

## **PLANS BOARD**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 1 August 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, G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds, M J Smith, C R Turley

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor E J Carter (for planning application TWC/2012/0211), A J Eade (for planning applications TWC/2011/0821 and TWC/2012/0053), V A Fletcher (for planning application TWC/2012/0423), A D McClements (for planning application TWC/2012/0240), J M Seymour (for planning applications TWC/2012/0362 and TWC/2011/0959), B J Thompson (for planning application TWC/2012/0395)

#### **PB-019      MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 11 July 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

#### **PB-020      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None

#### **PB-021      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor I T W Fletcher declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning applications TWC/2012/0031 and TWC/2012/0143 and indicated that he would leave the room during determination thereof.

#### **PB-022      DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

None

#### **PB-023      SITE VISITS**

**RESOLVED** – that determination of planning application TWC/2012/0423 be deferred to allow the Board Members to make a Site Visit on Wednesday, 22 August 2012 at 4.30pm.

#### **PB-024      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/2011/0959, TWC/2012/0053, TWC/2012/0240, TWC/2012/0355, TWC/2012/0395 and TWC/2012/0423.

(a) TWC/2011/0821 Land At, Wellington Road, Newport, Shropshire

This proposal sought outline planning permission for approximately 285 houses and open space provision (including an informal kick about area and associated works) on land between Wellington Road and Moorfield Lane on the southern edge of Newport. The applicant had stated an aim to meet the Council's Core Strategy policy requirement for 35% of the total homes being affordable units. All matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) were reserved for consideration at a later stage by means of separate application(s). Full details of the proposals were set out in the report. Members were advised that this application was one of four applications submitted to the Council seeking consent for residential development in and around Newport and the Board were supplied with a location plan for all four sites. A site visit for this application had been undertaken earlier in the day.

Councillor R Pitt, representing Newport Town Council spoke to oppose the proposals on the grounds of housing need and supply in Newport, lack of consultation and a feeling that the application was being rushed through the process, the principle of development on an area of historic significance and associated loss of open space, highways and traffic issues, risk of flooding, the quality of housing and lack of public transportation in the near vicinity.

Councillor S Stacey, representing Church Aston Parish Council also spoke in opposition to the proposals on the grounds of using Greenfield land before Brownfield land, housing need in a depressed market, affordable housing provision, and the cumulative impact of a number of developments. He also questioned whether the proposals were sustainable and therefore in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and noted that drainage, sewerage and flooding issues remained unresolved with Severn Trent Water still investigating the impact of the proposals.

Councillor A J Eade, the Borough Ward Councillor for Church Aston and Lilleshall, also spoke against the proposals on the grounds that due to the cumulative impact of applications for housing development in Newport and his belief that it was vital that all applications should be brought to Plans Board together. He argued that the local physical and social infrastructure was not sufficient to meet the demands of the applications and expressed concern that Section 106 contributions for education would not be payable with regard to this site if the other applications did not come to fruition. He believed that investigations by Severn Trent Water were crucial to the proposals and his latest understanding was that these would not be concluded until late in 2012. He expressed further concerns that the officer's recommendation was to delegate authority to the Development Plans Manager, that housing need in Newport had not been demonstrated and that this particular application utilised Greenfield land when Brownfield sites were available.

Mrs M Whitefoot, representing local residents, then spoke against the proposals on the grounds of the principle of development on agricultural land when Brownfield sites were available, the scale of development proposed was disproportionate to need, drainage issues, traffic and highways issues and the cumulative impact of phased construction work across four sites.

The Applicant's Agent, Mr N Hardy, addressed the Board in relation to boosting housing provision in accordance with the NPPF and Core Strategy, sustainability, scoping of and mitigation towards infrastructure issues, consultation, and housing need and supply.

The Planning Officer referred Members of the Board to the detailed report before them, highlighting consultation responses. He emphasised that Highways engineers had carefully costed the impact from trip distribution and that Severn Trent Water had indicated that capacity existed in the drainage system to accommodate this development. Severn Trent Water were undertaking a feasibility study which would reportedly be available by the end of the summer and any permission granted would be conditioned to prevent occupation before confirmation that capacity in the sewerage system was available. The Planning Officer considered that the proposals were compliant with the NPPF and Core Strategy and drew attention to the lack of affordable housing being a main driver for policies CS1 and CS6. To support this position, he drew Member's attention to the data set out in the report regarding delivery of housing and affordable housing in Newport to date and the housing trajectory beyond the end of the Core Strategy period and noted that granting permission for this proposal alone would not meet identified needs. In addition, he drew attention to the sections of the report which addressed affordable housing need, sustainability, infrastructure provision, surface water drainage, foul drainage and noise issues. He also explained the education contributions required as part of a proposed Section 106 Agreement and recommended that a further figure of £8,500 should be sought in relation to Planning and Financial Monitoring. He clarified that delegated authority was sought as the Secretary of State had requested sight of the Board's decision and report.

Councillor N A Dugmore, noting the planning history of the site asked why an outline planning application for residential development was refused in 1989 and the Assistant Director: Planning Specialist advised that it was important to focus on contemporary issues which would be different to those of 20 years ago. The Planning Officer was able to confirm that the refusal was given as the application (W89/0400) was contrary to the then Local Plan and also on drainage issues due to insufficient capacity at Newport Reclamation Works. The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist, further pointed out that the Newport Local Plan was no longer in force and that drainage had since been upgraded with Severn Trent Water confirming that capacity existed to meet the needs of the development.

Councillor N A Dugmore also expressed concerns about the projections for school places set out in the report, sustainability as the development did not comply with the Code for Sustainable Homes, flood risk, the use of a Greenfield site and the scale of development at this location. He also questioned whether the infrastructure was sufficient as the report of Severn Trent Water was still outstanding and questioned the use of aging housing data.

The Planning Officer stressed that it was important to consider the proposals holistically, reminded the Board that the application was for outline permission only and that there was a significant shortfall of much needed affordable housing in the area which would be partly addressed by the proposals. In addition, the

development would bring investment to the area which would increase overall sustainability.

Councillor S A W Reynolds noted the annual shortfall of affordable housing in the locality and stated her understanding that locally a person on a need band had an average wait time of 5 years and 2 months, with those in urgent need waiting an average of 14 months. Furthermore, over the previous twelve months only 5 houses had become available for rent and it was clear to her that this situation needed to be addressed.

Councillor I T W Fletcher stated that he felt it was inappropriate to make a decision on the application when Severn Trent Water's sewerage investigations were ongoing as the outcome would have a material effect on the proposals. He suggested that consideration of the application should be deferred until the report was available.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist advised with regard to infrastructure that consultation with both Severn Trent Water and the Council's Drainage Engineer had taken place and it was acknowledged that further infrastructure was needed in the future, but not immediately. Housing would be built over a period of time and this gave time for infrastructure to be delivered over a reasonable timescale as set out in the report. He noted concerns that the application was being rushed through the system but pointed out that the Government had made it clear that planning applications should be considered at the earliest opportunity and the cumulative impact of a number of proposals should therefore not unreasonably hold back applications. He explained that Brownfield sites were often more expensive to develop due to reclamation and reuse and this often resulted in Greenfield sites coming forward and being more likely to produce affordable housing and community benefits via the Section 106 process. The report comprehensively set out appropriate planning conditions and Section 106 requirements to deal with issues raised and whilst it was necessary to acknowledge the impact of development, it was equally important to balance this against need.

The Planning Officer advised that the need for 35% affordable housing in Newport was supported by information from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Telford & Wrekin's Choice Based Lettings scheme, 2005 housing needs summary together with profiles of the existing affordable housing stock, current housing market and the population of Newport. Whilst this had not resulted in updated figures since the publication of 2009 housing data it did support a general trend towards the requirement for greater provision.

At the end of the debate, the recommendations set out in the report, together with an additional condition for planning and financial monitoring, were proposed and seconded. In accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 12 and at the request of Councillors N A Dugmore and I T W Fletcher, a recorded vote was taken, the voting being as follows:

For:                   6  
Councillors J Loveridge, J C Minor, G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds, M J Smith and  
C R Turley

Against: 3  
Councillors N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher and R T Kiernan

Abstentions: 0

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0821 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to:-

- (a) Confirmation from the Secretary of State that he does not wish to call in the application for determination;
- (b) The applicants entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Council (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Manager) relating to:
  - (i) Affordable housing, to include:
    - 1. Provisions ensuring that 35% of the dwellings to be built shall be affordable housing either in number or value (to allow for the inclusion of more expensive specialised affordable housing where required)
    - 2. Of these 80% to be Rented Social Housing dwellings and the remaining 20% in Shared Ownership unless otherwise agreed with the Council
    - 3. Provisions ensuring that the affordable housing is provided throughout the development and not left to the latter stages and also that the affordable houses are delivered in small clusters
    - 4. Inclusion of details to ensure lettings are prioritised to Newport area based residents
    - 5. Receipts from the disposal of any Shared Ownership dwellings to be recycled and used for the provision of further affordable housing.
  - (ii) Highways works, to include:
    - 1. Off site highway infrastructure improvements - up to a maximum of £228,953;
    - 2. Public transport service enhancements – up to a maximum of £120,000;
    - 3. Public transport infrastructure (bus shelters) – up to a maximum of £20,000.

**Adjustment provisions will need to be agreed to take into account whether other permissions have been or are likely to be granted or implemented in Newport and if not to reassess whether the maximum figures stated can still be justified for this development.**

**4. Public Rights Of Way - £27,000;**

**5. Travel Plan monitoring - £5,000.**

**(iii) Education infrastructure funds up to maximum of £702,396 provided the average number of bedrooms per dwelling across the development is under 3.35. Timescale and triggers for the payment of the contributions to be agreed. Details of reviews will need to be agreed to take into account whether other permissions have been or are likely to be granted or implemented in Newport and if not to reassess whether the maximum figures stated can still be justified for this development.**

**(iv) The provision of Open Spaces, to include (if that option is exercised by the applicant) a transfer of the open space and recreation areas to the Council at a suitable time and with payment of a commuted sum for maintenance to be agreed. Or alternatively, provide for a residents management company to maintain those areas.**

**(C) £8,500 Planning and Financial Monitoring Contribution;**

**(D) the conditions set out in the report with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Manager.**

**(b) TWC/2011/0959 Isombridge Farm, Isombridge, Shropshire, TF6 6NF**

This application sought planning permission to convert two agricultural buildings located at either end of a small field on the edge of Isombridge Farm to a live/work unit. The Application had been deferred at Plans Board on 11 April 2012 to enable the applicant to submit further information to demonstrate the economic viability of the development. An update report, tabled at the meeting, set out information submitted by the applicant which clarified how potential occupants would operate their businesses from the site.

Councillor J M Seymour, Borough Ward Member for Wrockwardine, spoke in support of the application on behalf of the Applicant. She emphasised that the application would benefit a local farming business that currently supported four families by sustainably using redundant farm buildings to generate a small rental income. Councillor Seymour referred to the expressions of interest before the Members which demonstrated viability for the proposals and also indicated that she

understood that the Applicant was willing to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to tie the residential element to the business.

Mr B Davies, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting in support of the application. He referred Members to the genuine expressions of interest received and indicated that the income from rent was required to support the four farming families' income.

Members welcomed the additional information and the Applicant's consent to enter into the Section 106 Agreement.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0959 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the applicants entering into a Section 106 Agreement that the residential element shall be tied to the business and shall not be sold as a separate unit or let as a separate unit and further subject to the conditions set out in the update report.

(c) TWC/2012/0031 Land adjacent to, The Shires, Shifnal Road, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9NN

This was a proposal for the erection of 6 two storey dwellings along frontage and a four storey nursing home to rear, along with associated works including highways. This proposal had been deferred at the meeting of the Board on 11 July 2012 to enable Members to undertake a site visit.

Councillor I T W Fletcher, one of the Borough Ward Members for Priorslee, addressed the Board to speak against the application on the grounds that the proposals would have a detrimental impact on residential amenity, particularly overlooking from the 4 storey nursing home. In addition, Councillor Fletcher raised issues of traffic generation, parking and road safety and considered that the design was not in keeping with the character of the street scene and represented over development of the site. In accordance with his previous declaration of interest Councillor I T W Fletcher then left the meeting prior to the discussion and determination of this item.

Mr A Khoury, representing the Applicant, then addressed the Board to support the proposals which he maintained were an innovative and contemporary design resulting from working closely with Planning Officers. He noted requests for additional information regarding stability and drainage had been made but that these were not required by current national policy and that the proposals were consistent with the NPPF. He considered that the proposals would meet demand for family housing in the area and create employment opportunities.

In response to Mr Khoury's comments, the Planning Officer confirmed that information previously requested regarding drainage and stability was to satisfy local policy requirements but that during the application process the NPPF had come into force and it was subsequently acknowledged that whilst local policies were still relevant, the over-riding approach within the NPPF was that these issues were the responsibility of the developer.

The Planning Officer noted the innovative approach to the design and appearance of the proposed buildings which would create an interesting mixed use development and made excellent use of a sloping site. However, he considered that, should members be minded to give approval, an additional condition should be added which would allow Officers to negotiate further regarding the design of the window reveals and exact detailing of the elevations.

Councillor N A Dugmore considered that the proposed designs were inappropriate since they did not fit with the existing street scene, would dramatically overlook existing residents and that car parking provision was inadequate for the size of the site. Whilst he recognised the need for this type of development, he considered that this was not an appropriate site.

Councillor G C W Reynolds supported the development of the care home and whilst she noted the modern design she considered that it lacked features to fit with the existing character of the street scene.

Councillor S A W Reynolds expressed concern regarding car parking and was advised by the Planning Officer that no standards for car parking existed but that the Highways Authority had considered the proposal and had recommended various measures which had been covered in the report.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0031 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to further negotiation with the applicant relating to design elements particularly pertaining to window reveals and details of elevations and further subject to the applicant entering in to a Section 106 Agreement to provide financial contributions of £5000 for recreational facilities, £5000 for highways and £2500 for financial planning and monitoring and further subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(d) TWC/2012/0053 North Lynn Manor, Lynn, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9BB

This was a proposal for the erection of a 20kw wind turbine on a 20m high tower. The application had been deferred at Plans Board on 28 March 2012 to enable residents to have more time to consider a further noise assessment in respect of potential noise nuisance and the cumulative noise of the existing 18m high wind turbine and the proposed 27m high wind turbine.

Councillor A J Eade, the Borough Ward Councillor for Church Aston and Lilleshall, spoke to oppose the proposals. Councillor Eade referred to the history of this application and indicated that a compromise between residents and applicant could be reached if agreement could be achieved to resituate the turbine further away from residential properties. However, in order to do this it was necessary to remove part of a hedgerow and he understood that the Ecology Officer had objected to such removal, despite the fact that all of the hedgerow could be removed without planning permission. He urged Members to consider this as part of their deliberations.

Mr M Norton spoke against the proposals on behalf of local residents. Mr Norton referred to the compromise situation detailed by Councillor Eade, suggested that an Environmental Impact Assessment should be required and suggested that power generation by the farm was affecting local electrical supply.

The Applicant, Mr M Davies, then spoke in favour of his application which had already reduced from seeking permission for the erection of two turbines to one. He indicated that the erection of the turbine would provide energy saving mechanisms to the farm. He was disappointed by the level and methods of local objection but drew attention to letters of support detailed in the report and argued that it was a myth that difficulties in the local energy supply were being created by energy generation at the farm. Mr Davies also indicated that the proposals were NPPF compliant.

As had previously been the case, Members welcomed the generation of power from a renewable energy source and, recalling the site visit previously undertaken in July 2011, Councillors N A Dugmore and S A W Reynolds did not consider noise from one additional turbine would cause significant nuisance.

Councillors N A Dugmore and I T W Fletcher expressed concern regarding the late submission detailed in the tabled update report and preferred to view legal advice on the contents when received rather than delegate authority in accordance with the Officer's recommendation set out in the tabled update report. However, this was not a view supported by the majority of members.

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0240 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the receipt of legal advice on the contents of the late submission and further subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.**

(e) TWC/2012/0143 Land at junction of Moss Road/Rookery Road, Wrockwardine Wood, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 7BL

This was an application for demolition of 2no. dwellings (The Nyth and Erindale) and erection of a block of 13 apartments with associated car parking and amenity area. There was an extant planning permission for 4 dwellings (W2010/0060) adjacent to the proposed apartment block which would share the proposed access. This current application had been deferred at the meeting of the Plans Board on 11 July 2012 to enable Members to undertake a site visit.

Councillor I T W Fletcher, one of the Borough Ward Members for Priorslee, addressed the Board to speak against the application on the grounds of traffic generation and inappropriate design. He stated that the site was located on a busy main road serviced by several bus routes and, when combined with the adjacent development, a dangerous increase in traffic would occur. He was disappointed at the proposed loss of a beautiful and historic building which would be replaced by an apartment block of utilitarian design that would not blend into the street scene and, in his opinion, was a breach of urban design criteria. In accordance with his previous declaration of interest, Councillor I T W Fletcher then left the meeting prior to the discussion and determination of this item.

Councillor G C W Reynolds noted that, despite its traditional style and history, Erindale and the Nyth was not a listed building and she lamented the proposed demolition of such an attractive property. She questioned whether it would be possible for the developer to consider preserving the current building for conversion into luxury apartments. Councillors S A W Reynolds and N A Dugmore were similarly disappointed that the developer was not seeking to restore the property. In addition, Councillor S A W Reynolds did not consider that the plans complimented the existing street scene.

There being no proposer that planning permission be granted, it was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

**RESOLVED** – that planning application TWC/2012/0143 be refused on the grounds that the Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed development by virtue of the proposed scale mass and design is unacceptable and will result in an incongruous feature within the street scene, to the detriment on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to ‘saved’ polices UD2 and H6 of the Wrekin Local Plan, CS15 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained within the NPPF.

(f) TWC/2012/0211 Land To The Rear Of, Maynards Croft, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 7SZ

This was a full application for residential development comprising the demolition of a detached house (No.25 Maynard’s Croft) to facilitate the creation of an access road and the erection of 34no. dwellings comprising a mix of 16 three and four-bedroom detached houses; 8 three-bedroom semi-detached houses; 4 two-bedroom terraced houses and a two and a half storey block of 6 two-bedroom apartments, with garages and/or parking facilities, served off a new estate road with associated parking, drainage, sewage pumping facility, landscaping and associated engineering works. This would result in an average density of 38 dwellings per hectare and the provision of 35% affordable housing. The site lay outside the built up boundary of Newport, as shown on the Wrekin Local Plan Proposals Map, and hence lay in the countryside, however it was currently being used as garden land. A site visit for this application had been undertaken earlier in the day.

Councillor Peter Scott, representing Newport Town Council, spoke to oppose the application on the grounds of the suitability of the site for development, particularly due to subsidence as a result of the peat-based soil and the need for piling which could damage the canal. Piling would result in noise disturbance and this had not been adequately addressed by the developer. The Town Council objected to the use of Greenfield land whilst Brownfield land remained available for development and considered that housing need could be met by proposals for development at other sites. Councillor Scott also cited issues with road safety and suggested that the development would be detrimental to the quality of existing residents’ lives.

Councillor E J Carter, the Borough Ward Councillor for Newport East, also spoke in opposition to the application on the grounds that this unique site was unsuitable for development. He argued that the proposals were contrary to the NPPF since, as well as a presumption in favour of sustainable development, the NPPF sought to

recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, recognise the many functions performed by open land, not include residential garden land or land of special community interest in development, protect development from unacceptable risk or from being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability and also similarly protect Sites of Special Scientific Interest, avoid development that would give rise to noise causing significant adverse impacts on quality of life and stated that Local Authorities should not grant planning permission for peat extraction. In the spirit of the Council's Shaping Places scheme, he urged the Plans Board Members to listen to the views of the local community.

Mr E Howells, a local resident, also spoke against the proposed development on the grounds that it was not financially viable and, therefore, contrary to paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Local residents had sought the opinion of experts, including a Planning Inspector, Civil Engineers and out of the Borough Planning officers, who all concurred with the view that the project would be difficult to deliver due to falling market prices. He argued that the land was unsuitable for development which would result in significant noise nuisance from piling and construction traffic and would only deliver 3% of affordable housing need targets. He considered that, if the Board was minded to grant planning permission, the developer would eventually seek to vary Section 106 obligations relating to the affordable housing element in order to make the development viable in the current economic climate. He suggested that the scheme should be deferred until a full foundation plan and new viability assessment could be provided.

The Applicant's agent, Mr A Williams, spoke to support the application. He argued that there was a clear need to remedy affordable housing needs in the area and explained that this was difficult to deliver from Brownfield sites and, as this application was made in full and the developer was ready to begin work immediately some progress towards meeting targets could be made significantly sooner than with other proposals in the area which were only at outline stage. He referred to the consultation responses set out in the report, noting a lack of objection from the Council's Ecologist, Natural England, the Council's Arborist, Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water and the Council's Drainage Engineer. Piling would take place over a short period of time and noise would be managed by a detailed construction management plan. Overall, he considered that this was a good site for a modestly sized housing development.

The Planning Officer noted the recurring argument for development on Brownfield sites prior to Greenfield land existed in this case but he felt that there were mitigating circumstances for development in this case. He drew the Board Members' attention to the consultation responses set out in the report, particularly those of the Highways Engineer which addressed residents' concerns regarding the narrowed carriageway at the bend on Maynard's Croft as likely to relate to poor driver discipline rather than visibility falling below required standards, and those of the Housing Delivery Officer regarding the need to maintain provision for socially rented accommodation. A report on noise had been received and hours of construction and piling could be limited by condition. Whilst the proposals made a modest contribution towards housing supply, in accordance with policies CS1 and CS6, and contrary to the interpretation given by Councillor Carter, the proposals were consistent with the requirements of the NPPF. He did not consider that the vista from the canal would

be damaged by the proposed housing as it was a particularly discrete parcel of land which did not form part of the wider area and negotiations had already taken place to resite the tallest apartment block. Residential amenity would not be compromised as limited overlooking or loss of privacy would occur. He recommended that a further financial contribution of £2500 should be sought from the Section 106 Agreement in relation to Planning and Financial Monitoring. He also clarified that delegated authority was the normal process in this type of application.

The Chairman expressed concern about noise levels from piling and considered that if Members were minded to grant this application it was important that the impact on residents' quality of life should be mitigated and, if Members were minded to grant permission, a condition should be included to limit the hours that work would be allowed to take place. Councillor M J Smith shared his personal experience of piling works in another area and noted that whilst the work could be completed quickly, it did create a significant noise nuisance. The Planning Officer acknowledged these concerns and advised that it was normal to specify hours of operation in the site construction plan as agreed with the applicant. Piling was covered by building regulations but Officers had been assured that the works would not undermine the embankment.

Councillor N A Dugmore noted that the area was adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and that piling works would be likely to cause vibrations which would disturb local wildlife. He noted concerns regarding stability issues and, referring to the site visit which had taken place that afternoon, his opinion was that the ground was unsuitable for this type of development. He also noted that conditions C17 and C18 requested by the Highways Engineer were not included in the list of recommendations and was advised that these were encompassed in condition B150. Councillor Dugmore also expressed concern regarding the capacity for school places at schools in the locality. Councillor I T W Fletcher echoed these comments and noting the nature of the ground on site, felt that development may prove costly resulting in renegotiation of the affordable housing element at a later date.

Councillor S A W Reynolds noted that the area was fenced and overgrown and presently unsuitable for public access. She considered that the Plans Board needed to be mindful of social housing needs in the area and concurred with concerns that hours of operation should be controlled by condition. Councillor J Loveridge agreed with the view that social housing was required in the area.

Councillor G C W Reynolds noted concerns regarding land instability on site and questioned who would be responsible for remedial works if an incident occurred. The Chairman, on legal advice, pointed out that once planning permission had been granted, responsibility lay with the developer.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist noted claims that the application was inconsistent with the NPPF but advised Members that the Framework had to be considered holistically rather than by individual sections. The NPPF gave a presumption towards sustainable development in order to significantly boost housing supply. The Local Authority had an up-to-date Development Plan and Core Strategy and it was his advice that the application was, therefore, consistent with

local and national policy. He advised that the impact of development had to balance with the benefits. He noted growing concerns regarding the stability of the land and referred the Board Members to the Geotechnical Engineer's expert advice that the application was acceptable subject to condition.

Councillor J Loveridge moved the recommendation in the report, with an additional condition specifying hours of construction activity and this was seconded by Councillor S A W Reynolds. Members agreed that negotiations between Officers and the applicant regarding the hours for construction activity should be guided by the general principle of 9.00am to 5.00pm.

Councillor C R Turley expressed his decision to abstain from voting due to his involvement in a number of environment-based organisations and the site's closeness to an SSSI.

On being put to the vote it was, by a majority of five votes in favour and three against:

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0211 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the applicants entering into a Section 106 Agreement for financial contributions of £72,000 towards primary and secondary education provision, £10,000 towards highways improvements and 35% affordable housing, Monitoring Contribution of £2,500 and further subject to the conditions set out in the report to include agreement of hours of construction activities on site with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Manager.

(g) TWC/2012/0240 Land at, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought outline planning permission for residential development on 7.26 hectares of land for up to 103 dwellings (Use Class C3) and 50 extra care units (Use Class C2), provision of two new access roads and associated drainage, open space and landscaping. A site visit had taken place on the afternoon of 20 June 2012 and during the debate at Plans Board that evening Members raised concerns about the siting of the Extra Care facility and the impact of the three storey building on existing residents. The applicants had submitted amended plans, including the parameters plan, which set the zone for the extra care facility to be situated. The primary change was the repositioning of the extra care facility further south into a more central location of the parcel of land which was bounded by Dawley Road to the west and Kingsland to the north. This had led to the previously proposed zone of housing adjacent to the extra care facility moving from the south of the building to the north of the building. In addition a further strip of open space was proposed along part of the northern boundary with Kingsland, which was approx 10m wide including the existing hedge which was to be retained. In addition, the zone of building had also been reduced by re-evaluating the internal space requirements. An update report was tabled which set out a revised approach to the provision of recreational facilities.

Councillor J Gorse, representing Wellington Town Council spoke to oppose the amended proposals raising concerns in relation to the access through and to the proposed site, the potential use of the proposed mixed-use thoroughway by motor-vehicles, current sewerage and drainage problems which would be increased if the development proceeded, the high density of the proposals, impact on the character of Arlestone Village and over-development of Green network land.

Councillor A D McClements, the Borough Ward Councillor for Arlestone, acknowledged that she had previously supported development of Green Network land (at the Ercall Wood Technology College site; application reference TWC/2012/0069) because that development had demonstrated exceptional circumstances and community benefit to residents in her Ward. However, she felt unable to support this application as there were no such community benefits and, therefore, she spoke to oppose the proposals. She raised concerns on behalf of local residents regarding the loss of their "green lung" and associated abundant wildlife. She echoed the concerns of Councillor Gorse regarding traffic congestion and set out continued concerns regarding the location of the Extra Care Facility and lack of affordable housing. She informed the meeting that whilst the location of the Extra Care Facility was in proximity to local services there was a steep hill which, in her experience, elderly residents found it difficult to ascend. With regard to public transport access, Arriva were undertaking a review of their transport network and if the results were unfavourable residents could find themselves isolated. She did not, therefore, consider that the provision of the Extra Care Facility was sufficient to outweigh the loss of green network, particularly as similar facilities were located or proposed nearby.

Mr G Devey spoke on behalf of local residents to oppose the proposals. He expressed the residents' deep dissatisfaction at the loss of green network which played an important role in urban social development. Green network land had been dramatically reduced in recent years due to development and he expressed concerns for local wildlife. Although residents understood that there were sometimes community benefits to utilising green network land, in this case no such benefits were apparent. In addition, residents did not consider that the plans were demonstrably improved and security concerns remained together with concerns that the plans were detrimental to the character of the village.

The Applicant's Agent, Ms Y Bowater, then addressed the Board in relation to the revisions to the proposals following collaborative working with the Planning Authority, siting of the Extra Care Facility together with a reduced footprint, open space provision, housing need and delivery and the economic and community benefits to the Borough as a whole.

The Planning Officer noted that the use of Green Network land was a critical issue within the consultation, responses to which were set out in the report. Although he realised that the site had intrinsic value, it was a private site with limited public access, and the development would provide community value in the form of an Extra Care Facility, the retention of significant woodland and provision of allotments, activity trails and NEAPS. He noted reluctance to utilise the green network for development but also advised that the Local Plan policy which protected the green

network would be out of date by March 2013 and likely to be defunct by the end of any appeal process, should an appeal be lodged.

The Chairman reminded Members that this application was received in outline only and all matters were reserved for consideration at a later date.

Some confusion was expressed regarding the status of the land as green belt or green network and the Development Management Manager confirmed that the land was green network, as defined by the Local Authority, whereas green belt was formally designated under specific national legislation.

Councillor S A W Reynolds stated that this development would assist in the increase in provision of care homes in the north of the borough where there was a high population of elderly residents and would also assist in meeting strategic housing targets as set out on page 169 of the report.

Councillor G C W Reynolds recognised concerns from the residents that 50% of the green network at this location would be lost but she felt that this counter-balanced a currently unsafe and wild landscape becoming accessible together with the provision of play facilities. Councillor S A W Reynolds concurred with this view and also welcomed the retention of hedgerows to limit the impact of the development upon residents at the edge of the urban area.

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

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0240 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the applicant entering in to a Section 106 Agreement to provide 30 affordable extra care units within the extra care facility, provision of open space and play facilities on site and at John Broad Avenue with the Development Management Manager being authorised to agree an appropriate financial contribution, Highways contributions of £10,000 for maintenance of new junction, £600 for commissioning of new traffic signals controlled pedestrian crossing and £5000 for support/monitoring of Travel Plan for the Extra Care facility, an education financial contribution of £208,794, for primary education provision in the local vicinity. Public Art either £10,000 financial contribution for commission and erection on site or in local vicinity or creation of piece of public art outside or within the extra care facility to this same sum. Section 106 financial and conditions monitoring contribution of £3,500 and further subject to the conditions set out in the report.

(h) TWC/2012/0355 W Davies & Sons, Mill Lane, Kynnersley, Newport, Shropshire, TF6 6DY

This was an outline planning application for residential development to include access, layout and scale. Permission was sought to cease the existing B2 general industrial use, demolish the existing industrial buildings and clear the site of all structures and open storage to enable redevelopment of three new dwellings with detached double garages at land to the south of Kynnersley in the rural area. Matters of appearance and landscaping were reserved matters for later consideration.

Kynnersley Parish Council had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

Councillor J Edge, representing Kynnersley Parish Council, addressed the Board in opposition to the application on the grounds of setting a precedent for future development, access, that Kynnersley was deemed unsustainable in terms of residential development, housing stock in the village would have increased by 30% since 2000 once all barns with consent for conversion had been developed and the proposals were contrary to policy CS7. He felt that some of the potential B2 industrial uses sited in the report were scaremongering and the majority of the local community supported continued industrial use.

The Applicant's agent, Mr A Williams, then spoke to support the application explaining that the business use had been on site for more than 100 years, and applicant's impending retirement had resulted in bringing forward the application. He also indicated pre application advice had acknowledged the merits of the business ceasing on this site.

The Planning Officer drew Member's attention to the tabled update report which summarised a letter of support; she also noted that there two letters of objection on file and that the Highways Officer had no objections to the proposals. She noted that the property could change hands and operate with B2 or B8 use without consent and this could cause a proliferation of traffic and other nuisance; alternatively the property could become vacant and left to decay. Members were reminded of similar decisions within the rural area approved by board, taking account of The Piggeries at Rodington and the Glasshouses at Charlton where such building had been left to decay and residential approved to remove such eyesores; these merits outweighed the concerns of the additional housing outside of the suitable settlements, which is similar to this development. She believed that the proposals could be adequately sited and provide sufficient parking whilst preserving local amenity.

After careful consideration of the reports together with the comments received verbally above, it was proposed, seconded and unanimously:

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0355 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.**

- (i) TWC/2012/0358 Land between 44 & 45 Sandbrook, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire

This was a proposal which comprised the erection of a pair of semi-detached bungalows on a former garage site on land between 44 & 45 Sandbrook, Ketley. Councillor H Rhodes, Borough Ward Councillor for Ketley and Oakengates, had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0358 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.**

- (j) TWC/2012/0395 The Acorns, Donnerville Gardens, Admaston, Telford, Shropshire, TF5 0DE

This application sought outline planning permission with some matters reserved for the erection of 7 detached dwellings with garages and construction of a new access off Sweet Chariot Way following the demolition of The Acorns. Access and layout of the development were to be agreed at the outline stage, with scale, landscaping and appearance reserved for a further application. The principle of residential development on the site had been established by extant full planning permission for six dwellings (W2007/1723 and TWC/2010/0554) as detailed in the report. Additional consultation responses were set out in the tabled update report.

Wellington Town Council had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

Councillor B J Thompson, the Borough Ward Councillor for Park, spoke to oppose the proposals. He referred Members to the letters of objection detailed in the report and urged the Board to consider undertaking a site visit to put the objections into perspective.

Councillor I T W Fletcher proposed, seconded by Councillor R T Kiernan that determination of this application be deferred to allow Members of the Board to undertake a site visit but, on being put to the vote, this was not agreed.

Councillor Thompson then continued his address to the Board, on the grounds of highway safety due to the narrow nature of Sweet Chariot Way, the angle of the proposed access to the site, the principle of demolishing the existing building and the potential that the proposals would set a local precedent. He also considered the plans were inadequate and that noise and disturbance would result during construction.

Dr P Davies, speaking on behalf of local residents spoke against the application on the grounds of road access and safety, the potential for future additional development at and around the site and suggested that the application was contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 53). Councillor R Aveley, local Parish Councillor, also spoke on behalf of local residents who had approached Wellington Town Council after the Planning Committee had considered the application and submitted no objections. He echoed Dr Davies' comments and, in addition to noting the long planning history of the site, he considered that the application was over-development of the site and expressed concern that a precedent for development could be set in the cul-de-sac. Both Dr Davies and Councillor Aveley urged Members to undertake a site visit.

The Applicant's Agent, Mr A Williams, addressed the Board reminding them of the extant planning permission, and drew attention to the revised scheme for vehicular movements within the site to cater for a refuse vehicles, altering the internal layout of the road, however the access remained in the approved location and the lack of objection from Highways. He noted concerns for future development, but considered

that this was not suggested by the current Plans and asked Members to consider the application on its individual merits rather than speculation.

Following confirmation from the Planning Officer that it was believed the application met local and national policy requirements in the form of the NPPF, the majority of Members did not consider that this application deviated greatly from the extant permission already in place and, therefore, concluded that a site visit was not necessary. The recommendation of approval and associated conditions were proposed and seconded and was carried by a majority vote.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0395 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(k) TWC/2012/0420 80 Wombridge Road, Wrockwardine Wood, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 6QG

This retrospective application, for a change of use from garage to dog grooming business, was resolved to be granted by Plans Board on 11 July 2012. The applicant had subsequently asked for a minor amendment to the hours condition from 9.30am to 4.30pm Monday to Saturday to 10.00am to 5.30pm Monday to Saturday with no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0420 planning permission be granted subject to the revised condition as set out in the report.

(l) TWC/2012/0423 9 Bayswater Close, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9GY

This was a full planning application for the erection of a two storey front extension and the conversion of the attic to habitable space by creating a dormer in the west facing roof pitch.

Councillor R Williams, representing St Georges & Priorslee Parish Council, spoke against the proposals on the grounds that he believed the application was an over-development of the site which would result in excessive traffic generation and subsequent dangers to road safety.

Councillor V A Fletcher, one of the Borough Ward Members for Priorslee, addressed the Board to speak against the application on the grounds that there would be a significant impact on shared driveway access which would impact upon parking and access by construction vehicles, additional traffic generation would exacerbate traffic congestion, there would be a loss of privacy to 8 Bayswater Close and that over-development at the site would breach the building line and have a detrimental effect on the street scene.

Mr K Francis, representing local residents, also spoke to oppose the application on the grounds of loss of privacy, the increase in footprint would be out of character to

the street scene, parking and confusion over the proposed number of bedrooms. He asked members to consider undertaking a site visit.

The Planning Officer referred members to the tabled update report which addressed issues documented by residents of Bayswater Close and specifically set out the position with regard to potential loss of privacy and guideline separation distances. She also advised that the applicant had indicated ownership of the drive. The Planning Officer demonstrated on the displayed plans that some units on Bayswater Close projected forward of the main building, and that there was no distinct building line which characterised the area; as the proposal was located at the end of the cul-de-sac and only approached from the side, she also considered that the proposal would not adversely affect the character of the street scene, and she therefore believed the site could accommodate the extension without a detrimental impact.

Councillor I T W Fletcher noted that those units which projected forward of the building line were one storey garages whereas the application before the Board was for a two storey extension. Referring to the photographs supplied, he considered that this large extension would result in loss of amenity for neighbouring residents.

Councillor N A Dugmore expressed concern that the expectations raised by privacy guidelines were not being met in this case and he feared that a precedent for developing forward of the building line in this case could set a precedent.

Councillor S A W Reynolds noted that all of the plots were large and in her opinion the 2 storey extension would not be incongruous and would have sufficient parking space.

**RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2012/0423 be deferred to allow the Board Members to make a Site Visit on Wednesday, 22 August 2012 at 4.30pm.**

(m) TWC/2012/0472 Southwater Square, Southwater Way, Telford Town Centre, Telford, Shropshire

This was a Reserved Matters application for the erection of the Council's new Community Hub building and associated public realm enhancements at Southwater Square, Telford Town Centre. This mixed use building would incorporate First Point (A2), Library (D1), restaurants and cafes (A3) and flexible office space (A2 & B1) for a range of community, voluntary or public sector uses and associated public realm.

Councillor S A W Reynolds welcomed this application which would provide excellent facilities for the public. She commended the preservation of library facilities and accessibility of First Point facilities.

Councillor N A Dugmore queried the provision for a "Contact Centre" and was advised that the Community Hub was proposed to be the permanent base for the Council's Telephone Contact Centre which was currently based in Civic Offices and would temporarily relocate to Addenbrooke House.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0472 reserved matters planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report, together with a requirement to provide on site sample panels of proposed materials for prior approval.

(n) TWC/2012/0362 4 Little Meadow Close, Admaston, Telford, Shropshire, TF5 0DN

This was an application which sought consent to extend a two-storey detached, hipped roof dwelling with a two storey side extension, conversion and alterations of garage to a study and extension to porch. The extension would provide the dwelling with a bedroom and ensuite at ground floor and bedroom and ensuite at first floor. This application had been deferred at the meeting of the Plans Board on 11 July 2012 to enable Members to undertake a site visit.

Councillor J M Seymour, Borough Ward Councillor for Wrockwardine, spoke in opposition to the application, on the grounds that it constituted an unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbouring residents due to loss of light. She also drew attention to a legal covenant which existed to prevent use of properties on Little Meadow Close as commercial properties and which limited the number of families occupying each home. In addition, Councillor Seymour pointed to increased traffic and parking problems and feared that over-development of this site would create a precedent for development in the vicinity.

Mrs S Farthing, a local resident, also spoke to oppose the application on the grounds of over-development which would impact on the character of the area, over-bearing, over-occupation, increased vehicular traffic, parking problems and business activity at the property which should constitute change of use.

The Planning Officer demonstrated the extent of the development on displayed plans and advised Members of the type of development which could take place under permitted development rights. She advised that she understood the property was run as a family household, albeit an extended family which was becoming the norm in the current economic climate. This was not, therefore, considered to be change of use. However, the Planning Officer recommended an additional condition which would restrict windows and doors on the front elevation to deter the internal segregation of the living accommodation. With regard to business use at the property, liaison with the applicant had taken place and it appeared that he was a semi-retired gentleman with a total of 20 clients, 15 of whom were seen once per year and the remainder no more than quarterly.

Councillor R T Kiernan expressed reservations about the proposed increase in size of the property and the high number of potential occupants, expressing fears that the property would be available for multiple occupancy and this could give rise to an application in future for change of use to Boarding House or similar.

Councillor G C W Reynolds took the view that the plans made good use of a large garden and privacy would be adequately protected by existing boundary fencing. She did not consider that it was within the remit of the Board to limit the size of family which could occupy a home.

Councillor N A Dugmore noted the Planning Officer's advice regarding permitted development, however, he did have reservations regarding loss of light and the fact that the applicant was running a business from the property, regardless of how small.

Councillor S A W Reynolds similarly noted the extent of works which could take place under permitted development rights and she saw the benefit of accepting the application for controlled development. She considered that neighbouring properties would not be greatly adversely affected due to the presence of an existing fence and she also pointed out that many homes were coming under pressure to accommodate extended families due to the prevailing economic climate.

It was then moved, seconded and by a majority:

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0362 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and an additional condition notwithstanding permitted development rights to preclude any additional windows and doors on the front and side elevation of the proposed extension.**

The meeting ended at 11.48pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....