

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 5 November 2014 at 6.00pm in the Telford Suite at Shropshire College Hotel School Ltd (The Telford Whitehouse Hotel), Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NJ

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, E J Greenaway, A S Jhavar, J Loveridge, L A Murray, B J Thompson (as substitute for K R Guy) and C R Turley.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor A J Eade (for planning application TWC/2014/0348).

PC-044 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 15 October 2014 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC-045 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors K R Guy and A A Meredith

PC-046 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0883, Councillor A S Jhavar commented that he was the borough ward member but he had not engaged in any prior discussions and would not be withdrawing from the meeting for that item.

Councillor L A Murray indicated that he was one of the borough ward members for Hadley and Leegomery but he had not taken part in any previous discussions regarding planning application TWC/2014/0765, and would not be withdrawing from the meeting for that item.

Councillor C R Turley commented on his position as the Local Authority's representative on both the Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust and Severn Gorge Countryside Trust but he had not taken part in any discussions with regard to planning application TWC/2014/0272 and he would not withdraw from the meeting for that item.

PC-047 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

PC-048 SITE VISITS

None.

PC-049 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning applications TWC/2014/0272, TWC/2014/0765 and TWC/2014/0883.

(a) TWC/2014/0272 - Ivydale, High Street, Coalport, Telford, Shropshire, TF8 7HZ

This application sought full planning permission for the erection of 12 dwellings with associated garaging, new vehicular access, parking and private amenity space. An update report was tabled at the meeting which set out an additional consultation response received in support and outlined the developer's offer of a potential private pedestrian access point as presented in a revised site plan and street scene. Members had undertaken a site visit earlier in the afternoon prior to the meeting. An update to the report was tabled setting out a further consultation response received and proposals to provide a private pedestrian access point.

The Applicant's Agent, Mr A Williams, addressed the Committee in support of the application in terms of compliance with local policies, land stability, access and turning head, arboriculture, ecology, flood risk and drainage, extensive consultation and subsequent refinement of the proposals, employment opportunities for local tradesmen and the likelihood of early commencement.

The Planning Officer advised that the proposals were in accordance with policy and drew attention to aspects of the report relating to amended plans reducing the density of the proposals, land stability, highways, impact on trees and impact on heritage assets. Upon request, he reiterated the position with regard to the proposed footpath access point as presented in the revised site plan and streetscene tabled with the update report. He noted that a gate was already in existence which, subject to agreement with the Council as neighbouring landowner, could potentially be re-positioned to provide a pedestrian route from the western end of the site through to the Silkin Way and High Street, thereby avoiding the bridge and improving highway safety. In response to further questions, the Planning Officer advised that a site for recreational facilities had not been identified and that financial contributions resulting from this development were likely to be combined with other available monies to provide facilities in the vicinity but not on-site. The Committee were also advised that the National Planning Policy Framework was clear that the onus was on the developer/landowner to ensure a safe development; a Stability Declaration Form had been submitted and proposed conditions required the submission of detailed information with regard to stability.

Upon being put to the vote, Members unanimously supported the application.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0272 the Development Management Service Delivery Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the applicants/landowners entering into a Section 106 Agreement for a financial contribution of £600 per 2 bed unit (and above) towards off-site play and recreation and further subject to the

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

(b) TWC/2014/0348 - Littlehales Manor Farm, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9AN

This proposal, for the erection of 4 poultry houses, heating building with associated vehicular access, ancillary equipment and landscaping, had been amended since being deferred on 3 September 2014 to allow the applicant time to engage in further discussions. The amendments comprised removal of the biomass heating element which was replaced by a ground source heat pump system resulting in a reduction in the height of the shed and a new access to the site.

The Committee noted that Councillor L Hardy (Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council) had registered to speak but due to delayed travel plans he was not present.

Councillor A J Eade, the Borough Ward Member for Church Aston and Lilleshall, spoke in support of the application, commending the applicant for his efforts to resolve concerns with the original application and welcomed the amendments which had been made. He supported the comments of Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council regarding access and welcomed the proposed financial contribution towards the upgrade of Pitchcroft Lane.

The Applicant's Agent, Mr S Jones, addressed the Committee in support of the application. He noted the applicant family had a long history of farming on the site and that significant revisions had been made to address planning officers' concerns with the original submission regarding highways, noise and odour. He noted the lack of technical objection to the amended application and pointed out that a contract had been secured with a poultry processor but this would be withdrawn if building did not commence in the near future triggering huge abortive costs to the applicant.

The Planning Officer reminded Members' that originally this application had been recommended for refusal, but following discussions and subject to agreement with the Highways Officer, the amendments submitted were considered satisfactory. She welcomed financial contributions towards the upgrade of Pitchcroft Lane but noted that these were offered voluntarily in the form of a mitigation agreement between the applicant and the Parish Council and would not form a Section 106 planning obligation. In response to questioning, the Planning Officer clarified that hedgerows along the proposed access would require maintenance to preserve visibility splays.

Members unanimously welcomed the amended access and improved plans which they considered sufficiently mitigated against noise and odour.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0348, subject to satisfactory agreement on highways issues, the Development Management Service Delivery Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and

reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

- (c) TWC/2014/0765 - 1-3 Castle Lane, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 6RD

This was a full planning application seeking permission for the demolition of an existing dwelling and garaging off Castle Lane in Hadley and the construction of a block of 11 flats including a private car parking area to the rear. Councillor R K Austin, one of the Borough Ward Members for Hadley and Leegomery, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee. The Chairman noted that Councillor Austin was unable to attend the meeting and advised the Committee that Councillor Austin had indicated that he was not opposed to the development and merely wanted to see good car parking facilities to accompany it.

The Planning Officer advised that issues regarding lighting had been raised but that proposed condition 10 addressed these through the submission of a lighting plan. Some Members had recently had cause to visit the vicinity and noted yellow lining and the availability of a car park for Lidl customers. The Planning Officer provided other members with views of the site.

Upon being put to the vote, it was unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0765 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

- (d) TWC/2014/0883 - 25 Weavers Rise, Ketley Bank, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 0EX

This application sought consent to fell a Yew Tree, situated in the grounds of 25 Weavers Rise, which was the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Councillor H Rhodes, one of the Borough Ward Members for Ketley and Oakengates, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee. Unfortunately, Councillor Rhodes was unable to attend the meeting. An update report was tabled at the meeting which set out Oakengates Town Council's support to fell the tree due to the great volumes of berries produced which were poisonous. Members had undertaken a site visit earlier in the afternoon prior to the meeting.

Councillor S Reynolds, representing Oakengates Town Council, spoke in support of the application, noting that the application had been made due to problems encountered during the fruiting season impacting on the use and safety of the surrounding garden area. He did not believe that the specimen could be suitably pruned as suggested by the Arboricultural Officer and noted that the applicant was willing to plant a less intrusive, child and pet-friendly replacement.

During the course of the debate, the applicant sought to speak but as he had not previously registered in accordance with policy, the request was declined.

The Planning Officer advised that the proposed felling of the tree was considered unacceptable due to its amenity value within the estate. There was no arboricultural justification for the felling nor was there a highway or public safety issue. Therefore, the loss of the tree would conflict with local and national planning policies.

Members expressed converse views regarding the proposals and sought opinion from the arboricultural officer who noted the existence of the tree on the 1882 historic map, placing the tree at approximately 150 years old. The felling of a nearby Sycamore tree in recent years had increased the prominence of the Yew and enhanced its amenity value. No applications to maintain the tree had been made since the Tree Preservation Order was made in 1990 and there were mitigation measures available to the applicant in terms of light pruning whilst the tree was in flower which would inhibit the tree's natural fruiting cycle. Maintenance was the responsibility of the owner.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist reiterated the Planning Officer's view and the availability of mitigation opportunities. He indicated that, if Members were minded to refuse the application, they may wish to indicate a maintenance management plan could be considered. Members considered that this was the most appropriate course of action and on being put to the vote it was, by a majority:-

RESOLVED – that consent application TWC/2014/0883 be refused as the proposed felling of the Yew tree cannot be justified. The tree provides significant amenity value and contributes to the character of the area and its removal would be significantly detrimental to the immediate environment. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to policy CS12 and CS15 of the LDF core strategy and 'saved' policy OL11 and UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.

NB Members were minded to allow consideration of a maintenance management plan but this did not form part of the decision.

The meeting ended at 6.52pm.

Chairman:

Date: