

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 25th February 2015 at 5.00pm 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 (Chair), N G Dugmore, I T W Fletcher (substitute for E J Greenaway), R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, A A Mackenzie (as substitute for A S Jhawar), L A Murray, B J Thompson (as substitute for K R Guy) and C R Turley.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors S P Burrell (for Planning Application TWC/2014/1080), K T Blundell and W L Tomlinson (for Planning Application TWC/2014/0746), C R P Mollett (for Planning Application TWC/2014/0998), V A Fletcher (for Planning Application TWC/2014/0656) and P R Watling (for Planning Applications TWC/2014/0844 and TWC/2014/0845)

PC-074 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 4 February 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman, subject to the inclusion of a further declaration of interest at minute PC-067 to show that with regard to planning application TWC/2014/1012 Councillor B J Thompson advised that he was a member of Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

PC-075 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors E J Greenaway, K R Guy and A S Jhawar.

PC-076 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/1122 Councillor C R Turley advised that he was a local ward member and member of Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0671, Councillor C R Turley advised that he was a member of Great Dawley Town Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0656, Councillor I T W Fletcher advised that he was a local ward member and member of St Georges & Priorslee Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussion on this application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0998, Mr M Barker, Assistant Director: Planning Specialist, advised that he was a resident living close to the application site and would withdraw from the meeting during consideration of that application.

PC-077 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

PC-078 SITE VISITS

RESOLVED – that site visits take place in respect of the following planning applications on Wednesday, 18 March 2015:-

- TWC/2014/0980 - Priorslee ; and
- TWC/2014/1054 – 1 Moorhead, Preston upon-the-Weald Moors

PC-079 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 each planning application.

- (a) TWC/2014/1080 - Land south and west of Tibberton Motor Repairs, Mill Lane, Tibberton, Newport, Shropshire

This was an outline application for residential development (up to 22 houses) and construction of a modified vehicular access, with associated highways and drainage infrastructure and other accommodation works with all other matters reserved. The application site (1.18ha) was located on the northern edge of Tibberton, with a small car workshop at the northern end of the site. Due to past uses of the site, it was considered that parts of it could be characterised as brownfield land. An update report was tabled at the meeting which contained further comments submitted from local residents that did not give cause to any change in the recommendations from Officers. Members had undertaken a site visit earlier in the afternoon prior to the meeting.

Councillor E Ashcroft, member of Tibberton & Cherrington Parish Council, addressed the Committee. The Parish Council had objected to this application, and Councillor Ashcroft made particular reference to the proximity of the River Meese to the application site. This was a substantial, fast-flowing watercourse that would constitute a significant safety risk if houses were built here. There was also a flood risk, and this site had flooded in the past. Priority should be given to residents' safety. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advised that residential development should not be built on areas at risk of flooding. He also referred to the dangers of allowing more traffic along Mill Lane, which was a narrow road hazardous to pedestrians.

Councillor S P Burrell, Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee, and stated that the Committee needed to fully consider the impact that this application would have on the infrastructure of the village. The current drainage, highways and communications infrastructure was already under pressure, as were places at the local primary school. It was noted that the Committee had originally refused a previous application for residential development in Tibberton partly due to the lack of sustainable infrastructure, and that these issues had also prevented sites in the

locality that had been approved from progressing beyond consent stage. He asked for the application to be deferred for re-consideration.

Ms J Bleach addressed the Committee on behalf of the residents of a property adjoining the site. This property (Croft Cottage) was seen as the “stopping edge” of the village, and this application site was beyond that. The site was in a valley floor, and would be very visible from higher ground. More detail was required as to what the impact of this development would have on the landscape. Reference was also made to the flood risk.

Mr A Williams, the applicant’s agent, addressed the Committee and stated that this was part brownfield land. It was not in the recognised flood plain of the River Meese, and there was no objection from the Environment Agency in terms of flood risk. There were no objections from the Highways Authority, and it was contended that the objection from the residents of the adjoining property was about loss of view, which was not a material planning consideration. It was considered that the application was in accordance with the NPPF and the LPA’s policies. It was a modest development in scale, and would be delivered.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, and the absence of a demonstrable 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework for a presumption in favour of sustainable development. He also drew attention to aspects of the report relating to scale of development, design considerations, the relationship between the site and adjoining properties, highways, drainage and flooding and impact on other infrastructure. In terms of the refusal for a development of 60 dwellings on land adjacent to 12 Tibberton, this proposal was manifestly different to that site in a number of ways. The fact that other sites in the area had been approved or were for sale did not justify withholding planning permission. Financial contributions to improving the access and visibility of the local road infrastructure, as well as for local education and recreation provision, were being sought through a Section 106 Agreement. The application was considered to comply with relevant national and local planning policies, and was recommended for approval subject to financial contributions, affordable housing provision and appropriate conditions. Members were asked to disregard paragraph c) of the recommendation which had been included in error.

Reference was made to the Committee’s visit to the site, with some Members expressing the view that this was not an appropriate place for development and that the Environment Agency’s comments that there was no flood risk were contradicted by evidence from local people. Other Members were of the view that the advice and views of the statutory consultees and the Council’s professional officers should be respected, and that any concerns could be addressed through appropriate conditioning. In relation to the location of the site next to a river course, the Assistant Director: Planning Specialist advised that there were a number of examples of successful riverside developments in other parts of the Borough.

It was moved and seconded that the recommendations in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/1080 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) in order to secure:

- The provision of 40% on site affordable housing;
- A contribution of up to £115,146 towards primary and secondary education;
- A payment of up to £41,800 for local transport infrastructure;
- A payment of up to £13,200 towards the enhancement of local play and recreational space locally;
- A payment of £5,000 for financial management and monitoring of the legal agreement;

and to the conditions set out in the report.

(b) TWC/2014/1122 – Land at junction of Stirchley Avenue/Randlay Avenue, Randlay, Telford

This was a full application for the erection of 31 dwellings with associated parking, access and landscaping. The application site was just under 1ha in size and currently comprised hard surfacing associated with the former Randlay Lorry Park. It also contained a number of largely scrub trees, but was classified as brownfield land. The proposed houses would be a mix of two and three bed semi-detached units for private (market) rent. These formed part of the Council's Housing Investment Programme (HIP) that was intended to deliver over 400 new homes at various sites in the Borough, thereby providing much needed high quality rented accommodation. Although no affordable housing had been put forward for this application, the HIP as a whole would generate affordable housing provision of 17%, which was considered acceptable taking into account overall viability of the various sites.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development including loss of part of the site as an employment site, highways impacts, design considerations and affordable housing and Section 106 requirements. There had been no objections to the application, although the Parish Council had raised concerns regarding parking issues once the lorry park was lost for informal parking. It was considered that the proposed development was in a highly sustainable location, was accessible to local services and the Town Centre, was of an acceptable design and layout, and would cause no harm to nearby residential amenity. It was therefore recommended for approval subject to a prior memorandum for financial contributions and appropriate conditions.

In response to Member questions about the proposed CTAAP highway contribution, the Highways Manager reported that this had been reviewed, and a revised figure of £17,403 was now proposed. The Planning Officer added that while the site was just outside the Town Centre area, it would generate additional trips to and from the Centre. Members welcomed the proposal for more rented homes, and noted the

undertaking that affordable housing would be provided at other sites within the overall Housing Investment Programme.

It was therefore moved and seconded that the recommendation in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/1122 planning permission be approved, subject to the completion of a prior Memorandum to include the making of financial contributions of £17,403 for Highways, £40,069 for education provision, £2,000 for planning and financial monitoring and £1200 for Travel Plan monitoring; and the conditions set out in the report, with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to amend and add appropriately worded conditions.

(c) TWC/2014/1124 – Former Woodlands Primary School, Ironbridge Road, Madeley, Telford

This was a full application for the erection of 101 dwellings with associated parking, access and landscaping. The application site was located at the former Woodlands Primary School site, consisting of approximately 2.65ha within a predominately residential area. The proposed houses would be a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced units for private (market) rent. These formed part of the Council's Housing Investment Programme (HIP) that was intended to deliver over 400 new homes at various sites in the Borough, thereby providing much needed high quality rented accommodation. Although no affordable housing had been put forward for this application, the HIP as a whole would generate affordable housing provision of 17%, which was considered acceptable taking into account overall viability of the various sites.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, and the absence of a demonstrable 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework for a presumption in favour of sustainable development, highways impacts, design considerations and affordable housing and Section 106 requirements. Some minor amendments to the scheme had been received, but these were acceptable to the Highways Officer. Two letters of objection had been received, and the Parish Council, while supporting the application, had made a number of comments. It was not considered that these led to any change to the recommendation from Officers. It was considered that the proposed development was in a highly sustainable location, was accessible to local services and to Madeley Centre, was of an acceptable design and layout, and would cause no harm to nearby residential amenity. It was therefore recommended for approval subject to a prior memorandum for financial contributions and appropriate conditions.

Members commented on the derelict nature of the site at present, and welcomed its development and the proposal for more rented homes. It was noted that there was an undertaking that affordable housing would be provided at other sites within the overall Housing Investment Programme.

It was therefore moved and seconded that the recommendation in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/1124 planning permission be approved subject to completion of a prior Memorandum to include the making of financial contributions of £150,000 for the provision of an off-site sports pitch, £132,351 for education provision and £2,000 for planning and financial monitoring; and the conditions set out in the report, with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to amend and add appropriately worded conditions.

(d) TWC/2014/0746 – Maxell Europe Ltd, Hortonwood, Telford

This was an outline application for the erection of a mixed use development comprising of up to 540no dwellings (Use Class C3), a local centre (Use Class A1), and public open space with associated access and landscaping following the demolition of the factory. All other matters were reserved at this stage. The site amounted to 24.57ha within the settlement of Apley Castle adjoining the junction of the A442 Queensway and Whitchurch Drive. Part of the site contained the large factory premises of Maxell who, having reduced the scale of their operations, had surrendered their lease and were re-locating. The current applicants had purchased the site with the intention of building a meat processing and abattoir facility, but following local opposition had sought an alternative location. The remainder of the site was in agricultural use, part of which was in the Green Network.

At the meeting on 14 January 2015, the Committee had deferred further consideration of the application for further information to be provided in relation to education provision in the local area and the impact on the existing road network. Included in this report were statements from the Schools Organisation Service and the Local Highways Authority in response to the comments of Members at the earlier meeting. Update reports were tabled at the meeting which contained a further submission from the Friends of Apley Woods, a further Ecology Report from the applicants and a response from Council Officers, and further representations from the applicant's agent. The second update report also contained a slightly amended recommendation. Members had undertaken a site visit prior to the 14 January meeting.

Councillor K T Blundell, Borough Ward member, addressed the Committee. She did not accept the statement from the Schools Organisation Service that there were sufficient school places in the immediate area, and questioned the figures that had been quoted. The distances to schools further away were not viable or safe for walking, and so inevitably there would be more traffic generated to get children to and from school. The local road network was already at capacity, and she was not reassured from the evidence provided by Highways Officers that the extra vehicles arising from this development could be accommodated, and that there would not be a serious adverse impact on access to the nearby Princess Royal Hospital. This was not a sustainable development, and the application could not be supported unless a new primary school was built and significant improvements made to the surrounding highways network.

Councillor W L Tomlinson, adjoining Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee. He further questioned the assertion that there were sufficient school

places in the area, taking into account other housing developments that would come forward. There was an offer from the applicants to provide an area of the site for a new school, and it was felt that this should be taken up. In terms of the impact on the local road network, the issues of traffic congestion along Whitchurch Drive had not been addressed.

Mr S Warner addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents and the Friends of Apley Woods. Apley Woods was one of the key green spaces in the Borough and provided a habitat for many species, some under threat. This development placed this flora and fauna at risk. It was accepted that some development of the site was inevitable, but it needed to be sympathetic in order to minimise the impact on Apley Woods. It was considered that the density of housing proposed was too great, and there should be at least a 20% reduction along with extending the buffer zone between the development and the Woods to 30m. The concerns about the local infrastructure being able to cope with this development were repeated.

Ms K Else, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and stated that the applicants had sought to address the concerns raised at the previous meeting. An offer had been made to provide a site for the delivery of a new school, but the Council had advised that a financial contribution was the best way to address local education provision and need. It was considered that the proposed mitigation works to the local highway network would provide sufficient capacity, and the applicants had agreed to make contributions to the enlargement of the Shawbirch roundabout as well as a gift of land adjoining the roundabout in order to facilitate its improvement. The applicants would be seeking to avoid any damage to Apley Woods and to work with the local community in ensuring its protection.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, and the absence of a demonstrable 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework for a presumption in favour of sustainable development. He also drew attention to aspects of the report relating to loss of employment land and Green Network, the principle of a new Local Centre, highway considerations, landscape and visual impact, ecology and nature conservation, outdoor recreation and open space, design, flood risk and drainage, archaeology, affordable housing and section 106 contributions. The further information provided in relation to education provision highways did not support the building of a new school on the application site, as it was not necessarily the most optimum location to serve the needs of the area. In terms of the road network, the LHA was satisfied that the level of contributions proposed as part of a Section 106 Agreement would mitigate impacts arising from this development. The application complied with relevant national and local planning policies, was considered to be an acceptable form of sustainable development, there were no technical objections, concerns over education provision and congestion of the local road network had been addressed, and therefore it was recommended for approval.

Some Members questioned the additional information that had been provided in relation to education provision in terms of the impact on existing schools in the area. The Service Delivery Manager: School Organisation explained that over time children living at this development would gain places at 'in-area' schools who currently had a high percentage of 'out of area' pupils. It was considered that 70

additional places could be created at Millbrook Primary School and there was the possibility of expansion within the primary phase at Hadley Learning Community. She also explained the rules in terms of school admission policies. In relation to further questions about the capacity of the local road network, the Highways Engineer reported that Marches LEP funding had been secured for improving a number of key junctions in the area, and this money needed to be spent by March 2017. It was not possible at the present time, and in isolation from a wider review of traffic movements in the North Telford area, to consider dualling the link roads between the roundabouts. Some Members remained unconvinced by the assurances that had been provided, and expressed concerns at the impact of increased traffic congestion on access to the Princess Royal Hospital. However, other Members noted that this was partly a brownfield site, that the design was acceptable, the issues regarding school provision and highways had been addressed, and that the Council's Ecologist was satisfied that the development would not result in the loss of wildlife habitat. It was therefore moved and seconded that the recommendation in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0746 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) in order to secure:

- A payment of £1,085,231 for primary education and £528,974 for secondary education based on no 1 bed units and 15% affordable;
- A contribution of £130,000 towards on-site provision of open space and off-site sports/leisure provision and wildlife management of Apley Wood Wildlife Site;
- A payment of £50,000 for footpath improvements around Apley Pool;
- A payment of £350,000 (not inclusive of 5% admin fee) for maintenance of Local Centre, landscaping and drainage through a management company;
- A payment of 100,000 for public art;
- A payment of £50,000 for a control crossing, £30,000 for bus shelters and £5,000 for travel plan monitoring;
- A contribution of £112,350 for land and transport network improvements at Shawbirch roundabout and £46,200 for the Leegomery junction;
- A payment of £15,000 for planning and financial monitoring;
- Provision of 15% affordable housing with a tenure split of 50:50 social rent/shared equity (or intermediate);
- Scheme of drainage to be conditioned to be submitted before each phase of reserved matters is approved and future maintenance arrangement/funding agreed.

and to the conditions set out in the report, with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to amend and add appropriately worded conditions.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist left the room prior to consideration of the next application.

(e) TWC/2014/0998 – Land adjacent Windermere House, Farm Lane, Horsehay, Telford

This was a full application for the erection of 13no dwellings with associated parking, access and drainage. The application site was a large field located in a residential area within the Horsehay Conservation Area. Nearby dwellings were of mixed age and type, with a Grade II listed terrace of cottages at New Row immediately to the east of the site. The site had been levelled, but there was a drop in levels between the application site and New Row terrace. The application was for 10 detached houses and a terrace of three houses, loosely grouped around a new communal open space area. An update report was tabled at the meeting which highlighted some minor revisions to the application, which had the effect of increasing the distance between the existing houses at New Row and the proposed houses. A fresh set of three dimensional perspectives that incorporated these revisions had been submitted by the applicant. The update report also contained a further submission from Dawley Hamlets Parish Council, information about a petition that had been submitted opposing the application, a summary of a further 20 letters of objection from residents, and new photographic information from local residents which was available for Members to view at the meeting. Members had undertaken a site visit earlier in the afternoon prior to the meeting.

Councillor T Cashmore, member of Dawley Hamlets Parish Council, addressed the Committee. She acknowledged that the applicant had sought to address some of the concerns of local residents, but there were still significant worries about the access arrangements, overlooking of New Row and the fact that the application site was in a Conservation Area - which should allow for protection from policies in the Local Plan. It was felt that a decision should be deferred until the applicant had submitted a full design assessment and 360 degree views.

Councillor C R P Mollett, Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee. He noted that some amendments had been made to the scheme, but these were considered to be trivial and the development would still overshadow and overlook New Row. Some of the proposed properties were out-of-character with existing dwellings along Farm Lane and the heritage significance of the area needed to be recognised. He also referred to existing drainage and flooding problems in the area that were likely to be exacerbated, and to the dangers of additional traffic exiting Farm Lane onto a 50mph bypass.

Mr D Hopkins, a local resident, addressed the Committee, and urged the Committee to reject an inappropriate and unsympathetic development. Residents did not agree that the application was in compliance with Local Plan policies H3 and H4, and it would have a significant impact on neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, loss of view, and changing the appearance of the area. There would be a

considerable adverse impact on the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings. Concern was expressed at the late submission of further plans/photos by the applicant, which residents considered to be incomplete and inaccurate.

Mr A Williams, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and stated that the applicant lived in Farm Lane and had employed a heritage consultant to advise on the development. The applicant had responded to concerns raised by the Parish Council and residents and made a number of revisions to the scheme, including increasing the distance away from New Row. The development was well within the Council's standards in terms of acceptable distance and overlooking. The site was allocated for housing, and promoted at a greater density than this proposal in both the SHLAA and the recent consultation document for 'Shaping Places'. In relation to drainage matters, the applicant would undertake additional measures that would improve the situation. Reference was made to the photographs and montages submitted by local residents, which he considered to be inaccurate.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development taking account of the planning history, and drew attention to aspects of the report relating to the scale and mix of development proposed, heritage and design considerations, impacts on living conditions of neighbouring residents, highways impacts, drainage and impact on infrastructure. Members were reminded on the site visit and the current boundary treatment to the rear of New Row which would be increased in height. The proposed layout and distances from adjoining properties were acceptable, the design of the development broadly respected its setting within a Conservation Area and there were no objections from the Highways Officer. In respect of the photograph montages/drawings that had been presented by both the applicant and local residents, the Planning Officer advised Members that the accuracy of these could not be confirmed and accordingly appropriate weight should be placed on them. The application complied with relevant national and local planning policies, and therefore it was recommended for approval.

Clarification was sought regarding the planning history of this site, to which the Planning Officer advised that there was an extant 7(1) consent for 6 dwellings on the site, and an application for 10 dwellings was granted in 1996/97 (although it never commenced). Some Members referred to the site visit and the slope of the land which it was felt would cause overlooking of New Row and have an unacceptable impact on the Conservation Area. It was suggested that bungalows would be more appropriate for this site. Further concerns were raised about the proposed drainage solution. The Development Management Manager stated that the Conservation Officer had advised that bungalows were not appropriate for this site, and that the revised application met the relevant tests in terms of heritage considerations. There were a number of proposed conditions to address any drainage issues.

A proposal that the application be refused due to its impact on residential amenity and on the Conservation Area was moved and seconded. On being put to the vote, the proposal was lost. Other Members noted that the principle of housing development on this site had previously been determined, and that the application was in accordance with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and with Local Plan policies. It was therefore moved and seconded that the recommendation in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0998 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) in order to secure a payment of up to £7,800 towards the enhancement of local play and recreational space locally and a payment of £500 for financial management and monitoring of the legal agreement; and the conditions set out in the report.

(f) TWC/2014/0656 – Land Adjacent to Stone House, Shifnal Road, Priorslee, Telford

This was a full application for the erection of fourteen dwellings with associated garages and parking. The application site was a parcel of land of approximately 0.59ha located on the southern edge of Priorslee between the University campus to the north and the M54 to the south. The application had been brought to Committee for approval of a proposed Section 106 Agreement for developer contributions.

Councillor V.A. Fletcher, Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee. Shifnal Road was already a busy highway with a lot of vehicles travelling along it to and from the nearby Ricoh factory, and the university. There were also problems with on-street parking, and this development would add to potential traffic congestion. It was also asserted that there was no mains sewerage system on this side of Shifnal Road. In terms of the proposed Section 106 Agreement, it was suggested that it be amended to specify that all monies were allocated for the benefit of residents of Priorslee and for facilities in the local area.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, and the absence of a demonstrable 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework for a presumption in favour of sustainable development. He also drew attention to aspects of the report relating to design and impact on existing amenities, highways, drainage, ecology/arboriculture and section 106 contributions. The principle of development on the site had been previously established, and the layout, scale and design of the proposed dwellings and associated parking was acceptable and in keeping with the surrounding area. The site was considered to be in a sustainable location, and it was therefore recommended that permission be granted subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement and subject to conditions.

In relation to on-street parking on Shifnal Road, the Planning Officer advised that a Traffic Regulation Order would be secured through a S106 contribution. In respect to drainage, there were no objections from the Council's Drainage Engineers, and it was noted that an area of the site had been retained for the installation of rainwater attenuation tanks and estate sewage treatment plant. Further to the suggestion from the Borough Ward Member, the Legal Officer advised that the wording of the Section 106 Agreement could be varied to specify that contributions were for facilities in the vicinity of the application site. The Highways Engineer advised that £3000 in the proposed Section 106 Agreement for the removal of a traffic calming feature close to

the proposed access with Shifnal Road was no longer needed as the traffic hump would be removed as part of planned resurfacing works on Shifnal Road. It was advised that this sum could be re-allocated for other community benefits within the Agreement.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0656 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) in order to secure:

- A contribution of £16,500 towards primary education facilities;
- A contribution of £9,000 towards recreation and play facilities in the vicinity;
- A contribution of £1,500 towards highway works/improvements;
- A payment of £1,500 for financial management and monitoring of the legal agreement;

and with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to allocate a further £3,000 towards primary education and/or recreation and play facilities within the Agreement;

and subject to the conditions set out in the report, with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to amend and add appropriately worded conditions.

(g) TWC/2014/0844 – Central Café, 32A High Street, Ironbridge, Telford

This was a full application for the creation of an external raised seating area with associated balustrade and glazing sitting at the rear of Central Café, which operated as a fish and chip restaurant and takeaway. The application was part retrospective in nature stemming from an enforcement complaint relating to an alleged unauthorised erection of a rear balcony arising from the implementation of a previous planning consent for the installation of a new shop front and creation of an elevated external seating area with balcony. It was discovered that the proposed seating area was oversized leading to an overhang over the footpath beyond the rear of the site. This application (and associated application for Listed Building Consent) was seeking to rectify the position, and plans submitted with the application confirmed that the framework would be amended on site and drawn back away from the footpath.

Councillor P R Watling, adjoining Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee. He was speaking on behalf of local residents who had approached him while he was carrying out ward duties for the late Councillor Davies during his illness. The balcony would lead to overlooking of neighbouring properties in Severnside and loss of privacy. There was also concern about increased noise and the dropping of debris and food onto land below the development, leading to the possibility of rat infestation. The development would blight the view to and from the Iron Bridge, and may contravene Article 4 of the regulations governing World Heritage Sites.

Mr A Gayler, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and explained that the construction of the framework had inadvertently led to an overhang over the footpath. This application addressed any concerns raised, and had the support from a number of people with no objections from the Parish Council. The seating/dining area would be table service, and so it was not envisaged there would be a litter problem from chip papers etc.

The Planning Officer advised that the principle of development for this proposal had already been established through grant of the original consent. Officers had sought enhancements to the boundary treatment and materials proposed, and the proposed amendment was modest in form and would not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities, subject to appropriate conditions. The Officer also explained the restrictions of the Article 4 direction that removed permitted development rights from dwelling houses allowing the authority to assess such applications, but which was not relevant to this Listed Building. The application was acceptable to the Conservation Officer in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area.

Members considered the previous approved application in connection with existing windows on the rear elevation of the Listed Building.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0844, planning permission be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

(h) TWC/2014/0845 – Central Café, 32A High Street, Ironbridge, Telford

This was a listed building application in association with the previous application for the creation of an external raised seating area with associated balustrade and glazing sitting at the rear of Central Café, which operated as a fish and chip restaurant and takeaway. The application was part retrospective in nature stemming from an enforcement complaint relating to an alleged unauthorised erection of a rear balcony arising from the implementation of a previous planning consent for the installation of a new shop front and creation of an elevated external seating area with balcony. It was discovered that the proposed seating area was oversized leading to an overhang over the footpath beyond the rear of the site. This application was seeking to rectify the position, and plans submitted with the application confirmed that the framework would be amended on site and drawn back away from the footpath.

The adjoining Borough Ward Member and applicant's agent had spoken on this matter during consideration of the full application earlier.

The Planning Officer advised that the principle of development for this proposal had already been established through grant of the original consent. Officers had sought enhancements to the boundary treatment and materials proposed. The application was acceptable to the Conservation Officer in terms of its impact on the form of a Grade II Listed Building

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0845, listed building consent be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

- (i) TWC/2014/0671 – Land adjacent to Cheshire Cheese, Doseley Road, Doseley, Telford

This was an outline application for the erection of 13 dwellings with associated access, with all other matters reserved for consideration at a later stage. The application site comprised rough grassland measuring 0.53ha located just off Doseley Road, split between two paddocks forming part of the extended curtilage of the Cheshire Cheese Public House. The site had previously been used as a beer garden but was now described as surplus to requirements. The majority of the site excluding the access area from Doseley Road was designated as Green Network.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework for a presumption in favour of sustainable development. She also drew attention to aspects of the report relating to residential development on designated Green Network land, highways issues, drainage, ecology, scale, character and design of development, mining legacy and proposed contributions through a Section 106 Agreement. Seven letters of objection had been received. In term of Green Network, the land in its current state was not accessible to the general public and not of a quality that merited its retention in relation to the objectives of Green Network policy. In addition, the proposal would provide community benefits in terms of contributions towards parks and open space improvements and primary education that outweighed any loss of Green Network. A Member referred to the disused railway line nearby, which might be considered at some stage by the Horsehay Steam Trust as a potential extension to its existing line of operating track, and whether any noise mitigation should be included in the conditioning of the application in order to protect future occupants of the houses. The Planning Officer advised that a more specific condition could be added to address this.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0671 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) in order to secure:

- A contribution of £600 per dwelling (2 or more bedroom properties) towards off-site environmental improvements for play and recreation;
- A contribution of £2,298 per dwelling (excluding one beds were this relevant) towards primary education;

and the conditions set out in the report, with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to amend and add appropriately worded conditions, particularly in relation to noise mitigation if required.

(j) TWC/2015/0009 – 183 Woodside Road, Ketley, Telford

This was an application for a two storey side extension to be built to the rear or the original garage and the existing previously approved first floor side extension. The application was being determined by the Committee because the applicant was a Telford & Wrekin Councillor.

The Planning Officer advised that the proposed extension was well designed and of an appropriate scale and mass to be in keeping with the original dwelling. There was a minimal increase in ridge height, but it would not be detrimental to the street scene. There were no issues of overlooking from the extension, nor a loss of light to neighbouring properties.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0009 planning permission be approved subject to the conditions in the report.

The meeting ended at 8.43pm

Chairman:

Date: