

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 14 January 2015 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 (Chair), N G Dugmore, E J Greenaway, A S Jhawar, R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, L A Murray, K R Guy and C R Turley.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillors K Blundell and W Tomlinson (for Planning Application TWC/2014/0746).

#### **PC-062      MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 17 December 2014 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

#### **PC-063      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None

#### **PC-064      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0882, Councillor E J Greenaway advised that she had taken part in consultation relating to this application and would therefore not take part in the debate and would not vote.

#### **PC-065      DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

None.

#### **PC-066      SITE VISITS**

**RESOLVED** – that a site visit takes place on Wednesday, 4 February 2015 in respect of the following application (time to be determined):-

(a) TWC/2014/1054 – 1 Moorhead, Preston upon-the Wealdmoors;

#### **PC-067      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/2010/0332 – The Huntsman Inn, Wellington Road, Little Wenlock, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 5BH

This was a request to discharge the S106 Agreement that linked one holiday let cottage and 3 dwellings to the operation of the Huntsman Inn.

The options available to members in dealing with the request were set out in the report. In January 2011 the Board resolved to grant planning permission for the erection of one holiday let unit and three dwellings to the rear of the Huntsman Inn, together with alterations and extensions to the public house itself. The section 106 agreement linked the proposed market housing to the operation of the Huntsman Inn in order to assist in making the renovation project commercially viable. The renovations to the public house had been subsequently completed and the public house was now open and operating well. The housing development to the rear had also been completed. The Council had received a request to remove the section 106 agreement, together with the associated deeds of variation in its entirety from the applicant's Solicitors on the basis that it no longer served a useful planning purpose. It was also argued by the applicant that the presence of the S106 Agreement will continue to inhibit the investment. There had been a change in planning policy emphasis following the introduction of the NPPF which suggested that the Council could not place reliance on the restrictions contained within Core Strategy Policy CS7. It was considered that the request to discharge the S106 in its entirety was therefore reasonable.

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

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0332 the application for removal of the S106 in relation to the three houses be approved for the following reason:-**

**That the section 106 agreement no longer served a useful planning purpose**

(b) TWC/2014/0228 – Site of Haybridge Hall Flats, Haybridge Road, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application to grant full planning permission for the erection of 4 bungalows following demolition of Haybridge Hall flats. Members had undertaken a site visit earlier in the afternoon prior to the meeting.

An update report was tabled at the meeting, which contained the following information from the Applicant:

- The application building is of historical interest but is neither locally nor statutorily listed.
- The council owned the building for 15 years and transferred it to the Wrekin Housing Trust in a state of considerable disrepair. The Trust has taken measures to minimise its further deterioration but this is no longer economically viable.
- The developer has reviewed a number of options for the site involving retention of some or all of the front façade of the building. None of these are economically viable.
- The Parish Council and others were invited to find acceptable alternative uses for the building but to no avail.
- Planning officers do not dispute the various building condition reports submitted.

- While officers suggest that demolition is potentially acceptable if a redevelopment were grander in scale and design, such a proposal is neither viable nor practicable on this site.
- This bungalow development is compatible with surrounding development and would meet a need for housing for older/ disabled people.
- Demolition is regrettable but sadly inevitable.

Officers had reviewed this submission but did not consider that this raised any new matters that would justify granting planning permission.

Cllr P Smart, Parish Councillor for Hadley & Leegomery addressed the Committee regarding the iconic building which was bequeathed for the benefit of the community. She believed whilst in the ownership of the Council the building had been fully let but following the transfer of the property to the Wrekin Housing Trust that the building had been emptied of its 11 tenants and left to decay through neglect and that it was now beyond economic repair. It was not considered a good return to have 4 bungalows in its place. Cllr Smart asked the Committee not to permit the loss of a much loved and important building.

Mr A Williams, the Applicant's Agent, addressed the Members and referred to his letter in the update report. He agreed that whilst the hall had some historic value it was not a listed building and it was not on the non-statutory Local List. The building was surrounded by trees the subject of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) and was in a sensitive location in the heart of a complex of bungalows which significantly limited the options for use or redevelopment. He stated that the building had been in the ownership of Telford and Wrekin Council prior to that of the Wrekin Housing Trust and it had been transferred in a state of considerable disrepair. The Wrekin Housing Trust had tried to halt or at least minimise the deterioration but now considered that the building was no longer economically viable. The Parish Council had been approached for ideas for alternative use but none had been forthcoming. The Wrekin Housing Trust had considered retaining the façade with new build apartments behind, together with complete demolition and redevelopment into new-build apartments but the bungalows were the only viable option. The bungalows were sympathetic and compatible with adjoining site. Mr Williams then raised the question if the application was refused, what would happen next?

The Planning Officer confirmed that following consultation with the Conservation Officer, the building although not listed, was worthy of retention due to its local interest. Local Plan Policy HE25 sought to ensure that buildings of local interest were preserved and enhanced. The Planning Officer believed that from National and Local Planning Policy the new build would need to respond positively to the surrounding area and that the bungalows did not have the same effect as there were no architectural features and they were not a worthy replacement. There was a cramped feel to some parts of the development and any replacement scheme would need to be a sympathetic re-development. The NPPF supported the building's protection. Government also sought to boost significantly the supply of housing, particularly in sustainable locations such as Hadley. The replacement by just four bungalows would fail to meet this important Government initiative.

Members had attended a site visit and had concluded that this was a large, distinguished building that needed attention but to demolish it would be detrimental to the area and the community of Hadley & Leegomery. Members also felt that the proposed development did not address housing needs and that it would be more appropriate to retain and develop the building, although it was felt that car parking on the site would need to be addressed. Members questioned whether the building could be registered on the local list and were keen to investigate this option. Other suggestions were that the Wrekin Housing Trust put in bids for funding, e.g. the Community Pride Fund or Lottery Funding and turn this site into a community project as other distinguished buildings within the Borough had done very successfully.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Council did hold a register of buildings of local interest and that the building was of local significance. English Heritage had considered whether the building should be listed but had chosen to not list the building.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist informed Members that Officers could investigate the local listing of the building if Members wished as this was an appropriate and justified approach.

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

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0228 the application be refused planning permission for the following reasons:

**That the proposed development would result in the loss of an architecturally distinguished building. The replacement bungalow development failed to respond positively to and influence positively the appearance and use within the local environment and fell short of policy expectations as set out in national planning policy as well as Core Strategy Policy CS15 and Local Plan Policy UD2.**

(c) TWC/2014/0746 – Maxell Europe Ltd, Hortonwood, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 6DA

This was an application from J Ross Developments Ltd for outline planning permission for the erection of a mixed use development comprising of up to 540ono dwellings (Use Class C3), a local centre (Use Class A1) and public open space with associated access and landscaping following the demolition of the existing factory. Members had undertaken a site visit earlier in the afternoon prior to the meeting.

An update report was tabled at the meeting, which contained the following information from the Applicant:-

1. Leisure & Recreation facilities. At page 31 of Committee's papers, the report explains that the applicant has worked closely with the Council's Parks & Open Spaces section to provide certain facilities listed as bullet points. The applicant pointed out that further discussion took place with relevant officers who agreed that the scheme should incorporate a large equipped area for

children's play (serving a wide range), a multi use games area (MUGA) and also a naturalised walkers' route around the site.

2. Proposed Local Centre – community facilities. The applicant has provided details of discussions held with a local medical practice and NHS. Whilst there appears to be some support to provide local health facilities at the proposed local centre, there is currently no available funding to commission a purpose built facility. This might change in the next financial year.

Cllr K Blundell, Ward Councillor for Apley Castle, addressed the Members. The proposed development of 540 dwellings was considered to be excessive. It bordered the rural area and designated green network and would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and increase pressure on the highways. Cllr Blundell believed that the improvements to the Shawbirch Roundabout would not be adequate to deal with the impact of 1000+ extra vehicles on local roads which were already at capacity. The A442 Whitchurch Road to the Princess Royal Hospital was very difficult to access in the morning and evening rush hour. The proposed developments at Allscott and Leegomery would further exacerbate this. Schools, GP Surgeries and roads would struggle to cope with the increased use. It was also felt that this proposed development would be detrimental to Apley Woods. Cllr Blundell felt that local schools were at capacity and would find it difficult to cope with the increased demand. It was suggested that the monies raised from the S106 must be spent within the vicinity of the proposed development and suggested that a new school be built on the site. It was felt that collectively all of the issues meant that this was not a sustainable development.

Cllr W Tomlinson, Ward Councillor for Shawbirch, addressed the Members. He considered that the proposed development of 540 houses would have an adverse impact on the already pressured highways and schools. Both primary and secondary schools near to the locality were at capacity. Improvements to the highways on the islands at Shawbirch and Leegomery were welcomed but further improvements were needed at peak times mornings and evenings. This highway was a key road for ambulances attending at the Princess Royal Hospital and it was difficult for emergency vehicles during peak times.

Mr S Warner, a local resident, address the Members regarding the local flora and fauna, meadows and woodlands which he felt would be put a great risk by the proposed development. This was a special place for wildlife and was home to 30 species that were classed as officially at risk or in danger of risk. An application for a Local Nature Reserve was due to be submitted shortly. Mr Warner raised concerns that it had taken 10 years to repair, nourish and conserve the woods and the impact the development on the edge of the site would have. He did not oppose the proposed development outright, but requested that a wider density to the buffer zone be considered in order to protect the green spaces network. Mr Warner suggested that the Committee defer the application pending a visit to the Woods before any decision was made.

Mr J Snell, a local resident and Governor at a local School addressed the Members regarding school places. There were currently 420 spaces allocated at the school of which there were 415 pupils enrolled. Reception places were at capacity. Mr Snell

considered that the proposed development on the Maxell Site and other developments within the vicinity would mean that 65 new school places would be needed by next Autumn and 300 further school places within the next 3 years. A meeting was due to take place between the Director of Planning and 6 local schools on 12<sup>th</sup> February.

Mr N Scott, the Applicant's Agent, gave the Members a brief background to the application. The Pickstock Group had acquired the development land in 2009 for operational purposes and explored the options of locating Pickstock Telford and their modular construction operation. Local residents expressed concern and alternative premises were sought. Pickstock Telford relocated to Hortonwood and opened for business in 2011. It was decided that rather than using the development land for operational purposes that the Company would seek further premises at an established employment site and the development land be used as a mixed use site in order to assist with any relocation. The relocation would encourage investment into Hortonwood and would create a further 125 jobs to enhance the 160 jobs already created. Mr Scott explained that the company had worked closely with Officers and this was a high quality scheme that addressed local needs. The master plan was to develop the site with minimum disruption to species where the development abuts the woodland and would introduce a buffer. There would also be enhancements to the Pool. The section 106 agreement would include the infrastructure, affordable housing, highway improvements and more importantly a planned expansion to the Shawbirch Roundabout. There was also significant funding for education provision within the S106. The proposed development met the Council's requirements and was of a high quality.

The Planning Officer informed the Members that there had been significant local concerns and the update report referred to a further 5 letters of objection that had been received concerning the local infrastructure, schools and highways. The Parish Council had sent a comprehensive response which included that the proposed development be sensitive towards Apley Woods and that the size of the buffer zone be increased from 20m to 30m. The size of the car park needed to be increased and the management of the car park needed to be confirmed. The Parish Council also raised concerns regarding the lack of school places as local schools were at capacity. Other concerns were highways, rights of way and it was asked that a TOUCAN crossing be located across Whitchurch Drive. The location was not well bus routed although the Number 25 bus service to the Princess Royal Hospital was operating on a trial basis. Financial contributions were sought towards a crossing and 2 bus stops. The Planning Officer confirmed to Members that the northern corridor strategic highway was subject to LEP funding in recognition that it would serve additional development coming forward as part of Shaping Places. More locally, it was recognised that there were capacity issues at peak hours along Whitchurch Drive and Queensway. The development would contribute to a partial solution but it would be unreasonable to expect this development to resolve problems further along the highway network. Other developments coming forward through Shaping Places would contribute to the strategic approach to highway improvements. The application needed to be considered on its merits and the highway improvements and level of financial contributions were reasonable. The developer was also willing to provide the land necessary to improve the Shawbirch Roundabout. The Highway Authority did not object to the proposed development

subject to a series of conditions. Education was a central theme and the Education Service had been closely involved with the application and had no objections. Financial contributions were proposed for both primary and secondary education. The Parks and Open Spaces Team had also worked closely with the applicants and had raised no objections. The applicant was willing to contribute to leisure and recreation provision and a minimum 20m buffer zone would be provided along the site's boundary with Apley Wood. There was no evidence from the ecology report that there would be any significant impact on the wildlife and the Planning Ecologist had acknowledged the improvements proposed and had raised no objections.

With regard to the planning considerations the proposed development would be on previously developed land, greenfield land and green network. There would be a loss of green network and employment land but this was considered acceptable given the Council's lack of a demonstrable 5 year housing supply and the presence of a strategic employment land supply locally. It was likely that the site would come forward as part of the Shaping Places Local Plan. With regard to the loss of the green network, which was contrary to planning policy, the land was currently in private ownership and there was no public access across the land. Accordingly, the value of the green network at this location was negligible and that the benefits proposed would act as a counterbalance to this loss. The proposed development included an area of open space which would be publically accessible together with the provision of formal and informal leisure and recreation facilities. A landscape strategy which would include a minimum 20m buffer zone to the site's eastern boundary to help integrate the site with the proposed Local Nature Reserve. Ecology and leisure improvements were contained in the update report. The application was reasonable in visual and landscape terms. The two main issues remained the highways and the schools provision both in the short term and moving forward. The transport assessment was robust and provided a sufficient level of improvement. Although Education was an important area, given the view of the Education Service that there was capacity in existing schools to meet the demands arising from this development, there was no reason to object. There were no technical issues to prevent the granting of permission. The application had been the subject of a robust viability assessment that confirmed the level of S106 contributions together with the provision of 15% affordable housing. There was a slight modification to the recommendation in the update report to grant outline planning permission.

Members had attended a site visit at the proposed development site. They welcomed that the meat processing plant had re-located to Hortonwood as they could have moved onto the development site without planning permission. Members raised concerns regarding the numbers of houses, up to 540, together with concerns regarding the highways/traffic issues and education provision. They also took on board the concerns of local residents with regard to Apley Woods. A query was raised with regard to whether the development was capable of early implementation. Members further suggested that a school could be built within the proposed development site. Further comments were received from Members regarding the negative impact the proposed local centre would have on the adjoining local centres at Leegomery and Shawbirch and to the nearby petrol station.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist gave the Members a summary of the important points. A meeting had taken place with the Head of NHS England who was well aware of the issues locally. The provision of a medical centre at this location was a matter for NHS England. The proposed development was sustainable under the NPPF and was on previously developed land. With regard to transferring jobs away from the proposed development site, the Pickstock Group was investing in the Borough and creating job opportunities at Hortonwood. Education was an important issue and a report had recently been approved by Cabinet which confirmed that the Council could and would continue to provide school places and would ensure that there would be access to school places within the Borough. The S106 agreement provided a sufficient sum of money for the provision of education and the Education Officers had given no objections. Members must therefore be satisfied that the education needs could be met. With regard to highways the principle of access to the site was acceptable. Highway Officers were satisfied that there was adequate access and there were no objections from Highways. There were no technical reasons to object to the proposed development. Contributions towards ecology, open space and Apley Pool with the provision of disabled fishing and improvements to the fishing facilities had been agreed. Conservation on the site has been thoroughly looked at and fulfilled the requirements.

The Legal Officer addressed the Members regarding the request for a school within the proposed development site. The reserved matters application would not allow for a new school and a new full application for a school and houses would need to be submitted. Members were only agreeing in principle the educational contributions sufficient for that outline permission. The new school was not part of the proposal before Members.

Members asked if the outline permission could be negotiated to contain a new school. The Legal Officer confirmed that the reserved matters only referred to houses and the local centre and that the school was not part of the outline permission. A new full application would need to be presented if a school was proposed and contributions would need to be renegotiated.

In view of the concerns expressed by some members, Cllr K Guy proposed a recommendation that the application was deferred in order that further consideration could be given to issues regarding the highway infrastructure and the provision of education. This proposal was seconded by Cllr N Dugmore.

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

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0746 that the application be deferred in order that further consideration could be given to issues regarding the highway infrastructure and the provision of education.

(d) TWC/2010/0963 – Land adjacent to The Three Fish, Stafford Road, Newport, Shropshire

This application was a re-submission seeking full consent for the erection of a food store (Use Class A1) and associated parking, access and ancillary works.

An update report was tabled at the meeting, which contained the following information from the Applicant:-

The applicants believed that the report unfairly intimated that they were unwilling to hold discussions with the LPA over s106 contributions, which was not the case. Further clarification has been sought and a revised Heads of Terms document has been submitted. This included the following undertakings:

- a) a potential contribution of £108,479 towards the strategic highway improvement scheme in the Newport area (subject to agreement to the justification for this amount by the LHA);
- b) an undertaking to provide sufficient sums for a minimum period of five years to enable the local bus service to divert its bus service (the Stafford/Newport/Telford service) through the site;
- c) provision of a bus stop (shelter) within the Mere Park Garden Centre site;
- d) a contribution of £20,000 towards the provision of public art in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the LPA;
- e) a contribution of £5,000 for travel plan monitoring
- f) a contribution equivalent to 5% of total section 106 financial contributions for planning and financial monitoring.

Mr S McGrath, Local Objector, addressed Members with concerns that this development was in the countryside which was in conflict with Policy CS7 and that this had been the reason for the prior refusal in 2010. Consent had also been granted for a large food store and petrol filling station and more recently an Aldi store and Mr McGrath was of the opinion that there was no need for a second discount retailer. The proposed development site was on greenfield land within the countryside, although there was a brownfield site available for development.

Ms J Gabrilatsou, Objector for Aldi Stores, addressed the Members with regard to the fall back position within the garden centre. Aldi had dismissed this as a commercial and viable proposition as the existing garden centre structure was considered to be unsuitable and its conversion unrealistic. The application site is also a greenfield site within the countryside. Aldi would legally challenge any decision to grant permission contrary to planning policy.

Mr R Corbett, Local Supporter, addressed the Members. He had lived and had a business in Newport for many years but was now retired. Mr Corbett regularly walked to the Mere Park Garden Centre and would use a Lidl store rather than travelling to Hadley. With more houses due to be built it was important for people to be able to shop locally.

Mr C Hawley, the Applicant, addressed Members and confirmed that an Appeal with regard to the Mere Park site would be held in August 2015. There had recently been a change in retail with Morrison's and Sainsbury's no longer continuing with their plans to have retail stores in Newport. Mr Hawley confirmed that there was a lot of support for a Lidl store and that there would be a direct bus route to the site which would be funded for a minimum of 5 years. There had been improvements to the design of the road crossings and the cycleway/footpath which was similar to that along Audley Avenue and the Route 55 and there would be no issues with crossing

the road. There were no sequentially preferable sites and the proposed development was not in open countryside. Although there had been 1 further objection to the proposed development there had been 454 notes of support, 11 letters of support together with support from Newport Town Council and the Chamber of Commerce. A S106 and full Heads of Terms had now been submitted which totalled £200k.

The Planning Officer addressed the Members regarding planning considerations. A retail impact assessment was not required as the proposal was below the NPPF threshold of 2,500 sqm. The NPPF was silent on the subject of cumulative impact. Counsel advised that a lack of a retail assessment was not a valid reason for refusal but it would be for third parties to put this omission to the Inspector at the forthcoming appeal inquiry. The applicant had undertaken a sequential analysis of potential sites but suitable sites were not available at town centre or edge of centre locations. There was now potential for the Audley Avenue Business Parks site to come forward to meet any further qualitative and/or quantitative deficiencies. The applicant has proposed improvements to make the site accessible; however, whatever was proposed, the site would never be as accessible as the existing town centre stores or indeed at Audley Avenue. In addition the site was located in the countryside at a greenfield location. The loss of a greenfield site was always a question of whether its loss would be outweighed by the delivery of other benefits. Given that Aldi was now delivering a discount store, there no requirement to make this concession. Further out of town retail capacity would undermine the functioning of the town centre. This was a sub-optimal solution and contrary to the development plan which was on a greenfield site creating an out of town store which would run the risk of undermining and shrinking choice and variety of shopping in the town. The Planning Officer recommended refusal of the application.

Members considered the application. Although improvements to the accessibility to the proposed development site had been made, there were still concerns regarding the safe movement of residents across the busy road.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist gave a brief summary. There was no longer a need for a discount store. Accessibility was still poor. There would be the loss of a greenfield site and the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the high street. This application was against the national policy objective and there were strong and valid reasons for refusal.

On being put to the vote, it was:-

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0963 the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. Notwithstanding the proposed footway/cycleway improvements and proposal to divert an existing bus service through the Mere Park Garden complex, the application site is not accessible by a choice of means of transport to a satisfactory level for food retailing, where good access for those without a car is key and where social exclusion issues are to be avoided. Given the future increase in the local population following grants of planning permission for residential developments in the town**

**and the likelihood of there being a larger walking and cycling catchment wishing to access the site, the proposed development would not be located in an accessible location and would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Core Strategy policies CS7 and CS9.**

- 2. The proposed development would unnecessarily extend development into the countryside where development is strictly controlled and would consolidate a mixed used in an out of centre location which would be undesirable in terms of creating an alternative retail focus and would be contrary to the NPPF and Wrekin local Plan policy S1 and Core Strategy policy CS7**

(e) TWC/2014/1060 – The Queens Head, Horton, Telford, Shropshire  
TF6 6DW

This application was for outline permission for the erection of 2 no. detached dwellings with associated access, all other matters reserved.

An update report was tabled at the meeting, which addressed and re-considered access and ecology.

Mr R Turner, Local Objector, addressed Members. The proposed development site was within 150 paces of a recent fatal accident site. The volume and speed of traffic through the village was unacceptable. There was no pavement and local children were at risk when they walked to St Lawrence School and local residents were concerned about the lack of shops, narrow roads, no lighting, wildlife and paving over farm land. Local residents drew the conclusion that proposal would establish a precedent for future development. The residents were concerned about a step-by-step linking of Horton and Preston and the loss of farm land.

Mr S Jones, Applicant's Agent, addressed members. There had been no objections on technical grounds and no objections from the Highways Officers. The Parish Council had also not objected. With regards to education, this year's intake had meant that the school was only at two thirds capacity and 80% of the pupils came from outside of the area. This application was for only 2 dwellings and was sustainable and this was only a short distance to employment opportunities. With regard to the comment regarding the expansion of Preston, Mr Jones confirmed that this application was in Horton. The development site was not part of the public house and would not lead to the merging of Horton and Preston. Mr Jones considered that there were no sound planning reasons to refuse this application.

The Planning Officer addressed the Members and confirmed that there had been objections to this application. With regard to the planning considerations, this application had been considered against Core Strategy Policy CS7, which was not fully compliant with the NPPF given the unmet 5 year housing land supply. The Planning officer confirmed that this application was recommended for approval given its sustainability and contribution to meeting housing supply requirements. There were no objections received from technical consultees. The 2 additional plots fit in

reasonably well and the site was located within reasonable distance of a cycleway/pedestrian footpath and thereby community and employment opportunities.

Members considered the application and concerns were raised regarding sustainability. The development site was not part of a garden but an agricultural field which was greenfield land. Further concerns were raised regarding the narrow roads and volume and speed of traffic. This development would be likely to establish an undesirable precedent to expand the village in an unplanned manner.

A question was raised regarding traffic calming within the village. The Planning Officer confirmed that the development site now had a single means of access and there was no technical requirement for traffic calming. The concerns regarding the speeds and volumes of traffic were not echoed by the consultees.

Following the concerns raised by Members, Cllr K Guy proposed a recommendation that the planning application be refused as the development was not required, it was on a greenfield site and not a sustainable development.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist asked Members to consider the clear and defensible reasons for refusal of the Application being:

1. Not a sustainable location
2. No demonstrable need
3. Unacceptable extension into the countryside
4. Inappropriate setting

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist further confirmed that this application was not considered to be a settlement and was not identified as a sustainable settlement within the Local Plan.

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

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/1060 the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. Not a sustainable location**
- 2. No demonstrable need for the proposed development**
- 3. The proposed development was an unacceptable extension into the countryside**
- 4. The proposed development was in an inappropriate setting was unsustainable and was not an identified settlement**

#### **PC-068      TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2014**

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy and People Services seeking confirmation of a provisional Tree Preservation Order (TPO) in relation to a Robinia (False Acacia) Tree at St Peters and Pauls Roman

Catholic Church, Salters Lane, Newport. The report detailed an objection received from the occupier of the property on the grounds that the roots of the tree were causing deformation to the path which was now uneven and was becoming a trip and fall hazard to members of the public. A letter in response from the Tree and Woodlands Officer was also included.

The Tree and Woodland Officer explained the background to the making of the Provisional Order.

Members had undertaken a site visit and were of the view that the tree needed some work to the branches in order to make the tree safe. Members noted the comments of the objector and balanced this against the opinion of the Council's Tree and Woodlands Officer. Members unanimously concluded that the tree was worth preserving for its visual amenity.

**RESOLVED – that the Borough of Telford & Wrekin (Robinia (False Acacia)) Tree St Peters and St Pauls Roman Catholic Church, Salters Lane, Newport) Tree Preservation Order 2014 be confirmed.**

**PC-069      URGENCY RESOLUTION – SECTION 100B(4), LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**

The Chairman made the following statement:

“I am of the opinion that the following item of business should be dealt with as a matter of urgency at this meeting in order to avoid any unnecessary delay.”

**PC-070      TWC/2014/0882 – LAND OFF PARK ROAD/ROYAL WAY, MALINSLEE, TELFORD, SHROPSHIRE**

This application was for full planning permission for the erection of 93 dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping.

Mr P Dover, the Applicant's Agent addressed the Members and gave details of the planning application which was for 100% affordable units which would be owned and managed by Wrekin Housing Trust. The Applicant had worked with officers and the proposed scheme would be as follows: 20 x 1 bedroomed flats, 16 x 1 bedroomed houses, 45 x 2 bedroomed houses, 8 x 3 bedroomed houses, 2 x 2 bedroomed bungalows, 1 x 3 bedroomed bungalows and a 1 x 4 bedroomed bungalow.

There would be 56 dwellings per hectare which was in line with the Central Telford Area Action Plan and the NPPF. The proposed development would boost the housing surplus. Mr Dover confirmed that there had been no objections from the Highway Engineers. There would be no impact on the landscape and with regard to the tree belt casting shadows the mature woodland would act as a screen and a strategically placed landscape feature.

The Planning Officer addressed the Members regarding the planning merits. The site was an allocated site for residential development in the adopted CTAAP, with a stated capacity for accommodating 75 dwellings. The layout and design was

acceptable and the woodland to the north of the site could be managed and would provide screening and help to contain the traffic noise from West Centre Way. A viability appraisal had been undertaken, which confirmed the level of S106 contributions necessary to make the development acceptable. The proposed development was subject to Government Funding and needed approval by the end of the financial year.

Members considered the application. The Chair referred to the urgent nature of hearing the item relating to the availability of housing grant which was subject to a time limit. Concerns were raised regarding the rights of way and it was asked if this issue could be listed within the conditions. Members also discussed the crossing points and the links to the existing footpath network.

Cllr J Greenaway having previously declared an interest in this application did not take part in the discussion and did not vote.

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

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0882 the application be approved subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 agreement requiring contributions of £28500 for open space/recreation provision £52000 for education and £4025 for monitoring contributions and appropriate conditions being imposed.**

The meeting ended at 9.08pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....