

## **PLANS BOARD**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 30 May 2012 at 6.00pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire**

**PRESENT:** Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, , S A W Reynolds, R J Sloan (as substitute for Councillor G C W Reynolds), M J Smith, C R Turley

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillors G M Green (for planning application TWC/2010/0771) and J M Seymour (for planning application TWC/2012/0255)

#### **PB-001 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 16 May 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

#### **PB-002 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor G C W Reynolds.

#### **PB-003 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor C R Turley declared a personal interest in planning application TWC/2012/0283.

#### **PB-004 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

None.

#### **PB-005 SITE VISITS**

The Development Management Manager advised Members that an application relating to proposals for Land at Arleston (application reference TWC/2012/0240) was scheduled for consideration at the next meeting of the Plans Board and it would be prudent to undertake a site visit at that location in order to avoid unnecessary delay in determining the application.

#### **RESOLVED** – that: -

(a) the following applications be deferred for Site Visits to take place on Wednesday, 20 June 2012:

1. TWC/2012/0219 – 2.30pm – 8 High Street, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 5NL
2. TWC/2012/0240 – 3.00pm – Land at Arleston, Telford, Shropshire
3. TWC/2010/0771 – 4.15pm – 9 Park Street, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5LA; and

(b) that determination of planning application TWC/2012/0145 be deferred to Wednesday, 11 July 2012 to allow the Board Members to make a Site

**Visit and to allow time for the Planning Officers to further negotiate with the applicant regarding design elements relating to Station Field properties.**

**PB-006      PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION**

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Board and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning applications TWC/2012/0059, TWC/2012/0145, TWC/2012/0219, TWC/2012/0283 and TWC/2012/0327.

(a)            TWC/2010/0771 9 Park Street, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5LA

This proposed development sought planning consent for the demolition of a detached dwelling and the erection of a row of four terrace properties fronting Park Street Madeley. Councillor G M Green, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

Councillor G M Green spoke to oppose the proposals, primarily on the basis of community cohesion and access. Councillor Green further considered that the current proposals represented an overdevelopment of the site, which in her opinion could only accommodate three properties, not four, and invited Members to undertake a site visit.

The Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the detailed proposals in the report and the comments from the Highways Engineer to reduce parking provision to 7 spaces. She advised that the proposals were in a sustainable area with a bus route and could be sited without detriment to the existing or proposed residential amenities. The Planning Officer illustrated her comments by referencing Google Maps with Street View.

Councillor N A Dugmore proposed, seconded by Councillor I T W Fletcher that Members undertake a site visit and, on being put to the vote, four Members voted to defer the application for a site visit and four voted against. This being the case, the Chairman exercised his casting vote in favour of a site visit.

**RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2010/0771 be deferred to allow the Board Members to make a Site Visit.**

(b)            TWC/2012/0059 Land at Brodie House, Central Square, Telford, Shropshire

These proposals sought outline planning permission, with all matters reserved, for the demolition of existing buildings and footbridge over Grange Central, and development of a mixed use proposal with a cinema (Class D2), retail and food and beverage units (Class A1, A3, A4 and A5), and a pedestrian link between Red Oak car park and Central Square, within Central Square, Telford Town Centre. An update report was tabled which set out suggested changes to conditions and quoted a letter of support received from Odeon Cinemas.

Ms G Bunting, the Applicant's Agent, spoke in support of the proposals, principally focussing on the improvements that the development would bring to this neglected part of the Town Centre, particularly relating to improved linkages to the bus station, car parks and taxi ranks. Ms Bunting also highlighted the letter of support from Odeon Cinemas.

The Planning Officer further outlined the proposals set out in the report and explained the relationship with current planning policy, particularly CTAAP, which was fully detailed in the report. In addition, the Planning Officer summarised the consultation responses received.

Councillor N A Dugmore expressed concern at the removal of the footbridge and sought clarification of the term "at grade" in relation to the pedestrian crossing. The Planning Officer advised that the pedestrian crossing would be at highway level. Councillor Dugmore responded with concern that such an "at grade" pedestrian crossing was a retrograde step in the proposals which would be unsafe for use by cinema-goers during peak periods such as Christmas or the summer blockbuster season. Councillor Dugmore then asked whether the proposed "drop off zone" referred to private use or taxis only. The Planning Officer advised her understanding that it was intended for taxis only but such details were reserved matters at this stage. Councillor Dugmore expressed further concerns regarding the increased demand on town centre car parks and expressed doubts that there was sufficient demand in the town to support two cinemas in close proximity. He concluded by asking for the applicant to consider use of the drop off zone for all cinema users and to carefully consider the use of building materials.

Councillors R J Sloan and S R W Reynolds were both supportive of the proposals, noting that the area was currently poor public realm and welcomed the exciting proposals to increase the vibrancy of the area and generate employment opportunities. Councillor Reynolds sought clarification that the Asda car park would be retained. The Planning Officer advised that users would have a choice of town centre car parks.

Councillor I T W Fletcher expressed concerns regarding the demolition of the footbridge and replacement with an at grade pedestrian crossing, reminding Members that over 1500 employees were based at nearby Matheson House who would seek to use the crossing at lunchtimes and furthermore that the pedestrian crossing may prove unsuitable for disabled users. He shared concerns with Councillor Dugmore that, following the recent permission given for a cinema at the nearby Southwater site, a second cinema would not prove viable and he believed that the application should be deferred for a viability study.

The Planning Officer reminded Members that the cinema was not an additional cinema to existing and planned provision, but rather that the current Odeon Cinema would relocate to the site. She also advised that the Council's Highways Engineer was satisfied with the provision of an at grade pedestrian crossing, although the type was a reserved matter. The Development Management Manager informed members that permission should not be refused purely on a viability basis.

On being put to the vote it was, by a majority:

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0059 planning permission be granted subject to:

- (a) the applicants entering into a Section 106 Agreement for
1. Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution - £5,000 paid on first occupation of the development.
  2. CTAAP Highways Contribution – This will be paid on first occupation of the development. The contribution shall be the lesser of:
    - i. £584,765 (this maximum has been calculated on the basis of the theoretical mix of developable floorspace permitted by the outline planning permission which would result in the highest CTAAP contribution); and
    - ii. A sum calculated in respect of the actual mix of floorspace to be constructed pursuant to the outline planning permission for which approvals are issued to the outline planning permission calculated in accordance with CTAAP's policies on Highways Contributions. Such sum shall be agreed between the owner and the Council before the commencement of the development.
  3. Public Art – The owner shall provide Public Art to a value of no less than £25,000 within the development or other land within its control within Telford Shopping Centre. The precise nature of the work or works of art and location(s) to be approved by the Council before first occupation of the development and then provided no later than one year from first occupation of the development.
  4. S106 Monitoring Contribution - £5,000 paid on commencement of the development.; and
- (b) the conditions as set out in the report except:-
1. Deletion of Condition 17 - requirements for installation of a Sprinkler System as this is covered under Building regulations;
  2. Amendment of Condition 22 so that the development accords with the maximum and minimum parameters; and
- (c) the Development Management Manager be authorised to negotiate the exact wording with the applicant regarding Condition 13 - Car Park Management Plan.
- (c) TWC/2012/0255 6 Crofters View, Little Wenlock, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 5AU

This was a proposed loft conversion, which sought planning permission for the insertion of 1 dormer on the front elevation and 3 dormers to the rear, and a new window on the south west side elevation. Councillors R T Kiernan and J M Seymour, Ward Members, had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

Councillor J M Seymour, Borough Ward Member, spoke to oppose the application on behalf of residents at numbers 4 and 5 Crofters View on the grounds of overlooking and loss of privacy. She expressed concern that approval for the dormer windows on the side elevation would set a precedent, that the room should have sufficient light from the three other windows and suggested that at the least, the window size

should be reduced and/or consist of frosted glass as she considered obscure glazing to be insufficient.

Mr E Dixon, local resident, also spoke to oppose the application. He had submitted additional plans which he referred to during his presentation. He considered that the proposed window would overlook neighbouring properties due to the proximity and elevated position of the site and furthermore represented an imposing and invasive development which would affect the quality of life of families at Numbers 4 and 5 Crofters View. He also raised visual impact, loss of trees and loss of privacy and contended that the proposals were out of character in the cul-de-sac. If Members were minded to approve the application, he sought a condition for frosted glass but urged Members to undertake a site visit before reaching a decision.

The Planning Officer reminded Board Members that the dwelling benefitted from permitted development rights and as such a window on the side elevation did not require consent. Extensive negotiation had taken place with the applicant to reduce the size of the window and secure agreement to a condition for the window to be fixed and obscure glazed.

Councillor R T Kiernan proposed, seconded by Councillor N A Dugmore, that determination of the application be deferred to allow the Board Members to make a Site Visit but, on being put to the vote, this was not agreed.

Councillor R J Sloan noted the Planning Officer's advice regarding permitted development rights and Councillor S A W Reynolds considered that the proposed window was not overly large and applauded the Planning Officer's negotiations in this respect. Councillor Dugmore considered that if the application was approved, the obscure glazing should be of the greatest possible opacity to mitigate the concerns of the neighbours.

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0255 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and further subject to condition ensuring that obscure glazing is of the greatest possible opacity.**

(d) TWC/2012/0283 Telford Skating Rink, Telford Town Centre, Telford, Shropshire

This was a Council application seeking planning permission for the construction of an outdoor skating pad for a temporary period of 4 months whilst the established ice rink was extended and refurbished. It was envisaged that the skating pad would be in situ during the summer months whilst the works were undertaken.

Reverend A Smith, Chair of the Meeting Point Trust Limited spoke as a member of the public to oppose the application on the grounds of increased noise and access. He acknowledged that the area was already public open space but considered that the temporary siting of the ice rink would create greater disturbance and increased noise. He advised the Board that the Trust had lost custom over the previous year due to disruption from nearby building work and, as further construction work was anticipated, this would be likely to continue and would be exacerbated by these

proposals. He had been told that the position of the pad could be reviewed after three weeks and, if there was too much noise, the pad could be relocated. He therefore asked for the pad to be positioned at this unspecified alternative site from the outset. Mr J Harrower from the FairShare Credit Union also spoke to echo these concerns, highlighting the proximity of the pad to the FairShare offices, the potential for obstruction of access and egress to the office and reduced disabled access. He was also concerned that permission was sought for a six month period and that granting permission for a temporary pad at this location would set a precedent for future use.

The Planning Officer reminded the Board that the site was an existing thoroughfare in an public open space and that Officers had sought to mitigate the potential impacts through condition, specifically no music to be played. It was anticipated that the pad would be used by younger children, rather than teens. She informed the Board that it was anticipated the work on refurbishing the Ice Rink would be complete by September but permission had been sought for a temporary pad for six months in case the works over-ran. She advised that there was extremely limited scope for alternative sites for the Ice Rink and the siting of a pad was restricted to the area nearby. The Planning Officer also referred Members to the update report tabled at the meeting which set out an additional consultation response.

Councillor S A W Reynolds referred to the intimation that the site would be reviewed after 3 weeks and believed that such a review likely referred to an assessment of layout of the site, such as the addressing queuing mechanisms at the kiosk rather than a relocation of the pad as a whole. She considered that the site was already well used by the public and would not, therefore, significantly increase ambient noise. She considered that the need to keep a skating facility for the children of Telford outweighed the concerns raised and Councillor R J Sloan echoed this sentiment.

Councillor N A Dugmore considered that, if the Council wished to provide temporary ice-skating facilities at this site during the refurbishment of the established rink, action should be taken to mitigate against any potential detriment to users of Meeting Point House. In this regard, he considered that there were issues around the appropriateness of the requested opening hours, the proposed position of the kiosk and that, as well as there being no music played, loud speakers should be prohibited.

Councillor I T W Fletcher considered that, due to the proximity to Meeting Point House, the Library and FairShare Credit Union, the proposed site was inappropriate and would restrict access to those buildings. He was also concerned as to how the site would be secured from unauthorised use outside the opening hours.

The Planning Officer advised that the site would be securely fenced in the evenings. The Development Management Manager suggested that, if members were minded to approve the application, an additional condition could be included to preclude the use of loud speakers.

On being put to the vote it was, by a majority:

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0283 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and further subject to a condition stating that no loud speakers be used.

(e) TWC/2012/0327 Cemetery Lodge, Linden Avenue, Shropshire, Telford, TF1 1QR

This Council application sought planning permission for an extension to the existing Wellington Cemetery to meet the needs of the local community and to provide additional capacity for burials to take place at the cemetery site.

The Planning Officer referred Members to the update report tabled at the meeting which set out additional consultation responses.

**RESOLVED** – that with regard to planning application TWC/2012/0327 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to comments received from the Environment Agency and further subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 7.14pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....