

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

PLANS BOARD

14/12/2011

Schedule 1 - Planning applications for determination by Board

TWC/2011/0658 53, Newport Road, Edgmond, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8HG Erection of a single storey rear extension *****Amended Plans received.....	2
TWC/2011/0764 The Priorslee, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9SW Display of 6no. non-illuminated wall signs, 5no. free-standing non-illuminated post signs, 2No. internally illuminated wall signs, and 1no. externally illuminated wall sign (retrospective)	6
TWC/2011/0811 Greenfields Farm, Brockton, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9EP Erection of 14no. age-restricted dwellings and garages to include 4no. affordable dwellings together with associated gardens/allotments and erection of 1no. double garage to be used in conjunction with the existing dwelling	10
TWC/2011/0894 Station House, Barkers Court, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5AL Change of use to create a single residential dwelling (Use Class C3) together with associated ground works and landscaping ..	23

TWC/2011/0658
53, Newport Road, Edgmond, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8HG
Erection of a single storey rear extension *****Amended Plans received

APPLICANT
, C Snaith

RECEIVED
09/08/2011

PARISH
Edgmond

WARD
Edgmond

THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED AT PLANS BOARD ON 16TH
NOVEMBER FOR A MEMBER SITE VISIT

*****Original Report*****

EDGMOND PARISH COUNCIL HAVE REQUESTED THIS APPLICATION BE
DETERMINED BY PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES:

Principle of development and affect on amenity.

THE PROPOSAL:

This is a full application for the erection of a single storey rear extension to a semi detached bungalow. The extension extends 3.1 metres out from the rear and is the full width of the existing dwelling.

Amended plans have been received indicating reduction in height.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

This is a mature semi-detached bungalow located within a residential area of similar properties in terms of size, design and appearance. Both bungalows have a hipped roof rear outrigger (as originally built). The dwelling is constructed from a mixed red brick with the extension being built from a buff coloured alternative. Windows are white timber casements. The rear garden is mainly paved with evidence of several previous hard standings.

The West boundary is bounded by a 0.7m high post and wire and the East boundary (with the adjoining semi No 55) comprises an approx 1.5 metre high close boarded fence. The rear boundary is mainly hedging.

From the rear garden the property looks out onto open views of the field adjacent. Number 53 and both its neighbours are at similar ground levels.

PLANNING HISTORY:

No Previous history

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Guidance
PPS 1 –Delivering Sustainable Development
Draft National Planning Policy Framework

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
Policy UD2 – Design Criteria

LDF Core Strategy
Policy CS7 – Rural Area
Policy CS 15 Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Ecology: Object. There is a pond approx 200m to the west and another 300m to the south (over a road). It is possible that great crested newts are present in the ponds and using the surrounding habitats to forage. Therefore an ecological appraisal should be undertaken to determine whether any protected species are present within the development site, what impacts the development will have on these species and what mitigation/compensation is required to offset the damage. The results will inform the planning decision.

Edgmond Parish Council: Wish to endorse the objections submitted by neighbours to the site, relating to the size of the proposed extension, the loss of light and the fact that as a 'property available for small lets' there will be more vehicles and as such there will be issues regarding the access to the property.

2 letters of objection were received (from No. 55 and No.57); the comments were concerned with:-

- Area that the property covers
- The use of the property
- Loss of light to neighbouring property
- Drainage

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The proposed extension itself is relatively modest and will provide additional living space. The plot can comfortably accommodate this size of extension leaving a sufficient amount of garden space and therefore it is considered that the principle of development and the overall size are acceptable.

The extension would be satisfactory in overall appearance and roof design. Proposed external materials consist of matching facing bricks, felting material to the flat roof and white upvc windows to match and a condition will be placed to ensure this. The proposal will therefore not be of detriment to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area.

Officers consider that any loss of light associated with the new extension would not have a significant impact on the amenity of number 55 due to the proposed being single storey and flat roofed and there being no windows on the side elevation of next door. Under permitted development the existing infill

extension already breaches the 45 degree code, but officers do not consider the proposed extension will exacerbate the effect to a significant degree. To try and overcome the neighbour's concerns about loss of light, the applicant has amended the scheme to reduce the height of the extension by 150mm to an overall height of 2.4m.

It is worth considering what development could be installed at the property under permitted development. A 2m high fence could be erected along the garden boundary between the application property and No.55, and the proposed extension would project 400mm above this with a flat roof. Instead of an extension the applicant could also erect a large free-standing structure up to 2.5m in height which could extend along the boundary much further than the proposed extension. When considering these scenarios, officers consider that on balance any loss of light or overbearing effect in this instance would not be significant. The neighbour at number 57, which is next but one along, would not be affected by any loss of light because of the separation distance between the properties.

The proposed extension does not contain any windows which overlook number 55. There is a kitchen window in the existing extension that faces No.55, but this would have been permitted development and the location of windows would not be something the Council would have had any say in. As already mentioned the boundary fence could be replaced with a higher 2m high fence would virtually conceal the window.

The proposed window on the west of the extension partially overlooks an obscurely glazed window and a solid brick wall of the neighbouring property (No.51) and there are two driveway widths separation of 5m between the proposed window to the extension and next door's obscure glazed window. Officers are satisfied that the proposed extension does not cause any overlooking to either neighbouring property.

Ecology states that an initial assessment of the site for great crested newts needed to be performed as the hard standing in the rear garden and other debris can create a potential habitat. The assessment has been carried out and the ecologist is satisfied that the garden is not inhabited by any endangered species.

It is noted that the adjoining neighbour at number 55 has concerns with the use of the property for students, but planning legislation does allow this type of use without needing planning permission if there is no material change of use, and therefore there would be little control in this instance. The drainage to the flat roof is not a material planning consideration and can be dealt with via Building regulations approval.

On balance, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable. There will not be a significant impact on the neighbouring properties by virtue of any undue overlooking or loss of light. The proposed development will not have a significant detrimental impact on residential amenity and is appropriate in terms of scale and appearance.

RECOMMENDATION: to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following

Conditions

- A04 Time limit
- C01 Finishing materials to match existing building
- C38 Development in accordance with plan Nos
- D09 No windows or other openings shall be formed in the side elevations without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Informatives

- I40 Conditions
- I41 Reasons for Grant of permission
- 124a Great Crested Newts

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The proposed extension would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area due to the scale, design and the use of the materials to match the existing dwelling.

The proposed development will not have a significant detrimental effect on the amenity to any of the neighbouring properties amenities through loss of light, nor will there be significant overlooking.

As the development does not dominate the site, and is in keeping with the character and appearance of the general area and not of detriment to the amenities of the neighbouring properties, the proposal complies with policies UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan and CS15 of the Core Strategy.

TWC/2011/0764 The Priorslee, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9SW
Display of 6no. non-illuminated wall signs, 5no. free-standing non-illuminated
post signs, 2No. internally illuminated wall signs, and 1no. externally
illuminated wall sign (retrospective)

APPLICANT
, Gillian Breakwell

RECEIVED
09/09/2011

PARISH
St. Georges and Priorslee

WARD
Priorslee

COUNCILLOR IAN FLETCHER HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS
APPLICATION BE CONSIDERED BY THE COUNCIL'S PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Visual amenity and Highway safety

THE PROPOSAL:

This retrospective application is seeking consent to display 14 advertisements on and around the Priorslee Public House off Priorslee Avenue in Priorslee. All the signs are direct replacements for ones which were approved in 2006 and 2007 and which were displayed in and around the site until earlier this year.

The advertisements comprise 6no. non-illuminated wall signs, 5no. non-illuminated free-standing post signs, 2no. internally illuminated wall signs, and 1no. externally illuminated wall sign.

Most of the signs are attached to the public house itself and the others are free-standing signs, mainly along the access road directing people to the car parks and the pedestrian entrance.

One of the new post signs that was erected – that adjacent to Priorslee Avenue – was significantly higher than the sign it replaced, and also higher than the sign shown on the submitted plans. This sign has now been removed and replaced by another one which is the same height as the one that stood on this site until earlier this year.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site lies in the centre of Priorslee, on the northern side of Priorslee Avenue. The public house is situated on the top of a small hill – probably an old pit mound – the sides of which are mainly covered with trees.

To the north east of the public house is a small car park. A larger overflow car park lies at the bottom of the hill, opposite doctor's and dentist's surgeries.

PLANNING HISTORY:

W2006/0336 – Display of illuminated and non-illuminated signs – approved
W2006/0336 – Display of static internally illuminated double-sided pole sign - refused
W2007/0156 – Display of externally illuminated free-standing post sign – approved

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Guidance
PPS 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPG19 – Outdoor Advertisement Control
Draft National Planning Policy Framework

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies

S31 – Shop fronts, advertisements, and hoardings

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The Parish Council supports the application.

Councillor Ian Fletcher has objected to the size of the pole sign and its intrusion in the street scene.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer originally objected to the application on the grounds that the plans did not show underground service routes for the electricity cables. However, this objection was withdrawn when the applicant confirmed that all the signs (apart from those on the existing building) will now be non-illuminated.

The Council's Highways Engineer has no objections to the application subject to the relocation of 2 of the free-standing signs which are at present within the adopted highway verge.

4 letters/e-mails of objection have been received (3 from local residents and one from the Priorslee Primary Academy). The grounds of objection all relate to the pole sign near the Priorslee Avenue junction and are summarised below:-

- It is larger than the previous sign
- It is larger than that shown on the submitted plans
- It is large and intrusive
- It is out of character with the existing street scene and with this part of Priorslee
- It is inappropriate in a residential area
- Adverse visual impact
- Inappropriate advertising near to the entrance of a primary school
- Garish colour scheme

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

This public house was formerly known as the Priors Lodge and has recently been rebranded and renamed as The Priorslee. This has involved changing all the signage on the building and around the site. The intention was to replace all the previous signs with new ones which are exactly the same size.

The replacement signs comprise 3 illuminated and 5 non-illuminated wall and fascia signs on the public house; 5 free-standing non-illuminated post signs, 4 of which lie along the access road; and 1 non-illuminated wall sign along the access road.

The sign that has been the subject of all the objections is the post sign situated adjacent to the Priorslee Avenue junction. In 2006 an application for a 6-metre high internally illuminated post sign on this spot was refused on the grounds that it represented a visually intrusive feature in the street scene which was out of character with the adjoining residential area and detrimental to the amenities of the surrounding area.

In 2007 an application for a 4.5-metre high and 1.8 metre wide externally illuminated post sign was approved. The planning officer's report stated that *"the proposed sign is of a lower height (to the 2006 one) and the proposed graphics/colour scheme is less visually intrusive. In addition the sign would be externally illuminated rather than the existing internal illumination. The overall appearance would be more in keeping with a traditional pub sign and acceptable in the street scene. Therefore, on balance the proposal is considered acceptable having regard to the surrounding residential area"*.

Turning to the current application, the originally submitted plans showed an internally illuminated post sign 4 metres high and 1.5 metres wide. Nevertheless, soon after the application was submitted a post sign was erected that measured 6 metres high and 2 metres wide. It is likely that this is the sign that generated most of the objections. However, this sign has recently been removed and been replaced by another one which is 4.5 metres high and 2 metres wide. Amended plans have now been received that confirm these dimensions.

It is considered that the post sign that has now been erected is acceptable. It is the same height as the one approved in 2007 that stood on this site until earlier this year, and only 0.2 metre wider. It is felt that this increase in width is not significant enough to warrant refusing the application.

Moreover, it is considered that the pole sign is not visually intrusive in the street scene and does not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the site or the immediate area around it. In addition, it is felt that the colour scheme of the new pole sign does not adversely affect the visual amenities of the surrounding area. As the sign will now be non-illuminated it will not be visible during the hours of darkness, thereby further reducing its visual impact in the street scene. All the other advertisements are direct replacements for the previously approved signs, and of similar

dimensions and are considered to be of an appropriate design and scale for the building.

Because the site is relatively secluded and is screened by a large number of trees none of the signs will be visible outside the site apart from the post sign at the Priorslee Avenue junction. There is no visual clutter or proliferation of signs in this area and it is considered that the new signage will not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the site or the surrounding area.

PPG19 states that the display of outdoor advertisements can only be controlled in the interests of 'amenity' and 'public safety'. It is considered that the proposed advertisements comply with these two criteria.

It is considered that the advertisements also accord with Policy S31 of the Wrekin Local Plan in that they do not dominate the street scene; do not lead to an unacceptable level of visual clutter or an excess of advertising; do not prejudice the amenity of the occupiers of nearby dwellings; do not obscure traffic signs; do not distract highway users; and do not hinder the free passage of pedestrians.

Two post signs along the driveway will need to be moved a slight distance off the adopted highway onto the applicant's own land. The applicant has been asked to submit amended plans to show these very slight repositions and for this reason the application needs to be delegated to the Head of Housing and Planning to allow this matter to be resolved.

In conclusion, it is considered that all the new advertisement signs are acceptable. All the signs are of similar dimensions and in the same position as the previous ones which were approved in 2006 and 2007, and which were displayed in and around this site until earlier this year, with the exception of the post sign at the Priorslee Avenue junction which is marginally wider but which is now to be non-illuminated.

RECOMMENDATION: Subject to two free-standing signs being relocated outside the adopted highway, then delegate authority to the Head of Housing and Planning to GRANT ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT subject to the following conditions:-

1. E01 Standard Advertisement condition
2. C38 Advertisements to be displayed in accordance with submitted plans

TWC/2011/0811

Greenfields Farm, Brockton, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9EP

Erection of 14no. age-restricted dwellings and garages to include 4no. affordable dwellings together with associated gardens/allotments and erection of 1no. double garage to be used in conjunction with the existing dwelling

APPLICANT
, Mr Tim Marc Warner

RECEIVED
27/09/2011

PARISH
Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton

WARD
Church Aston and Lilleshall

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: YES

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of development in the rural area, housing numbers, affordable housing, impact on the character and appearance of the area, design & eco-credentials, trees, ecology, highway safety, drainage and flooding, National Grid.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is to relocate the existing rose business that operates from the site to Devon and then erect 14 no. near zero-carbon footprint age-restricted dwellings (8 x 2 bedroomed houses, 2 x 3 bedroomed houses and 4 x 3 bedroomed flats) and a row of 14 garages (with a practice bowling green on the roof). The scheme includes 4no. affordable dwellings (28.5%) together with associated gardens/allotments and 14 gardening sheds; a bin buggy storage; bin store; 7 visitor car spaces and the erection of 1no. double garage to be used in conjunction with the existing dwelling and improvements to the existing access.

Residents would have a maintenance plan including an electric buggy facility for taking bins to the refuse store located a. There would also be a manager responsible for visitors, deliveries, allotment allocation, internet & wireless facilities, sales, refuse, garden and maintenance contracts and health and domiciliary care as required.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site is Greenfields Farm also know as Warner's Roses and formerly Greenfield's Poultry Farm. The site consists of a rose business and farm with a single storey dwelling and several timber and block outbuildings (of various states of repair and dilapidation), a glass house, garaging and a Dutch barn.

The site is designated open countryside in the Wrekin Local Plan Proposals map and is situated 8 miles north of Telford Town Centre and 3 miles south west of Newport Town Centre. The site is accessed off Longford/Edgmond Road just west of the bridge which forms part of the disused railway.

The site is roughly rectangular in shape and comprises a rose field and glass house to the front of the site, the existing dwelling house and domestic

curtilage roughly central to the site with a range of outbuildings behind and a second rose field and grassland beyond. There is a single track driveway providing vehicular access running along the right hand side of the site. The right (south east) boundary is formed by an embankment associated with the disused railway line, the left (north west) boundary is formed by the Strine Brook which is lined by mature trees. There are various sections of post and rail and post and wire fencing and 5-barred gates and numerous trees (including ones which are TPO'd) within the site and the rear of the site backs onto open countryside, and the front of the site is screened from the public highway by mature trees and hedging. The closest neighbour to the right is located on the other side of the old railway embankment and the closest neighbour to the left is on the other side of the brook.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

Core Strategy:

CS1 Homes
CS7 Rural Area
CS9 Accessibility and Social Inclusion
CS12 Natural Environment
CS13 Environmental Resources
CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan:

UD2 Design Criteria
H9 Location of New Housing
H25 Affordable Housing Rural Exceptions Policy
OL11 Woodland and Trees

National guidance:

PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS3 - Housing
PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
PPS9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
PPG13 - Transport
PPS 25 – Development and Flood Risk.
Draft National Planning Policy Framework

CONSULTATIONS:

Three direct neighbour letters and site notice have publicised the application.

7 letters of objection have been received. The issues raised are summarised below:

- I have lived and worked on this farm since 1961 and am bitterly opposed, it is out of character with the area and will double the size of Brockton,
- If my father was alive today he would be strongly against the development,

- As The Shropshire Star Weatherman I can assure you if the amount of rainfall which fell in Bridgnorth in June 2007 fell on Brockton many buildings would be under water,
- The site is vulnerable to flooding and therefore is a natural sewerage system advisable, additional rainwater run off would contribute to flooding,
- In 1957 the poultry houses had to be dragged to higher ground,
- The land is a small low lying green field with a redundant railway embankment on one side and Strine Brook on the other,
- It is unacceptable and unsustainable to build on unspoilt rural land,
- The style of the proposed development with 2nd & 3rd level rooms with balconies is not characteristic with country style housing and do not fit in with the area, would be over bearing,
- There is a gas supply pipe running along the embankment and 'cutting in' to it could be dangerous,
- The row of 14 garages is uncharacteristic with the area,
- The nearby brook often floods and is potentially dangerous to health,
- Traffic generation, the current access is onto the Brockton to Edgmond road, which may not be considered suitable for additional traffic. The road is very dark and narrow and access is located on a dangerous bend. In order to cater for elderly residents it may be necessary to widen the road, providing pavements, ramps, lighting, suitable signage and traffic calming measures. It may also necessitate the removal of the existing railway bridge.
- Pressure on existing water supply,
- The proposed development would not provide a solution to housing needs but would further stretch the essential services, existing permissions will satisfy the need,
- Age related accommodation is some distance from public highway and services, no footways or pavements, Public transport does not pass the site and there are no shops or facilities other than a pub within walking distance,
- The proposal would be visible from certain aspects especially when the trees have lost their leaves,
- Noise and disruption in the local neighbourhood,
- Impact on wildlife, the countryside should be protected,
- It is in contravention of Preferred Option CS7 as regards being outside of the designated settlements, within open countryside and is not necessary to meet the needs of the area.
- The location for the site is totally inappropriate for 'age restricted' living and the proposals within the application to deal with this are totally inadequate.
- The general nature of the detail within the application gives inadequate information as to how the various components for the scheme actually will be designed and built in reality i.e. the information is 'aspirational' but does not interpret and detail the aspirations into designs from which we are able understand how these will be applied for the scheme as a whole and for the proposed individual units.

- With the recent approval of 209 units for the Continuing Care Village by the A41, a further 80 units applied for in application TWC/2011/0871, the near completion of the 'senior living' dwellings in the centre of Newport and the existing care and aged living offering already operating in Newport, we would suggest in the absence of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment for Newport and the rural hinterland, that further provision of 'aged living' units are not required as demand is already more than adequately addressed and thus does not warrant any departure from Preferred Option CS7.

Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council object to the proposal for the following reasons;

- Access – the proposed access to the site is close to a railway bridge through which large vehicles have to drive in the centre of. There is also a very sharp bend and some form of traffic calming measures would have to be installed to make the access to this site safe.
- Demand – no survey has been undertaken to discover if there is a demand for this type of housing in the area neither have neighbours been approached personally to discover their views.
- Remoteness – as there are no on site facilities residents would have to drive to local amenities adding to the number of times vehicles are leaving and entering the site or walk along a road which has no pavement.
- Policy – as the proposed application is to develop a green field site this is in conflict with the planning policy of Telford & Wrekin Council.
- Garage design – this is more in keeping with urban areas and not that associated with rural designs.
- Parking – there is insufficient parking for residents and whilst consideration has been given as to where visitors would park this would be used as overflow parking by residents with two or more vehicles.
- It is suggested that Mr Warner consider something more in keeping with rural developments and possibly address the points/concerns raised above.

The Council's Policy Officer has confirmed that the proposal is considered unacceptable in policy terms as the site is outside one of the 3 suitable settlements in which new residential development is permitted. The development is not exceptional i.e. it is for small scale affordable housing, agriculture/forestry workers dwelling or development related to a listed building. There is no identified need for this type of housing in this locality and the proposed would exceed the identified housing needs for the rural area.

The Council's Strategic Housing Officer has confirmed that in respect of affordable housing the proposal is contrary to policy, which requires the affordable element of new residential development in the rural area to be 40% (this proposal equates to 28.5%). The location is outside the 3 identified villages in the rural area, and there is no evidence of 'need'.

The Council's Ecologist has objected as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that Protected Species on the site will not be adversely affected by the proposed development, given that evidence of bat usage was found in the buildings due for demolition and Activity Surveys have not been carried out on the adjacent trees which are likely to be used for foraging and commuting.

The Council's Arborist objects to the application on grounds of insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that protected trees on the site will not be adversely affected by the proposed development.

The Council's Landscape Architect requests an annotated plan showing features referred to in text, location of visual barriers and location of photos. She has concerns as to who would maintain the bowling area. What will happen to land beyond allotments including trout pond? How would access be gained to this area? The Council would need commitment to planting along railway being appropriate species and density.

The National Grid has advised that there is High or Intermediate Pressure gas apparatus in the vicinity which may be affected by the proposed development. The works proposed are likely, unless controlled, to adversely impact the safety and integrity of National Grid apparatus.

The Council's Highway Engineer has no objections in principle subject to conditions in respect of the provision of sufficient visibility splays, a bellmouth and hardsurfacing. The assumptions which have been made on travel to and from the site have been based on the submission being retirement units. Therefore, any planning permission should condition the site for such use. If the site is to be available on the open market then travel modes and patterns may be different and increased if younger residents with children occupied the site with the associated travel to work and school run etc.

The Council's Drainage Engineer has no objections subject to the imposition of conditions requiring additional details relating to the point of discharge from foul water reed bed system, and details of surface water discharge (at Greenfield run-off rates) are also required. He also advises that part of the site is affected by Floodzone 2. Due to the limited area that is affected, and the extent of the development, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is not required. However there should be no solid fence lines or other structures, including garden sheds on the proposed allotments that may affect flood storage/flows. This requirement should be written into the deeds of the property to ensure that this is maintained in the future.

PLANNING HISTORY:

PE/2011/0272 Prior to the submission of this planning application an informal enquiry was made to the Council informing the LPA of the intention to submit a formal planning application for between 8 & 12 age restrictive units with an affordable element.

The letter acknowledges that the land is not designated for new housing and does not feature within any local housing policy boundaries and/or is not part or provided for in the Local Plan and /or GDO, however wished to argue the positives for the scheme on a merit and sustainable basis.

The applicant was advised that the LPA would not support the proposed development.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

Principle of development in this rural location and housing numbers.

From a planning policy perspective, the scale, location, and nature of the development proposed are key considerations for this application, with Policies CS1 *Homes*, CS7 *Rural Area*, and 'saved' policy H24 *Affordable Housing Rural Exceptions Policy* of the Wrekin Local Plan being most relevant.

The applicant makes reference in the supporting documentation to Policy H8 *Rural Housing Numbers* in seeking to define relevant policy merits of the application. This policy has not been 'saved' i.e. retained and therefore is not relevant to the determination of this application.

The Core Strategy was adopted on 1st December 2007 and sets out the Spatial Development Strategy, alongside related policies for the Borough. The Core Strategy is based on the principle of concentrating development within Telford focussed on 'highly accessible' locations. Some development will be permitted in the rural area limited to that necessary to meet the needs of the area.

In taking forward these principles, Core Strategy policy CS1 requires that the spatial distribution of new homes be consistent with the spatial development strategy stating that housing needs in the rural area will be met by approximately 170 new dwellings. This figure is derived from evidence provided by the Telford & Wrekin Housing Needs Study, with its inclusion in local policy also reflecting national planning policy (PPS7) requirements to limit the number of new dwellings in rural areas. At the current time, this threshold has already been met from dwellings already built or having received planning permission. This proposed development would therefore exceed the need identified for the rural area contrary to CS1 in terms of the scale of development proposed.

Whilst the applicant is seeking to provide a specific type of housing in the form of age-restricted properties, with the exception of the 4 affordable units the nature of this type of property is considered to be open market and therefore contrary to current policy. Reference is made in the application to wide and established demographical need in the parish. However, material submitted does not provide the quantified evidence of this need in order to justify this scale of provision in Brockton as an acceptable departure from policy. Similarly, even with on-site provision of leisure facilities in the form of a roof

top bowling green and allotments these are still not enough to outweigh policy.

Within the context of the local rural policy framework, Policy CS7 holds that housing development within the rural area will be limited to that necessary to meet the needs of the area and will be focussed on the settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Any development proposed outside of these settlements would be limited with the exception of affordable housing, agriculture/forestry workers dwellings or development related to a listed building. Whilst a component of affordable housing is proposed as part of the application, this does not fit within the parameters of Policy H24 in representing a small scale affordable exceptions proposal, and this is discussed below.

Guidance contained within the Draft National Planning Policy Framework states that development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay – a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision. Furthermore, to promote sustainable development, housing in rural areas should not be located in places distant from local services. In this regard officers opine that this location is such that the proposed development is not sustainable due to its location in the rural area. Hence the proposal is contrary to this document.

Affordable housing

As mentioned above Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy seeks to limit development in the Rural Area to that required to meet local needs and requires provision of 40% affordable housing, focussed in one of three named settlements. This application proposes 28.5% affordable housing (4 units) in the countryside and is not in any of the named settlements - it is therefore not compliant with policy CS7.

Housing development could be considered in other locations in the Rural Area if there is evidence of local need. This could be achieved through the Council's rural exceptions policy, saved policy H24 of the Wrekin Local Plan, which would require the scheme to be 100% affordable housing, to be small-scale (no more than 8 units), within or adjoining a village and based solely on evidence of need. The provision of 14 low carbon dwellings (including 4 affordable units) on a rural site, away from an identified settlement where there is no proven local need is not a material consideration that outweighs policy. This proposal is therefore not compliant with this policy.

Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy also requires the type, size and tenure of new homes to meet local need and be delivered in such a way that creates locally inclusive sustainable communities. The proposal refers to meeting a "huge local need", however it is not clear what evidence this is based on. There does not appear to be any evidence of need submitted to support the proposal. A recent parish housing needs survey (for the rural parts of Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton) carried out by the Council identified a need for 4 single storey units for older and/or disabled people and potential need for both single and two-storey homes for newly-forming households. This

proposal seeks to provide 2 storey houses for people aged 55 and over, however the survey did not identify any need for this provision.

The Design & Access statement also refers to providing “health and domiciliary care as required” by the scheme manager, suggesting that this may be a sheltered or Extra Care scheme, however does not set out any further details about this. Nonetheless, the applicant has advised that it is proposed that the occupiers will be able bodied retiring couples who wish to consolidate their assets and down size to more manageable accommodation. As the occupants age the dwellings are designed in such a way that when infirm there is the opportunity for residents to sleep downstairs or upstairs. It is envisaged that the initial residents will live in the dwellings for approximately 25-30 years and when they either eventually move into a care home or die it is possible that other younger members of the same family could take up residence.

This proposal must also be considered alongside other schemes in that locality which would meet local needs. There is an imminent a proposal for residential development in Lilleshall which complies with policy and which, if developed, would meet the current affordable housing needs of the parish.

In conclusion, the application does not comply with relevant policies CS1, CS7 and H24 and there is no evidence that this scale or type of provision is necessary to meet local housing needs.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area, design and eco-credentials

This is a greenfield site in the rural area and thus the introduction of a development comprising 14 single, 2 and 2½ storey dwellings and apartments is considered inappropriate and out of character with the locality and would result in an adverse impact upon the rural appearance of this area.

The proposed layout comprises two ‘L’ shaped blocks arranged in a ‘U’ shaped formation with a staggered height roof line. The D&A statement advises that the layout is representative of a farmstead layout and comparisons are made to previous barn conversions within the Borough. However, officers do not concur with this view. This proposal is not a conversion of an existing agricultural building with significant architectural and historic value; it is all new build and therefore not comparable. The D&A statement also advises that the design will emulate and be sympathetic to barn conversions, and be unique, ground breaking, exemplary and highly sustainable. Officers do not share this view; apart of being in a highly unsustainable location it is considered that the design and detailing of the proposed dwellings does not respect Shropshire rural vernacular.

The D&A statement advises that the new built form will result in a smaller volume of sensitively designed built form when compared to the existing buildings on site. Officers do not concur with this claim and consider that the existing buildings, whilst not of any notable visual merit, are relatively low key and appropriate in this rural location. In contrast the proposal comprises 14

new dwellings of a significant scale and massing, plus a row of 14 flat roofed garages, which are not sympathetic to this rural area away from a settlement.

The drawings do indicate corbelling detailing to the verges however the development includes modern 4 light wide casement windows, brick soldier courses, flat roofed conservatories with French doors above opening onto balconies with railings, French doors with Juliette balconies, full height dormer windows with French doors on the second floor with Juliette balconies. Thus the proposed development has the appearance of a modern housing scheme more suited to the urban area. Therefore, the proposed development fails to respect or relate positively to its context and fails to enhance the quality of the local environment through high quality and, appropriate and distinctive design. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with policies UD2, CS15, PPS1 and PPS3.

The proposal includes and promotes the ambition to create as near a zero-carbon footprint including; a heat sump, photo-voltaic panels, grey water harvesting, reed bed sewage treatment, triple glazing, high insulation, locally sourced materials and craftsmen. These 'Eco' credentials are noted and laudable, however these issues are considered insufficient to justify in themselves what are essentially 14 new dwellings in the open countryside. Whilst the 'Eco' credentials are a "sustainable" form of development they are not what the Draft National Planning Policy Framework intended as a sole factor in its presumption in favour of "sustainable development", as the definition of sustainable development has wider implications. Hence officers do not consider the 'Eco' credentials of the scheme to be a significant material consideration to justify a deviation from policy. The majority of the 'Eco' issues presented with this development proposal are those which would be considered in all new development and everyday sustainable living and supported by policy CS13.

Impact upon trees

PPS9 sets out the Government's vision for conserving and enhancing biological diversity in England. It includes the broad aim that planning, construction, development and regeneration should have minimal impacts on biodiversity and enhance it wherever possible. It notes that the re-use of previously developed land for new development makes a major contribution to sustainable development by reducing the amount of countryside and undeveloped land that needs to be used. Policy CS12 refers to the protection of the Borough's natural environment and policy OL11 states that the Council will resist development proposals that would result in the loss of trees which make a valuable contribution to the character of the landscape or have significant ecological value.

There are a number of trees within the site and adjacent to it that will be affected by the development, but, there is no information relating to them, or how they will be protected during the construction phase.

BS: 5837 'Trees in Relation to Construction, Land Surveys' paragraph 4.1.5 summarises; that '*a Tree Survey should include the approximate location of*

trees within, and, on land adjacent to the development site, which might influence the site or be important as part of the Local Landscape character’.

Of particular note, there are 2 Red Oaks within the site that will be affected by the development. These trees are worthy of preservation, and as such there is an order pertaining to them.

One of the Red Oaks is within a metre or so of the Dutch barn, therefore an Arboricultural Method Statement is required for its deconstruction, utilising the ‘Top down, Pull back’ method of deconstruction. There should also be an Arboricultural Method Statement for the screening tree line/ hedge adjacent to the old chicken shed and how this is to be removed.

The existing access road is currently designed for one property and hence a low volume of traffic. The application entails the proposed turning circle adjacent to the existing property. One of the Red Oaks currently grows adjacent to this space. Additionally, it would be necessary that the construction of the new road should be of a porous nature to allow for the gaseous exchange of water and nutrients between the roots.

Furthermore, there is no detail of any services runs within the application drawings. They are mentioned in the D & A but not featured within the plans e.g. foul water, electricity, gas, communications, and lighting, and there are no details of the route they will take through the site. Accordingly, it is considered that the application has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal will not adversely impact upon the trees on site and therefore the application is considered contrary to policies CS12, OL11 and guidance contained within PPG9.

Protected Species

A protected species survey accompanied the application and showed evidence of bat usage in the buildings. In the Dutch barn several pipistrelle and brown long-eared bat droppings were scattered randomly about the floor, suggesting foraging activity, and a number of moth wings were scattered under the steel roof-supporting, suggesting the presence of a brown long-eared bat’s feeding perch.

In the cowshed, several moth wings were noted throughout the building, but no associated droppings were found which, given the lack of roost availability, suggests that the barn is used solely as a feeding perch by low numbers of brown long-eared bats.

Bats are not roosting in the buildings due for demolition; however the destruction of bat resting places (e.g. feeding perches) is an absolute offence under Article 12 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Therefore a Natural England European Protected Species Licence is required. The submitted report should be updated to confirm this, and appropriate mitigation measures suggested. Until the LPA receives this information the Council cannot answer the Habitat Regulations 3 tests and discharge its duty.

In addition, the report has stated that there are potential bat roosting opportunities in mature trees along the stream, although no activity surveys were carried out to confirm this. A number of bat species are likely to forage and commute along the stream. Therefore, it is considered necessary that any suitable trees close to the site are assessed for their potential to support roosting bats. Activity surveys should also be carried out to ascertain bat usage in the area. Case law dictates that it is not acceptable to leave required surveys to be dealt with by way of a planning condition (R v Cornwall CC).

Given that the LPA does not support the application in principle the additional surveys were not requested as this would have resulted in additional expense for the applicant. Nevertheless, it is considered that insufficient information has been submitted with the application to enable the LPA to determine whether or not the proposed development would adversely impact upon any protected species on the site. Therefore the proposal is deemed contrary to policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained in PPS9.

Drainage and Highways

PPS25 states that planning policy on development and flood risk is to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process, and to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas at highest risk. Comments from neighbours in respect of flooding area noted however, the Council's Drainage Engineer has confirmed that he has no objections in principle subject to foul and surface water conditions. The proposal is therefore deemed compliant with guidance contained within PPS25.

The objectives of PPG13 are to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local level and to promote more sustainable transport choices, by promotion of accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling; and a reduction the need to travel, especially by car.

The applicant has suggested the provision of a footway linking the site to the A518. For a retirement community development of just 14 units it is considered that this is somewhat over engineering a solution to a problem which is likely not to exist. The site location is unsustainable with no amenities within suitable walking distance and therefore it is likely that the predominant transport mode to and from the site would be the car. Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICP) (provided by the Council's Highway Engineer), which is the national database for vehicular movements associated with new development, suggests no more than 14 two way pedestrian movements associated with the site even if the site was in a more sustainable location. Accordingly, a footway provision, which would have to be extend for 300m, be street lit, have crossing points and be sufficiently drained could cost in excess of £30k but would only have minimal use and is likely to become an unsafe moss covered maintenance liability within a short period of time.

The applicant has also suggested the provision of a bus stop, near the site, however no bus route goes past the site and just 14 units is unlikely to justify the re routing of an existing public service.

That said, the Council's Highway Engineer has advised that he has no objections to the proposed housing development in principle providing a suitable alteration to the existing access can be achieved which will ensure that there is no detrimental impact upon highway safety.

Other Issues

Issues in respect of the National Grid could be addressed via the imposition of suitable conditions and informatives if the LPA supported the principle of the development.

Similarly additional informational required to satisfy the Council's Landscape Architect could have been requested and addressed via the imposition of conditions and informatives if the LPA supported the principle of the development.

In conclusion, it is considered that the creation of 14 additional dwellings on this site is unacceptable as it is a highly unsustainable location in the rural area and is outside the settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. The eco credentials associated with the proposed development are laudable; however no information has been submitted to demonstrate that this proposal should be an exception to general housing policy. The proposal to create 14 new dwellings in the open countryside would exceed the maximum housing numbers permitted in the rural area and undermine the Core Strategy approach. The proposed development has the appearance of a modern housing scheme more suited to the urban area rather than this rural location. Therefore, the proposed development fails to respect or relate positively to its context and fails to enhance the quality of the local environment through high quality and, appropriate and distinctive design. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to enable the LPA to determine whether or not the proposed development would adversely impact upon any protected species on the site. Therefore, the proposed development is deemed contrary to both local and national policy and guidance and recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reasons:

1. The Local Planning Authority considers that the erection of 14 additional dwellings on this highly unsustainable site is unacceptable as it is outside the settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Furthermore, no information has been received to demonstrate that there are material considerations to justify this proposal as an exception to general housing policy. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to 'saved' policies H10 and H24 of the adopted Wrekin local Plan 1995-2006 and policies CS1 and CS7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2007 and national guidance contained within PPS1, PPS3 and PPS7.

2. The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed development has the appearance of a modern housing scheme more suited to the urban area. Therefore, the proposed development fails to respect or relate positively to its context and fails to enhance the quality of the local environment through high quality and, appropriate and distinctive design. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to 'saved' policies UD2 of the adopted Wrekin local Plan 1995-2006 and policy CS15 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2007 and national guidance contained within PPS1 and PPS3.
3. The Local Planning Authority considers that proposal to erect 14 new dwellings in the open countryside would exceed the maximum housing numbers permitted in the rural area and undermine the Core Strategy approach. Accordingly, the proposal is deemed contrary to policy CS1 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2007.
4. The Local Planning Authority considers that insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the trees and any protected species on the site will not be adversely affected by the proposed development. Accordingly, the proposal is deemed contrary to 'saved' policy OL11 of the adopted Wrekin local Plan 1995-2006, policy CS12 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2007 and national guidance contained within PPS9.

TWC/2011/0894

Station House, Barkers Court, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5AL
Change of use to create a single residential dwelling (Use Class C3) together
with associated ground works and landscaping

APPLICANT
, Andy Collier

RECEIVED
26/10/2011

PARISH
Madeley

WARD
Madeley

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: No

MAIN ISSUES:

Principle of residential development and amenity.

THE PROPOSAL:

This is a Council application which seeks planning permission for the change of use of a Day Service Resources Centre to create a single residential dwelling with associated landscaping.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site is adjacent to the Silkin Way in Madeley and comprises of the Station Master's House dated from the late 18th/early 19th century. It is a detached two storey building with a single storey flat roofed element being the former waiting rooms. The building is not listed but still has original features of white painted timber sash and casement windows with brickwork arches and white painted sills. The site is accessed off Barker Court and has a shared vehicular entrance point with the parking area for 1 – 5 Barker's Court.

To the front and north side of the building, the site is laid to tarmac which is currently used for parking. To the south side a footpath leads to a small part enclosed courtyard at the corner of the building where there are planting beds with trees. The rear has a small strip of grass which abuts the Silkin Way and has mature and young trees at either end.

The application site is located in a predominantly residential area, with traditional properties on Station Road, and modern housing on adjoining Barker Court. To the south are light industrial workshops owned by the Council, with the Silkin Way to the east. Madeley district centre is within walking distance with shops and a public library.

PLANNING HISTORY:

W2000/0199 Change of use to Day Service Resource Centre and erection of security fencing granted 12th April 2000.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Guidance
PPS 1 –Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS3 – Housing

PPS9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
PPG13 – Transport

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
UD2 – Design Criteria
H6 – Windfall sites in Telford & Newport
OL11- Woodland and Trees

LDF Core Strategy
CS1 – Homes
CS5 – District and Local centres in Telford
CS9 – Accessibility and Social Inclusion
CS13 Natural resources
CS15 – Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Madeley Parish welcome the proposal with the following comments;

- The historic building contributes to character and sense of place within Madeley, therefore this supports the retention of the property as an historic asset.
- The old station served a passenger service from 1861 until 1952 on the Coalport Branch line. For the benefit of conservation and stewardship an application to English Heritage for listing should be accompanied.
- More sensitive rear boundary is necessary as the Silkin Way is heavily used by pedestrian and cyclists. Boundary treatment should be subject of condition.
- Loss of green open space may be mitigated by provision of a heritage information board on the Silkin Way. Suggested that Telford & Wrekin Councils Estates and Investments discuss financial support for additional signage with Built Heritage Officer.

Drainage has raised no objections.

Ecology has raised no objections subject to informatives on bats and birds, trenches and vegetation cutting due to the site.

Shropshire Fire Authority raise no objections subject to informatives regarding the installation of a sprinkler system and adequate access for emergency vehicles is provided.

Neighbour consultation responses

A site notice and 10 direct neighbour letters have advertised the application;

1 joint letter of support has been received from 2 neighbouring properties who are delighted to see that residential use is planned as it would enhance the area and the historic importance of the building has been recognised. They would like to see some form of restriction to prevent any significant change to the exterior of the building or future demolition.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The Design & Access statement advises that the proposed development was converted from its last use as a Council house to offices in 2000, when the former waiting rooms were re-opened and refurbished. At that time it became occupied by the Council's Adult & Consumer Care, Day Service Resources Centre team. It is currently occupied on a temporary basis by the Council's Learning & Behaviour Team who has been there since 2010, primarily to keep it occupied prior to sale. They will relocate in due course, following wider Council restructures, prompting this application which applies for Change of Use back to residential. Onward disposal will release funds to contribute to the Council's property rationalisation programme.

As the site was previously a dwelling and the building has remained substantially unaltered the building lends itself to the conversion. The grounds of the building have also been retained, providing ample amenity. The proposal will not have an impact on the adjacent or surrounding uses. It is considered that Station House has an important history within Madeley and retains original features, Therefore it is considered that the conversion to residential will help to retain the character and historic relevance of this building. The control of any future external changes, extensions, outbuildings and boundary treatments can be mitigated through conditions to protect the historic features of the building and lessen the impact on the proposed amenity space.

The site is in the built up area of Madeley in a highly accessible location within walking distance of bus stops along High Street just 150m away and is well connected to public transport services. The close proximity to Madeley District centre means that it is convenient for walking and cycling. There are both primary and secondary schools close by along with several play areas; therefore the principle of additional residential development in this area is acceptable and compliant with local adopted policies CS1, CS5 and CS9 and national guidance PPS1 and PPS3.

As it currently stands, there are six parking spaces on existing tarmac to the side and front of the building. It is proposed to reduce the tarmac area to the front to create more green space and garden land. At least three parking spaces will be retained to the side (north) of the site with room for vehicles to turn around and exit the site. The proposal does not require a change to the existing gated entrance which will remain; subsequently it is considered the proposal provides adequate on site parking facilities. The proposal will not have any further impact on drainage or land conditions and subsequently compliant with policy H6 .

The rear of the site has existing security fencing. The applicant wishes to extend this fencing out towards the Silkin Way to extend and close off the rear garden. Concerns have been raised by the Parish in respect of the boundary treatment to the rear as it is a significant border to the Silkin Way. It is considered that fencing alone is rather harsh looking along this boundary; therefore a condition will be imposed to have appropriate fencing and

landscaping to soften the look and preserve the appearance of the environment. There are numerous trees and shrubs located just outside the site boundary which will remain. The existing greenscape within the site will be retained, along with the walled courtyard. Tarmac removed from the front of the site will be laid to grass with borders and new trees will be planted within these garden borders. The site has an existing small courtyard to the side which will house refuse and recycling bins.

The Local Authority considers that the proposed change of use to residential with car parking and landscaping is acceptable in principal as it is located in a highly accessible sustainable location. There is no detrimental effect upon the residential properties within the immediate surrounding area and the conversion will provide adequate living accommodation for future occupiers. The proposed development is sympathetic and will result in a positive impact on retaining the character and historic relevance of this building and the locality. Parking provision is acceptable and will not have a detrimental impact on parking in the adjacent highway. Accordingly the development is considered compliant with 'saved' polices UD2, H6 and OL11 of the Wrekin Local Plan, policies CS1, CS5, CS9 and CS15 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained within PPS1, PPS3, PPS9 and PPG13.

RECOMMENDATION: to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions

1. A04 Time limit
2. B06 Samples of materials
3. B13 Details of enclosure
4. C14 Landscape implementation soft
5. D01 Removal of all permitted development rights
6. I23a Bat, bird and invertebrate boxes
7. I25e Trenches
8. I25h Vegetation Cutting
9. I25k Bats and birds
10. I32 Access and sprinklers
11. I40 Conditions
12. I41 Reasons for Grant
13. RACustom Reasons for approval

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The proposed change of use of the Station House to a single residential unit with with car parking and landscaping is acceptable in principal as it is located in a highly accessible sustainable location. There is no detrimental effect upon the residential properties within the immediate surrounding area and the conversion will provide adequate living accommodation for future occupiers. The proposed development is sympathetic and will result in a positive impact

on retaining the character and historic relevance of this building and the locality. Parking provision is acceptable and will not have a detrimental impact on parking in the adjacent highway.