

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 5th January, 2011 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

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

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor J.M. Seymour (for planning application TWC/2010/0332)

PB-63 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the Plans Board held on 8th December, 2010 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PB-64 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

PB-65 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

PB-66 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

PB-67 SITE VISITS

None.

PB-68 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

(a) TWC/2010/0259 – Rough Park House, Woodside Avenue, Woodside, Telford, Shropshire

This proposal sought to renew the recently expired planning permission W2005/0294 to restore the fabric of the building, convert it into 5 one-bedroom flats, with 2 flats on each of the ground and first floors, and a further single flat at second floor level. It was also proposed to demolish a single storey flat-roofed addition at the rear and replace it with an additional 2 storey gabled element to complement similar gabled structures alongside and to erect 2 blocks of 2 bedroom apartments to provide an additional 18 units, which would be split between 12 apartments in a block to the east of Rough Park House, extending towards the rear of the site, and 6 in a block to the west. Some car parking spaces would be provided to the site frontage with most of the car parking provision and a bin store enclosure being located to the rear of the site. Rough Park House was Grade II Listed detached 18th century former farmhouse, which formed part of a 19th Century parkland landscape. The application was considered in conjunction with planning application TWC/2010/0260 relating to

Listed Building consent.

The vacant house and its grounds had been the subject of vandalism, arson and fly-tipping for many years and the applicant had erected a solid boarded fence on the boundary as a temporary measure to prevent any further damage to the site. Behind this boarding the site now had a very poor visual appearance, although the house itself, despite its condition, was still regarded as being worthy of restoration and re-use by English Heritage, as set out in the report.

Despite the previous planning consents the property had changed hands several times and no development had commenced on the site despite discussions with the current owner. Urgent Works Notices under Urgent Works Notices pursuant to Section 54 of the of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 had been served on the owner and had resulted in some degree of roof protection and site security, but the condition of the structure and the site continued to deteriorate further to the detriment not only of the listed structure but also to the amenity of the surrounding area. In 2010 Members of the Plans Board had approved a formal Repairs Notice, which had been served on the owner and required him to undertake the works set out in the report. If the owner did not either undertake these works or enter into discussions with the Council regarding its acquisition of the property by agreement then, after two months, the Council could commence a Compulsory Purchase Order for the property under Section 48 of the Act.

Madeley Parish Council had strongly objected to the proposal, as summarised in the report, and one local letter of objection had been received on the grounds of disturbance from building works, in combination with the building works for the adjacent redevelopment of Woodside.

The proposed development, as previously approved, sought to respond to the site characteristics as detailed in the report. When planning application W2005/0294 was approved, it had been considered that the proposal represented both a unique opportunity and a challenge due to future of the site having been undetermined for over a decade. There were unknown quantities relating to the development in particular the costs of the works required on the Listed Building and the difficulty of accurately predicting the selling price of the apartments given this particular site and the uncertainty in the housing market. It was noted that W2005/0294 had been approved subject to a S106 Agreement relating to the timed restoration of the Listed Building.

Members were advised that the granting of any further planning permission on the site would not prevent the Council commencing Compulsory Purchase Proceedings if the Repairs Notice was not complied with and the previous grant of planning permission was a relevant material planning consideration in determining the current application. Furthermore, the regeneration of Woodside was progressing and that, combined with the prior notification for the demolition of 40 dwellings surrounding the site, demonstrated the regeneration mechanisms that the Council was undertaking. Therefore, it was considered that the opportunity to develop this site should be encouraged.

The concerns raised by Madeley Parish Council had been noted but the current proposal sought to replace a previously approved consent. Whilst the Parish Council wished the development to commence within a year, this was not considered to be a reasonable condition for any approval given the current market conditions. However, by means of the S106 Agreement, time limits could be imposed to restore the building, thus meeting the Parish Council's and this Council's wish for the Listed Building to be restored.

In conclusion, as the application had previously been approved in this form and planning policy had not significantly changed, it was recommended that the application as submitted would preserve the Listed Building and provide enabling works to ensure the restoration and long term survival of the only remnant of an earlier historic development in a large area of 20th century development.

Councillor G.M. Green requested further information on the option for a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and the Planning Officer explained that the planning and Listed Building applications before Members would have no bearing upon the process. The Council's Solicitor added that the CPO was currently being progressed and stated that planning permission subject to a S106 Agreement was necessary to control development on the site. In response to a question from Councillor D.R. Chaplin, the Planning Officer confirmed that the proposal had not amended the design of the approved application W2005/029. However, an updated Section 106 Agreement was required to take account of the current condition of the site and the work required by the Repairs Notice.

In conclusion, the Head of Housing & Planning explained that the refurbishment and development of this site was an important part of the overall regeneration of Woodside in which the Council had been involved for many years and it could intervene if necessary. Members welcomed the applications as, if no work was commenced on Rough Park House in the near future, its survival could be threatened.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0259 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a S106 Agreement relating to an agreed amount of restoration work on the Listed Building being achieved within a certain period of time, and the timing of the construction of the new-build in relation to the restoration of the Listed Building, and to the conditions as set out in the report.

(b) TWC/2010/0260 – Rough Park House, Woodside Avenue, Woodside, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application to replace the extant Listed Building Consent W2005/0295 for the conversion of this Grade II Listed Building to form 5 apartments, the erection of 18 new apartments and associated parking together with alterations to the existing access and a new boundary treatment. The application was considered in conjunction with planning application TWC/2010/0259

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0260 the Head

of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant Listed Building Consent subject to the applicant entering into a S106 agreement relating to an agreed amount of restoration work on the Listed Building being achieved within a certain period of time, and the timing of the construction of the new-build in relation to the restoration of the listed building, and to the conditions as set out in the report.

(c) TWC/2010/0332 – The Huntsman Inn, Wellington Road, Little Wenlock, Telford, Shropshire

The applicant wished to reopen 'The Huntsman' which had been vacant for approximately twelve months and sought planning permission for the erection of a 2 storey extension to the existing building to provide a restaurant with guest accommodation above, a physical link to a new building to the rear comprising 1 holiday let and 3 dwellings for rent with associated access, and a flag pole to the front of the Public House. Councillor J.M. Seymour, Ward Member, had requested that the application be considered by the Plans Board.

Following concerns expressed by both the Council's Highways Engineer and Little Wenlock Parish Council, an amended parking design to provide 32 spaces and disabled parking had been submitted. This was considered to be acceptable subject to parking space No.6 being allocated as a disabled space alongside No.5 and spaces 14 and 15 being combined to make a single space to ensure ease of use. The layout of the parking for the residential units would have little or no effect on the safe operation of the public highway and there were now no objections subject to standard planning conditions.

The Council's Parks & Open Spaces Section had been concerned that it was proposed to site residential dwellings adjacent to a children's equipped play area and to avoid any potential issues, officers had accepted an exception for holiday lets and requested that the proposed buildings within this curtilage buffer be holiday lets rather than residential dwellings. Alternatively, they had been prepared to accept the relocation of the play equipment more than 20m away from the proposed permanent residential properties. In response, Little Wenlock Village Hall & Playing Field Committee and Little Wenlock Parish Council had verbally stated that they did not consider this to be a viable option but that the proximity of the new dwellings would aid security by providing natural surveillance and the level of use would be such that there would not be a significant impact on future occupants of the dwellings.

Approximately 50 local residents had made representations to the original consultation, of which 23 supported the proposal, including Wellington Town Council and Councillor V. Tonks, as set out in the report. 28 letters of objection, as summarised in the report, had been submitted, the majority of which supported the proposed extension and the re-opening of the public house but not the erection of the proposed dwellings. Following receipt of the amended plans the Council had carried out a second consultation and 4 letters of support and 4 of objection, all providing additional comments, had been received, as summarised in the report.

As set out in the report, the application complied with PPS4 and Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy. However, while there were no planning policy issues relating to the

refurbishment of the Public House, the proposed residential development in Little Wenlock was a departure from planning policy, as detailed in the report. In particular, Core Strategy Policy CS7 stated that development within the rural area should be focussed on the three key settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton and, therefore, the principle of open market residential development on this site would be contrary to its aims. Therefore, officers had advised that the proposal should constitute either affordable housing in accordance with Policy H24 or that all the units should be holiday let accommodation.

To address these alternatives the applicant had submitted a Viability Report, which stated that the 3 dwellings for rent would provide additional housing choice and affordable accommodation for local people. If, however, all the units were holiday lets, the income would be marginally lower than the projected income from all the units being for rent and the provision of affordable housing would not generate any significant long term income to support the business. Furthermore, it asserted that many banks would not provide funding for such a business proposal. There had been a number of unsuccessful attempts to operate this Public House profitably and the Viability Report stated that the additional revenue from the properties would provide sufficient income generation to support a successful business venture. It, therefore, concluded that the preferable option was for 1 holiday let and 3 for rent, as corroborated by the Council's Property & Design Department following scrutiny of the financial projections.

Regard also had to be given to the current economic climate and the closure of many public houses and other community facilities in rural areas. Local concerns had been raised that, if approved, the proposed dwellings could later be sold if the Public House were to close and a precedent would have been set for further residential development on the site. However, following thorough evaluation of the revised application, it was considered that the long term survival of the Public House would be achieved by this scheme. Subsequently, officers supported the application subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to ensure that the dwellings were tied to 'The Huntsman' in perpetuity and, if it were to close, it had been agreed that the 3 rented units would revert to holiday let accommodation to comply with existing policies.

The proposed extensions and alterations to the Public House would replace the existing modern ad hoc elements to the side and rear following their demolition. The floor area of the Public House would be increased with additional first floor accommodation providing 3 bedrooms adjacent to the Manager's flat but the ground floor area would be slightly reduced in size. Whilst the scale of the building had increased, the roof of the 2-storey element was lower than the ridge of the original building, thus reducing the overall mass and ensuring this element was not overly prominent in the street scene. The single storey elements to the side elevations were a new glazed entrance from the car park and a repositioned kitchen and cellar. The overall design was acceptable and in keeping with the character and appearance of the building. In addition, it was considered that the window openings to the side elevations of the 2-storey element, particularly on the west elevation facing The Wrekin, would not have an adverse impact on the adjoining residential amenities of either No.5 Wellington Road or The Stone House.

The initial plans, comprising 2 pairs of semi-detached cottages had not been considered acceptable, as set out in the report. The revised design before Members proposed a single building, linked to the rear of the Public House, in the form of a converted barn with a hipped, lowered roof but in the same position for the cottages but with revisions to amenity space and parking provision. A separate access from the Public House car park was proposed to serve the dwellings. The two central units were now 4-bed properties with first floor accommodation above the archway, which provided covered parking for units 2 and 3. The design included simple proportioned doors, windows and small dormer windows to the front and rear with first floor windows on the side elevations. The amended design was considered to be a more appropriate and cohesive form of development in relation to the Public House extensions and the rural setting.

The roof of the building was lower than the roofline of the Public House and, whilst it would be visible in the streetscene, was at the rear and followed the building line of the Public House and, thus, would not be overly prominent. The lowered roof height of the dwellings and the orientation of the building to the north of adjoining dwellings would ensure that there was not a significant impact on their light or outlook. Given the separation distance, the position of the dwellings and retained landscaping, the development would not have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Listed Building. The rear garden areas were relatively small in relation to the surrounding properties, but were of an adequate size and included external storage facilities for each unit to enable control over domestic paraphernalia as the gardens would adjoin the car park of the Public House. The proposed boundary treatment was 1m post and rail fencing and the screening to the boundaries of the Public House site would be retained in addition to the sufficient separation distance between the proposed dwellings and adjoining properties.

Concern had been expressed that the development of dwellings on the car park would introduce a conflict of uses and an adverse impact on future occupants' amenities but it was considered that people renting these properties or staying in the holiday let accommodation would be aware of this prior to moving in.

With regard to the flagpole located at the front of the site, the Highways Engineer had no objection to its location as it would not impact on highway safety. Neighbour concerns had been raised with regard to noise and disturbance from the ropes rattling, but it was considered that the flagpole and flag were of an acceptable design, visually appropriate, in keeping with the character of the building and would have no significant detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenity. The applicant would require separate advertisement consent if the flag displayed on the flagpole was not a national flag and for the signage on the building.

The update report tabled at the meeting summarised the comments made in 3 further letters of objection that had been received including the public not having had an opportunity to consider the information contained in the Viability Report and the Section 106 Agreement. In response, the update report stated that Viability Reports, which contained confidential commercially sensitive information, were not normally available in the public domain; this request was then being considered under the Freedom of Information Act as a separate matter. With regard to the Section 106 Agreement and the conversion to holiday lets in the event of the public house

closing, the Council's Legal Department was still in negotiation with the developer's Solicitor to agree the details and the Local Planning Authority would ensure, amongst other things that, if the Public House closed, all units would revert to holiday let accommodation. In conclusion, the Local Planning Authority considered that this has been a democratic process as local residents and Little Wenlock Parish Council had been consulted, and re-consulted following submission of amendments, and the application was being considered by the Council's Plans Board.

The update report also informed the Board that an additional condition was required to control the use of the proposed holiday let by stating that no one individual or family/group should occupy it for more than 4 consecutive weeks in any calendar year. The Council had been seeking to agree the Section 106 Agreement with the developer's Solicitor and, consequently, a revised recommendation was set out in the update report.

John Marsham, Clerk to Little Wenlock Parish Council, and Councillor J.M. Seymour. Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the application. Both referred to the loss of community facilities in rural areas and the vital role of The Huntsman at the heart of the community, as an important social hub, provider of employment and tourism opportunities. They also stressed the need for the operator of a public house to diversify in order to survive by responding to community needs and expanding into alternative businesses. Neil Blackie of Manby Bowler, the applicant's agent, added that this was a very important proposal for the local community. The applicant was committed to the retention of the public house and the proposal would support economic development, leisure and tourism in line with the Core Strategy and PPS4.

Keith Harris, owner of the adjacent Stone House, spoke against the application and, in particular, the proposed housing units and S106 Agreement. He considered that many of the issues relating to the proposal were too marginal to be acceptable and that the grounds for granting planning permission for 3 rental units was not a justified departure from policy.

Members commented on the number of public houses that had closed down and welcomed this opportunity to retain and develop The Huntsman. Councillor G.M. Green asked what action would be taken to ensure that the rental units would be maintained as short term lets and the Council's Solicitor responded that the S106 Agreement would be monitored and, if necessary, appropriate Notices served.

RESOLVED - that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0332 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the owner of the development land entering into a Section 106 Agreement to ensure that the 4 dwellings and the Public House remain in the same ownership, to ensure that none of the 4 dwellings shall be occupied until the Public House is completed and open to the public for business, to ensure that one of the 4 dwellings is holiday let only and the other 3 are rented on suitable short term tenancies or holiday lets to ensure that an appropriate obligation is imposed to require that all 4 dwellings be holiday lets only in the event of the Public House failing, and subject to the conditions as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

(d) TWC/2010/0521 – Telford Millennium Community, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought Reserved Matters approval for 83 dwellings as Phase 2 of Ketley Village. The development comprised 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings and a small block of 2-bedroom apartments. They would be mainly terraced fronting the Spine Road with a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings behind with a mix of on-street and on-plot parking and parking barns. 30% of the dwellings, all of which were 2 and 3-bedroom units, would be affordable housing with 17 for social rent and 8 for shared ownership. The development also included new roads, infrastructure and landscaping and the site would be connected into the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) constructed as part of the Reclamation and Infrastructure works for the site.

The Design Statement included within the outline planning permission had set out a concept masterplan for Ketley Village of three character areas, of which this application was the 'Ecoville'. It was a central area adjacent to the most sensitive ecological and landscape areas on the site and it was envisaged that it would be a lower density development to create a positive interface with these areas. It would retain the perimeter block structure of Phase 1 but would be more informal with a mix of detached, semi-detached and linked dwellings with those adjacent to the ecological areas to the north being villas looking onto the open areas. Most development would be 2 and 3 storeys with most of the 3 storey buildings being along the Spine Road. Wildlife corridors would be provided linking the ecological areas to the north to Badgers Mound and the Rabbits Head.

The developers had carried out a 'lessons learnt' exercise for Phase 1 to establish what aspects of the design were essential to the character of Ketley Village and what change would be appropriate in the current economic climate whilst remaining compliant with the Regulatory Plan and Design Statement. Standard house types were proposed using traditional methods of construction but they had been given a contemporary appearance to reflect the designs in Phase 1, some of the detailing had been changed to reflect the current economic climate, and greater account had been taken of the future maintenance of the buildings by using less timber on the frontages. All the buildings would turn corners to avoid blank gables and walls towards the public realm and provide interest and passive surveillance. The streets had been designed on home zone principles, as set out in the report, and parking provision would be increased to an average of 2.3 parking spaces per dwelling, including visitor parking, together with parking barns and on-street parking. No parking courtyards were proposed in this phase.

Greater emphasis had been placed on landscaping in the public and semi-public realm to provide a transition from the formal planting in Phase 1 to the ecological areas to the north, which would provide a diverse habitat and the ecological connections between the open areas required in the original Design Statement. No formal play space would be provided, as set out in the Master Plan. Hard surfacing would include block paving to reflect the palette of materials in Phase 1 and maintenance of the public realm would be undertaken by the Community Trust established for this purpose as part of the outline permission. However, the roads and shared surfaces would be adopted. The applicants had submitted evidence from an independent consultant which suggested that the development would meet

the requirement for Ecohomes Excellent as required by the outline planning permission and the Millennium Community targets.

Ketley Parish Council had raised concerns and 4 letters of objection had been received, as summarised in the report. The main concern of local residents was the position of Plot 186, which was close to the back of the dwellings in Broadway and faced the footpath that ran along their rear boundaries, and the loss of trees. In response the report stated that the dwelling on Plot 186 was intended to provide passive surveillance of the footpath and, due to its orientation, should not give rise to undue overlooking and loss of privacy to the existing dwellings in Broadway as there would be no windows on the west elevation. To the rear of Broadway it was proposed to fell one sycamore in the garden of Plot 188 which would improve both the garden and views of the oak tree behind. In addition one Alder tree was to be crown lifted.

Ketley Parish Council had queried the lack of surveillance over the NEAP and the existence on the Master Plan of an apartment block on the opposite side of the footpath. In response it was stated that Plot 117 had been designed to overlook the NEAP area but the building shown on the masterplan had never been intended as an apartment block, as confirmed by the original designer. The Parish Council had also been concerned that residents in Ketley Village had not been consulted on the plans particularly the landscape proposals, which was an issue as these residents contributed to the Community Trust that would be responsible for the future maintenance of the landscaped open area and any areas that did not fall within the adopted highway. The Board was informed that the normal planning consultations had taken place and two exhibitions had been held at the beginning of June and early August in the Ketley Community Centre.

It was considered that the proposals for Phase 2 complied with the requirements set out in the approved Regulatory Plan and the parameters set out in the Design Statement approved as part of the Outline planning permission. The design of the development would carry forward the contemporary design approach of Phase 1 whilst at the same time meeting the requirements of the 'Ecoville' character area set out in the Design Statement and comply with the sustainability targets set out for this development.

Since the report was prepared the applicants had submitted some minor changes to the layout of the site and the house types as outlined in the update report tabled at the meeting. However, none of these would adversely affect the form and character of the proposed house types. The update report also recommended the imposition of an additional condition relating to all construction traffic for the development being required to use either the eastern access off Beverley Road or the access off Wombridge Way with none accessing the site via the Holyhead Road.

Cllr Martin Young, on behalf of Ketley Parish Council, thanked all those concerned for the work they had done on preparing the application but expressed concern regarding the future maintenance of the open spaces in the development. Normally, these would be the responsibility of Telford & Wrekin Council but, for this scheme, it would be the responsibility of the residents and, therefore, they needed to be fully informed in the process. He also raised concerns regarding the retention of trees on

the site and the issue of security for the proposed NEAP. He did not wish to see the application refused but requested that it be deferred to allow the residents to discuss the implications and take them to the Millennium Management Committee.

Jon Rowland, on behalf of Taylor Wimpey, the applicant, responded that considerable consultation had been undertaken with new and existing residents and with the Steering Group for the past 18 months, including 4 public consultations in June, from which the proposed layout and design had emerged. With regard to the concerns raised on the trees, he informed the meeting that only one tree had been removed, the sycamore at Plot 188, as it had previously been vandalised. 2 trees with Protection Orders had been retained and 200 new trees would be planted. With regard to security for the NEAP, this would be provided by Plot 117 in line with secure by design planning.

In presenting the report, the Planning Officer explained that a Community Trust had been set up to maintain the open spaces rather than a commuted sum as used in the past. The Council was not a member of and had no involvement with the Trust but the developer and the Registered Social Landlord were both committed to retaining the open spaces.

Councillor H. Rhodes said that, although she wished to see the development progress, she was concerned at the issues raised by Ketley Parish Council and suggested that the application be deferred to allow for further consultation with the residents. This was supported by Councillor R.T. Kiernan.

In response the Head of Housing & Planning advised the Board that consultation had previously taken place which had informed the proposal before them. This was an important scheme for both the Council and the HCA and was consistent with the approved outline application. He further emphasised the importance of this application which, at 30%, would provide a higher level of affordable housing than a number of other recent applications and would give support to the housing market in difficult circumstances. Whilst the Community Trust was a new approach to the maintenance of open spaces, it had been discussed throughout development of the scheme and had the potential for greater local involvement than in the past. In conclusion, he said that he could not recommend deferring the application, as sufficient assurances had been given on the issues raised and, as the most affected residents were not yet occupying the 83 new properties, they would not be able to participate in any further consultation process.

Councillor H. Rhodes proposed, seconded by Councillor F.R. Picken, that determination of the application be deferred for one cycle but, on being put to the vote, this was not agreed. Councillor G.M. Green stated that she would wish to see a method by which the interested parties could resolve the issues raised and the Head of Housing & Planning responded that the developer, the HCA, and the Local Planning Authority would ensure that all those involved were kept fully informed and given an opportunity to make their views known.

RESOLVED - that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0521 approval of reserved matters be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the

report and to the additional condition relating to access to the site for construction traffic as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

- (e) TWC/2010/0566 – Telford International Centre, St. Quentin Gate, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought Reserved Matters approval for the access and landscaping elements relating to the Events Box extension, as clarified by the update report tabled at the meeting, including the temporary layout of parking provision, the pedestrian route to link the Town Centre to the adjacent hotels and links to further afield, and the retention of structures to complement the building. The proposed development formed an integral part of a wider scheme under the recently approved Southwater Core outline planning permission and the landscape planting would complement the previously approved building, have a softening effect upon the retained structures, and respect and integrate with the surrounding area and positively enhance its visual amenities in accordance with Policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council had commented on the proposal, as set out in the main report, and had submitted further comments on the relocation of the coach parking area, the additional landscaping and tree planting, and the potential for noise pollution should coaches travel through residential areas particularly at unsocial hours as summarised in the update report. In response the planning officer stated that these issues had been considered at the outline planning stage and alternative arrangements agreed.

The access element of the scheme was a mix of temporary and permanent solutions to allow for the phasing of development over the wider Southwater area. A number of the car parks had been identified as building zones for a mix of uses within the Outline application but the drawings submitted demonstrated that there was sufficient parking provision on site to support the existing Centre and the new extension. The update report tabled at the meeting informed Members that the Council's Highways Engineer supported the revised parking layout and level of provision as detailed in the amended plans, subject to it being available prior to the occupation of the new extension. In addition, there was provision within the site for coach parking and drop off as per the existing arrangement together with a coach drop off on St. Quentin Gate, which would be available for TIC use if necessary. The interim footway/cycleway was now along an acceptable route but should be marked out prior to occupation and two further conditions relating to this were recommended in the update report.

With regards to pedestrian movements, the new building incorporated a central concourse, which would be an important link between the TIC and the proposed Events Box and could be used as a route from the Town Centre to the hotels and areas beyond. This would be a managed route, which would not be available when the Centre was closed, and would be an extension of Main Street, the backbone of pedestrian movements through Southwater linking to the Town Centre, the existing TIC and its facilities and the Town Park

In the long term it was anticipated that the vehicular route and associated pedestrian route, would run adjacent to the new Events Box to link the proposed hotel/residential development in zone 6 with the St. Quentin's roundabout to create an attractive and legible route for pedestrians 24 hours a day. It was further anticipated that this road would come forward with the development in zone 6 and, therefore, in the short term a temporary 24 hour solution for pedestrians to link with the wider surroundings was necessary and would be a delineated route through the car park to link with existing access points. The width and siting of this route had been amended through the application process to be accessible to a wide range of users, and create an easily identifiable route for use.

Fergus Mitchell on behalf of the applicant, the Southwater Event Group, stressed their commitment, together with that of the TIC, to this development as part of the ongoing programme for the Southwater Regeneration.

RESOLVED - that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0566 Reserved Matters approval be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the main report and to the two additional conditions as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

(e) TWC/2010/0596 – 69 Haybridge Road, Hadley, Shropshire

This was an application for the erection of a single storey front and side extension to replace the existing garage, a first floor rear extension above the existing flat roofed ground floor rear extension, and a tiled roof above an existing flat roof rear extension. The application site was a traditional semi-detached two-storey dwelling in a predominantly residential area and was sited on a separate access road fronting the highway on Haybridge Road. Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council had requested that the application be considered by the Plans Board and had objected on the grounds that the proposed extension to the front of the property was completely out of character and context with the adjoining properties and would have an adverse effect on the street scene.

The proposed development would provide an enlarged living room, hall, kitchen and dining room on the ground floor. On the first floor bedroom 3 would be converted into a bathroom with the existing bathroom being enlarged to become a new bedroom 3 and Bedroom 2 would be enlarged. The proposed front extension would project forward just over 1.1m and be finished in a hipped tile roof to match the main roof of the dwelling. The ground floor bow window would be removed but the first floor bow window would be retained to preserve the design style of the original dwelling.

The report drew the Board's attention to the changes and differing exterior treatments that had been made to a number of properties in the vicinity of the application site. Therefore, whilst there was a general symmetry in the street, alterations had been made to properties over many years. Not only were these considered a normal evolution of houses in any street but, given that the houses were set back almost 40m from the main part of Haybridge Road and behind an established hedgerow and beyond a service road, it was considered that the

proposed development would not be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the property or the streetscene.

The proposed brick and tiled hipped roof side extension was considered an improvement to the existing lean-to timber garage built against the common boundary with no. 71 and its design and materials would be sympathetic to the main house. In addition, the reduction in width compared to the existing garage would provide pedestrian access to the rear garden and the removal of the existing garage would result in a reduction of the overall footprint of the property. A new side facing kitchen window was proposed but this would look towards the gable wall of no.71 and, therefore, result in no loss of amenity. The proposed first floor rear extension would be only half the depth of the existing ground floor rear extension.

The remaining flat roof of the existing rear extension would be re-roofed with a pitched tile roof to match the roof of the main dwelling, which would have a positive impact on the appearance of the property. The amount of private amenity space available would be slightly increased by the proposed development and adequate off-street parking would be retained. Overall, the proposed development was a typical style of rear extension to this type of house. The materials, windows and roof would match the main dwelling house and would have no adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area. The proposal complied with the Council's 45 degree code and, therefore, would have no detrimental impact on residential amenity by way of over-looking

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0596 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

- (f) TWC/2010/0652 – Donnington Recreation Ground, School Road, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire

This application by Telford & Wrekin Council was for a children's ball court and the erection of 3.5m high boundary fencing on the Recreation Ground which currently contained two bowling greens, a BMX track, a play area, three football pitches, four tennis courts, and general grassed areas. Litter bins would be provided as part of the proposal but not the seating which would normally accompany this type of facility.

The proposed development, which would be sited on one of the existing tennis courts, would provide a ball court measuring 29m long by 14m wide mainly for the use of local children and young people aged from 3 to 16 for a range of ball games. The proposals had been drawn up in consultation with the West Mercia Police, Youth Services, and Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council. Donnington, which had a high percentage of children and young people, had been identified in the Council's Outdoor Recreational Strategy as an area deficient in outdoor recreational facilities. The proposal was part of a complete modernisation of the existing Recreation Ground, the future plans for which included a new children's play area and the refurbishment of the three remaining tennis courts.

National guidelines for older children's play provision suggested that they should be sited a minimum set distance of 30m from existing or proposed residential

properties, which would be exceeded in this instance apart from an isolated block of 4 one-bedroom flats at The Lodge, approximately 15m away. However, there were no other sites available within the Recreation Ground that met the national guidelines or had not been earmarked for other future activities and the bowling club had stated that the ball court could not be located at the other end of the tennis courts due to increased security issues and the Lawn Tennis Association wished to ensure that the three remaining tennis courts were kept together. The '30-metre rule' was for guidance only and there were a number of other facilities within the Borough which were significantly closer than this proposal, which had been carefully designed and widely consulted on and would only be changing the use of a tennis court to a ball court rather than introducing a new facility. No objections had been received from the occupants of the adjacent flats or the landlord, a local housing association.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0652 be granted planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(g) TWC/2010/0745 – Highway Verge, Priorslee Avenue, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for a determination as to whether prior approval was required for the siting and appearance of a 14.8 metre high slim line telecommunications monopole shared between Vodaphone and O2. The Vodaphone antennae would be situated within the monopole at a height of 13.23 metres above ground level and the O2 antennae situated at a height of 13.88 metres, all within a smooth circular sheath. In addition there would be a ground equipment cabinet at the base of the pole measuring 1.89m in length, 0.79m in width and 1.65 metres in height. Both the monopole and the equipment housing would be coloured green. The applicants had stated that the proposal was required in order to increase 2G network capacity to the Priorslee area and to provide 3G coverage. The installation would be situated on the grass highway verge on the eastern side of Priorslee Avenue, approximately 100m south of Abelia Way and 100m north of Glenbrook Road. The surrounding residential areas consisted mostly of low-density detached dwellings.

Councillor I.T.W. Fletcher, the Ward Member, had requested that this determination be considered by the Plans Board. He had submitted objections to the proposal and 74 letters and e-mails of objection had also been received, as summarised in the report. One e-mail in support of the proposal had been received.

The Chairman reminded Members that this was a telecommunications determination application and, therefore, the decision whether to give or refuse prior approval had to be based solely on the siting and appearance of the installation.

The applicant stated that they had investigated existing telecommunications installations, buildings, and other structures within the required coverage area but all had been discounted, mainly for contractual reasons. The chosen site had been identified as the most suitable option that balanced technical and operational requirements with local planning policies, national planning policy guidance, and the need to minimise visual impact. Careful consideration had been given to identify a site that placed the facility as far away as possible from any housing.

Although the monopole would differ in appearance from the existing angled street lighting columns it would, in effect, be an additional item of street furniture and not an alien feature to the street scene nor significantly visually intrusive. Its location within the grass highway verge would not form an incongruous or unduly prominent feature on the skyline or on the street scene and would be viewed in relation to the trees located beyond the grass verges and on the open space to the east of the site. There was no fenced compound proposed and it was normal to find various types of electrical equipment cabinets and relay boxes alongside urban roads. Therefore, the overall impact of the installation on the street scene was considered to be acceptable.

There was much public concern relating to the possible adverse health impacts of telecommunication development. However, Members were advised that consideration of the application should follow the advice given in PPG8, paragraph 98 i.e. "...it is the Government's firm view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards. It remains central Government's responsibility to decide what measures are necessary to protect public health. In the Government's view, if a proposed mobile phone base station meets the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure it should not be necessary for a local planning authority, in processing an application for planning permission or prior approval, to consider further the health aspects and concerns about them."

The requisite ICNIRP certificate, which had been submitted with the application, confirmed that the site and the proposed emissions would comply with the appropriate guidelines. Recent High Court and Court of Appeal decisions in relation to planning appeals for telecommunications equipment had established that, when evidence was submitted to confirm that an installation fell within the ICNIRP guidelines, a perception of fear or concerns about health issues did not provide justification for a Council to refuse an application. Therefore, the proposed slimline monopole was considered an acceptable installation in this urban residential area, where its siting and design would not detract from the character of the area or the general street scene.

The update report tabled at the meeting informed the Board that, since publication of the main report, 100 additional letters and e-mails objecting to the application on similar grounds to those previously submitted, had been received. In addition, a petition signed by 147 people had been received objecting to the proposed scheme and St. George's & Priorslee Parish Council had objected on the grounds that the proposed site overlooked an area used by children for recreation. In response to the comments made regarding accidents at the proposed site, the update report informed Members that the Council's Highways Engineer had stated that there had been no recorded incidents at the specific location of the proposed monopole. In addition, the equipment would be situated far enough away from the bend in the road not to cause concern. The update report also drew the Board's attention to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on 'Telecommunications Development', as adopted in May 2009 and outlined its key points, and summarised the additional information submitted by the applicant in support of the application.

Councillor I.T.W. Fletcher spoke against the application and drew the Board's attention to the Stewart Report which advised that Local Planning Authorities should

take a precautionary approach towards telecommunications masts by not siting them near to schools, houses, or vulnerable people. The application site was close to numerous family homes, a play area, a picnic area, and was an area where young people congregated. In addition, that particular section of road had had a high number of accidents, as witnessed by the replacement railings visible on the presentation. Councillor Fletcher also made reference to the fact that the application contained a number of inaccuracies. PPS8 stated that there should be local consultation and the application form referred to '3 local councillors' where there were only two, himself and his wife, neither of whom had been consulted on this application. Finally, the proposed structure at 14.8m high would be 50% higher than the adjacent lamp posts and, therefore, visually intrusive.

Samantha Lane spoke against the application on behalf of local residents. Whilst the residents understood Government support for telecommunication masts, the applicant should still follow the guidance within PPG8. In addition, the applicant had failed to reduce the visual impact of the mast, which would be highly intrusive and would not be mitigated by being painted dark green as it would not be sited near to any trees. She also stressed that the siting of the mast near homes and a play area was not acceptable.

The applicant's agent, Damian Hosker, spoke in support of the application and stated that the need for the mast was driven by the increased use of smart phones, broad band and wi-fi which was placing the current G2 and G3 capability under strain. Due to the changes in technology the cell search areas were much tighter and, thus, the area covered by a mast had also changed resulting in an acute need for this type of monopole in residential areas.

In response the Planning Officer said that the site was not in a designated area and would be sited as far away as possible from housing and schools and the mast would be shared between Vodafone and O2 to help reduce the overall number. The monopole would be a slim structure with no antennae or other attachments and could be appropriately disguised depending on its location. Given the proposed site along a verge, disguising it as a lamp post would be the best option. Whilst it would be 5m higher than the adjacent lamp posts, it would be only one more structure among several.

Several Members expressed concern that the local Ward Councillors appeared to not to have been correctly consulted on the application and others expressed concern at the siting and height of the proposed mast. In response the Planning Officer explained that the error on the consultation had only applied at the pre-application stage and that the correct consultation had been undertaken, in accordance with PPG8, at the submission consultation stage.

The Head of Housing & Planning added that, whilst the consultation process had been correct, Members needed to consider whether, on balance, the application would have been any different if the Ward Councillors had been contacted at the pre-application stage. He advised Members that they needed to decide if the proposed site was suitable or whether an alternative would be preferable and whether the design was appropriate. Monopoles were common in urban areas and generally fitted into the roadside context but the decision was for Members to make based

upon the information before them. He reminded Members that if they did not make a decision at the meeting, the application would automatically succeed. However, if they decided to reject the application, the applicant had the choice of either going to appeal or submitting an alternative proposal.

DETERMINATION:

The proposed 14.8 metre high slim line telecommunications monopole not be granted **prior approval**.

Reasons for Refusal.

1. **The proposed mast will be visually intrusive in this location due to its height.**
- 2 **In all the circumstances and noting that there had been inadequate pre-application consultation with local Ward Councillors, alternative sites have not been fully explored and the siting in this location was not considered suitable.**

The meeting ended at 8.22 p.m.

Chairman:

Date: