing town centre uses including Meeting Point House, the library, hotels, etc. with entertainment, leisure and night-time uses.

The proposed Civic Offices had been designed to provide an appropriate civic quality and to be a benchmark for subsequent development through design quality and high quality materials. The aim was for the building to achieve BRE Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) 'excellent' status in terms of sustainable design in line with the planning conditions attached to the outline permission. The proposal comprised a gross internal development area of 8,434sqm of which 7,816sqm was civic offices (sui generis) and 617sqm A1-A4 (flexible) restaurant and retail space. This would be provided as a five-storey building incorporating three wings of accommodation arranged around two atria. Height to the roof parapet was 22m with a further 2.95m addition of relating to the plant room located on the roof. A new Southwater Lake would introduce a formal open space feature that would not only integrate the building into the Town Park but also provide space for informal activity and relaxation. Terraces would project from the ground floor of the building into the lake to create hard and soft landscaped 'fingers'.

The building would be set at the same level as the square and a consistent ground floor level throughout would be provided to allow maximum flexibility of use within the building as well as providing maximum accessibility for users. It would provide new office space for departmental staff, the Contact Centre and 'First Point'. The latter had generated significant visitors and would be located on the ground floor together with a coffee shop and seating areas. The ground floor would also contain back of house facilities, together with flexible A1-4 retail/restaurant uses.

With regard to car parking, the multi-storey car park previously discussed would not now come forward and the temporary use of Randley Lorry Park would be necessary with further information on lighting, barrier detail and drainage being sought. It was recommended that a condition requiring the provision of 250 minimum car park spaces including surfacing, drainage etc, be imposed. However, disabled spaces should be on the Southwater car park rather than at Randley.

A letter of objection letter had been received from Pegasus (Planning Consultants) on behalf of Meeting Point House, as summarised in the report.

The Design & Access Statement (DAS) that had accompanied the outline permission had required development to strive to provide a more positive inter-relationship with the Town Park to maximise this unique asset and had also raised an expectation that the new Civic Offices, along with other new structures, should provide a powerful icon based on the interplay between buildings, urban form and Park while creating sustainable buildings which architecturally were "highly distinctive". The design of the new Civic Offices was bespoke and would provide a highly legible civic building of significant quality which would meet these requirements through a five storey building able to sit easily and begin to achieve visual and aesthetic dominance over existing neighbouring leisure buildings. The scale would also allow considerable opportunities to improve views towards the Town Centre from the Park.

The proposed building would use the highest quality materials, including white terracotta tiles for the office element above ground level with blue brick used for column elements in the ground floor and as subdivisions for openings within the terracotta panels. This would give solidity to the building base and frame the entrance when viewed from Southwater Square. The remainder of the ground floor

would be enclosed in aluminium framed curtain walling and glazed full height windows. Timber would be used sparingly, predominantly as a foil to the dominant brick and terracotta tiles and the roof would have a timber clad plant area set back from the parapet edge. The necessary building services had been carefully designed out.

The report detailed the energy efficiency measures that would be incorporated into the proposed development and it was considered that these would deliver significant benefits in terms of carbon emissions reductions and energy efficiency and should comply with the conditions attached to the outline permission, subject to final accreditation.

In terms of landscape design, the public realm directly associated with the Civic Offices planning application was confined to the areas between the southern elevation to the Town Park boundary and Southwater Lake. The proposals for soft landscaping were designed to offer a softening of the Civic Offices when viewed from the Park and to help in providing biodiversity interest and in contributing to the health of the lake.

The proposals overall had been the subject of considerable public and stakeholder consultation and the proposed building would provide a modern and flexible environment to meet corporate requirements for operational excellence and flexibility together with opportunities for contemporary methods of working. The proposal satisfactorily demonstrated how the development would act as a focus for Southwater and set a standard for future development.

The update report tabled at the meeting outlined the consultation responses received from the Fire & Rescue Service and the Drainage, Energy, and Land Contamination Officers. The comments from the Fire Service were in respect of access for emergency fire service vehicles and the installation of sprinkler systems in commercial premises. It was, therefore, recommended that an appropriate Informative be attached to any planning consent. The Land Contamination Officer had recommended that a requirement be included for the submission of a land contamination report.

Members indicated their general approval of the scheme and, in particular, welcomed the use of sustainable energy technology. The new Civic Offices would set the standard for subsequent buildings in the Southwater area. Some concerns were expressed regarding car parking but Members noted that this was an issue that was being addressed outside of this planning application.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0564 reserved matters approval be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the main report and to the imposition of an additional condition relating to land contamination requirements and the issuing of an Informative concerning the advice given by the Fire Officer, as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

The meeting ended at 8.08 p.m.

Chairman:

Date: