

INFORMATION RECEIVED SINCE PREPARATION OF REPORT

Application number **TWC/2014/0746**

Site address Maxell Europe Ltd, Hortonwood, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 6DA

Proposal **Outline application for the erection of a mixed use development comprising of up to 495no. dwellings (Use Class C3), a local centre (Use Class A1) and public open space with associated access and landscaping following the demolition of existing factory (All other matters reserved) *** AMENDED PLANS AND AMENDED DESCRIPTION *****

Recommendation **Outline Grant**

1.0 **Introduction**

1.1 Further to the issuing of the Committee papers on 28th July, the Clerk to the Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council has contacted the planning case officer to enquire why the views of the Parish Council have not been included in the main report. Unfortunately the report to Committee was being prepared as the Parish Council's representations were being submitted (23rd July). It is normal for representations received subsequently to be included in an update report. However, it is clear that the Parish Council submitted its representations within the statutory consultation time period and it has been agreed that these comments should be made public as soon as possible so that Members can take the Parish's views into consideration.

1.2 Members are reminded that all views expressed are available for inspection on the Council's web site at

<https://secure.telford.gov.uk/planning/search-reference.aspx>

Since publication of the Agenda, the following additional comments have been received:

1.3 Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council – continues to oppose the development and ask that the following views are considered by Committee (summarized):

- a) The proposal fails to promote sustainable forms of transport by enhancement to public transport, cycling and pedestrian routes – contrary to Policy CS9 Accessibility & Social Inclusion
- b) Open Space – the applicant has failed to demonstrate significant community and environmental benefits; fails to protect and conserve nature conservation etc contrary to Policy CS11;

- c) The proposals fail to promote land-use patterns that reduce the need to travel by car contrary to Policy CS12;
- d) The proposals do not positively influence the appearance and use of the local environment contrary to Policy CS15;
- e) The proposals fails to respect and respond positively to the context and enhance the quality of the local environment contrary to Policy UD2 Design Criteria;
- f) The proposed shops etc are not located within an existing District or Local Centre or close to a public transport route with a regular service or on a brownfield site contrary to Policy E4 Employment Sites in the Urban Area;
- g) Policy E9 seeks to safeguard existing employment sites whilst Policy H7 seeks to prevent housing on employment sites greater than 1 Ha unless buildings are derelict or obsolescent;
- h) The proposal for retailing will undermine existing retail centres contrary to Policy S25 as it is not intended to meet the needs of the immediate area;
- i) The Parish has previously expressed concern relating to highway infrastructure capacity; Refer to Policy T22;
- j) The development will have an unacceptable environmental impact contrary to Policies OL2, OL3, OL4, OL5 and OL6 – exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated to permit developing on Green Network land.

1.4 In addition the following comments were received between 23rd July and 29th July:

1.5 Drainage Section (TWC) – No objection subject to conditions relating to drainage attenuation, SuDS and SuDS management arrangements being agreed.

1.6 West Mercia Police Crime Prevention Officer – Need for detailed proposals to design out crime in accordance with Secured by Design principles.

1.7 In addition, a further ten letters of objection have been received together with a letter from Mark Pritchard MP. The issues raised relate to the following:

- The loss of Green Network is unacceptable;
- The reduction of 45 houses is not sufficient given the impacts on local roads, school provision, medical services; it is not sustainable;
- The proposal does not reflect the views of Committee when it considered the application on 22nd June 2015 when it was decided that development should not occur on greenfield land within the site but be directed onto the brownfield area;

- No need for this amount of housing given the Council's confirmed housing land supply position;
- Applicant's case based on assisting in economic development is irrelevant – why hasn't the applicant been directed to build his new factory at Maxell's which is a designated employment site;
- This development will impact on future of PRH;
- Local residents may be taking holiday at this time – Planning Committee should not determine the application until September when residents can be present.

2.0 OFFICER RESPONSE

2.1 The Parish Council has prepared its response by assessing the application against Development Plan policies. Many of the issues raised are covered in the main report and Members have already considered those issues and confirmed that they have been addressed. However for completeness and using the same numbering system as the Parish comments above, the following response is given:

- a) It has been argued that the development is not sustainably located close to existing bus routes and the Parish claim the proposal is contrary to CS9. The proposal includes a section 106 public transport contribution. Bus route No.15 at the time that the application was first considered was an experimental route linking Wellington with Admaston and on to the Town Centre. The No.15 is now permanent following Arriva's recent timetabling changes. The proposal is well connected to the Silkin Way; planning conditions will be imposed requiring both a Travel Plan and provision of cycle facilities at the proposed Local Centre.
- b) The applicant has offered substantial contributions to the provision of open space facilities and improvements to existing. The Parish is quite wrong in this regard.
- c) It is argued that the site is sustainably located and well connected to local infrastructure, open space and leisure facilities and Wellington. The provision of a small Local Centre to include a possible medical centre together with improved access to areas of open space will help reduce the need to travel by car albeit on a moderate scale; the site is conveniently located to the Hortonwood employment area;
- d) The report to Committee of 22nd June explained that the application proposes substantial section 106 contributions towards improving Apley Woods whilst the proposals indicate extensive areas of new open space and the opening up of areas of Green Network that were previously no accessible by members of the public. These improvements would satisfy Policy CS15;

e) In terms of Urban Design, the application includes a masterplan that depicts the way that the site may be developed in future to achieve high urban design standards; it is though a matter for Reserved Matters but the outline application certainly provides the basis for future negotiations with housebuilders.

f) The application for the proposed local centre has been the subject of impact assessment; there is nothing within either national or local policy that would require a formal impact assessment of existing Local Centres i.e. it is largely left to competition. Clearly the impact on the District Centre of Wellington is inconsequential given the size of this proposal as the aim would be to provide very localised services to a relatively small population. In planning terms the location alongside a small group of commercial uses serving the local community would not be unacceptable. In other words there are no planning grounds on which this part of the application should be resisted. It should actually be welcomed as an additional facility that could offer the prospect to house a medical facility – a facility that appears to be in demand in this area.

g) The Parish Council suggests that the Council should protect this employment use. This is not possible. As the original report to Committee explained, the previous Policy E1 that sought to protect employment land from other uses was not saved and no protection exists, which is consistent with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework that states that applications for alternative uses of land or buildings on employment sites should be treated on their merits. Moreover it is considered that there is currently a sufficient supply of land available for employment development in Telford, and that the loss of this site for employment use would not therefore significantly impact on the overall supply of employment land or on growth of business in the Borough.

h) As f) above;

i) Highway capacity has been addressed and accepted by Committee at previous meetings. The proposals will provide significant financial contributions for highway improvements and provide land to improve Shawbirch roundabout.

j) The use of Green Network land is covered comprehensively in the main report to Committee. This is now the principal outstanding issue needing to be addressed by Committee.

2.0 The further representations from individuals do not appear to raise new planning issues that haven't been addressed previously. The Green Network issue is the outstanding issue that will be considered by Committee on 5th June. The 5 year land supply issue however still continues to create confusion. Members will appreciate that now that we have a demonstrable 5 year housing supply, this doesn't mean that the Council should now resist housing developments coming forward. The principal thrust of the NPPF is to deliver significant housing growth. It is argued that a housing proposal on a site within the Urban area of Telford on partly

brownfield land and where there are real opportunities to enhance Green Network should be supported and fully complies with Government guidance.