

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 15 January 2014 at 6.00pm in the Walker Room, Meeting Point House, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), I T W Fletcher, V A Fletcher (as substitute for N A Dugmore), E J Greenaway, A S Jhawar, J Loveridge, G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds and C R Turley.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor A Lawrence (for planning application TWC/2013/0881).

PC-070 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 4 December 2013, 11 December 2013 and 18 December 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

PC-071 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor N A Dugmore.

PC-072 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

PC-073 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager informed the Committee that further discussions with the applicant and Environment Agency were required regarding planning application TWC/2013/0871.

RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2013/0871 be deferred until the next meeting of the Planning Committee.

PC-074 SITE VISITS

RESOLVED – that site visits take place on Wednesday, 5 February 2014 as follows:-

3.30pm Land off Shepherds Lane, Red Lake, Telford, Shropshire
(TWC/2013/0824)

4.15pm (approx) Unit 108C, Halesfield 13, Halesfield, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 4QR
(TWC/2013/0871)

PC-075 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

(a) TWC/2013/0881 - Land to rear of 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, & 61 Muxton Lane,
Muxton, Telford, Shropshire

This was an outline application for the erection of 5 detached dwellings and double garages. Access, layout and scale were included for determination with appearance and landscape matters reserved for subsequent consideration. Councillor A Lawrence, Ward Member for Muxton had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee and determination had been deferred at the meeting of the Committee on 18 December 2013 to

enable Members to undertake a site visit. Members received a comprehensive report for consideration.

Councillor A Lawrence spoke against the application in terms of the location of the site in proximity to the border of open countryside. Whilst he understood issues regarding housing supply, he feared that approval of this application would set a precedent for the erosion of the borough's Greenfield land.

Messrs H Haycocks, S Clinton and O Daley, local objectors, spoke to oppose the application which they believed was contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Mr Haycocks stated his belief that the site was open countryside and development was, therefore, also contrary to the Local Development Plan. Mr Clinton expressed concern regarding the access in terms of pedestrian safety and Mr Daley commented upon the loss of green belt and countryside.

The Applicant, Mr A Williams, spoke in support of the application, focussing upon the principle of development in terms of changing policy context, accordance with highways guidance and standards, landscaping and minimising impact on residential amenity.

The Planning Officer noted issues raised by speakers and advised Members of the changing policy context since the previous application W2004/0965 was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. The current proposal conformed with current policies including the NPPF was, therefore, deemed acceptable subject to conditions and informatives. She noted that the Highways Engineer did not object to the proposal and that refusal on highways grounds had not been considered by the Planning Inspector when the previous application was dismissed.

Members referred to the site visit which had taken place that afternoon and expressed concern regarding agricultural land use, pedestrian safety, use of the access by the nearby ménage and dwellings which had taken place since the previous appeal decision, lack of footpath, impact on the visual amenity, loss of green network and a preference to reuse previously developed land, suitability of turning points, the weight of local objection, affordable housing and whether there was sufficient space allocated for car parking.

In response to questioning, the Planning Officer further outlined the changing planning context in terms of the appeal decision in 2005 and the current situation, particularly noting that the sequential assessment set out in PPG3 which prioritised brownfield land over Greenfield was no longer required. She noted that the site was not designated Greenfield despite its appearance but that a balance view had to be taken regarding the demand for housing in terms of the requirement for a five year housing supply. The Planning Officer advised that the number of houses proposed by the development did not meet the threshold to require affordable housing and that the size and nature of the proposed dwellings matched the character and setting of the area.

Members were provided with clarification regarding the process for change of use from agricultural land to paddock to development land and also regarding the location of the access road on the plans. Members were also provided with information regarding the upgrade of the access road following development in the immediate vicinity which had brought it to adoptable standard.

With regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development when a five year housing supply did not exist, Members expressed concerns that developers' were failing to build despite significant consents being in place which was putting pressure on sites such as this. The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist acknowledged that consents were in place for significant developments on public land, many of which were owned by HCA.

Unfortunately, development was taking place at a rate determined by developers which was, in turn, determined by take up within the housing market. He also reminded Members of the government's interpretation of deliverability which affected whether a five year housing supply could be demonstrated. In addition, he advised that the access had been assessed by the Highways Engineer in terms of national government standards, that the site was not Green Network and, therefore, had always been considered suitable for development, that the urban boundary had been established when the New Town was designated, and that all forms of housing, not just affordable, were required throughout the borough.

Whilst some Members' concerns were not assuaged, other Members were of the view that the site was within the urban boundary and not part of the Green Network, that adequate separation distances could be demonstrated, there were no highways or drainage objections, and, whilst the loss of paddock land could be lamented, the hedgerow would be retained and the application concurred with current national and local policy. The majority of Members, therefore, considered that there were no justifiable or defensible reasons to refuse outline planning permission.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0881 outline planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 6.50pm.

Chairman:

Date: