

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 24th June 2015 at 6.00pm in the Haybridge Restaurant, Telford College of Arts and Technology, Haybridge Road, Wellington, Telford TF 1 2NP

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chair), N A Dugmore, J A Francis (substitute for N C Lowery), E J Greenaway, J Loveridge, M J Smith, P J Scott and C R Turley.

PC-016 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 3 June 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment to the minute in relation to planning application TWC/2013/0685:

The words “could appeal if the application was refused and objectors to the application” to be inserted after “The Applicant” in the 11th line of the 6th paragraph .

PC-017 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr N C Lowery

PC-018 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

With regard to planning application TWC/2015/0039 – Cllr E J Greenaway confirmed that she was a member of Lawley and Overdale Parish Council but had not been involved with any discussions on this application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2015/0265 – Cllr C R Turley confirmed, for information only, that he was a Trustee on the Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust and the Severn Gorge Countryside Trust.

With regard to planning applications TWC/2011/0827, TWC/2011/0871 and TWC/2013/0855 Cllr P J Scott confirmed that he was a member of Newport Town Council and had been involved with some discussions on 2 of these applications. The Legal Advisor confirmed that, providing Cllr Scott had kept an open mind and not pre-determined his decision, he could take part in consideration of these applications if he so wished.

With regard to planning application TWC/2015/0039 - Cllr J A Francis confirmed that this application was on the edge of her Ward - Ketley & Overdale – but that she had not taken part in any discussions on this application.

PC-019 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None

PC-020 SITE VISITS

Cllr J A Francis requested a site visit on TWC/2015/0039 – The Wrekin View Public House, Milners Lane, Dawley Bank, Telford.

Following a discussion between Officers and Members, a vote for a site visit took place, but was not carried.

PC-021 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.

The Planning Officer suggested that she gave an overview of all three of the Newport applications on the schedule, prior to each application being considered separately on their individual merits. Following the announcement that the Council now had 8.2 years of deliverable housing land, applications with a resolution to grant subject to the signing of a S106 agreement were being brought back to Committee.

The 5 year housing supply position now enabled officers and the Committee to focus on the up-to-date housing supply policies CS1 and CS7. Members were reminded that they had already resolved to grant planning permission and that the technical aspects of the application had already been accepted. Previously there was a shortfall with the housing land supply and the NPPF ruled that where policies were out-of-date planning permission should be granted unless there were adverse impacts that would significantly outweigh the benefits. Following the recent Objectively Assessed Housing Need Report, the Council now had 8.2 years of deliverable land for the Borough. This report acknowledged that there had been an under-supply of new housing in the last 8 years from the start of the Core Strategy in 2006 until 2014. Policy CS1 set out a level of delivery for Newport for 60 dwellings per year. Only 304 dwellings were built during this time and using the delivery target of 60 dwellings per year, there should have been 480 dwellings built which left a shortfall of 176 dwellings. This averaged out at 38 dwellings per year instead of the 60 per year target.

In April 2015, the AMR indicated a 625 dwelling commitment, but it may be unlikely that this quantity of development would be met due to delays on lead in times and outline applications then requiring reserved matters applications, and there was no guarantee that these developments would be built. This meant that whilst the Borough had a 8.2 year housing land supply, this did not mean that planning applications could be refused on housing supply issues alone. The supply of deliverable land needed to be maintained into the future and beyond 2016. In addition, there was a need for affordable housing within Newport which had a shortfall of 134 affordable dwellings over the last 9 years so it was necessary for supply to catch up with need. Development on the remaining few brownfield sites in Newport would not yield the number of houses to achieve the CS1 delivery targets or the provision of 35% of affordable housing required by Policy CS6, as brownfield sites often had above normal costs that made viability a particular problem.

Objectors had raised concerns that following the grant of planning applications that these often came back for a reduction in affordable housing at a later date on the grounds of viability. This had occurred at Audley Avenue (17%) but the development of land off Wellington Road provided 20% affordable housing on-site with a monetary provision for 15% affordable housing off-site elsewhere in Newport. Each application needed to be assessed on its merits.

With regard to the issue of determination using the Local Plan process, as the Council had not yet published a draft Local Plan, no weight could be attached to this and it would be premature to determine applications on this basis and therefore this could not be used in advance to make decisions with regard to the Newport applications.

Other material elements were the S106 contributions and the recent Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) changes that came into force in April 2015. As a result of this, the pooling of financial conditions was restricted to no more than 5 contributions to a single type of infrastructure. Highway network improvements were envisaged from all applications determined and this had a proportional impact on contributions which meant that these contributions now needed to be broken down into specific elements for each application although the contributions remained the same. Education specific school infrastructure projects had now been identified.

These were the main issues that were common to all three sites, which would now be considered individually.

a) TWC/2011/0827 – Land to the North of Audley Avenue, Newport, Shropshire

This application was for outline planning permission to the North of Audley Avenue, Newport, to include access for the erection of up to 215 no dwellings, highway works, public open space, allotments and associated infrastructure development following demolition of buildings. The development included 17% affordable housing, highway works, bus subsidy and shelters along Audley Avenue, provision of open spaces, play area on Shukers Field, a new sports pitch at Burton Borough school for school and community use, transfer of land to extend the nearby allotments and transfer of land to be used for continued sports pitch provision. The report originally came before Committee on 14th November 2012 where it resolved to grant permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement. The application was then brought back to Committee on 23 July 2014 to seek a variation to some of the S106 contributions which included a reduction in the amount of affordable housing provision to 17% for viability reasons.

Cllr A Meredith, Ward Member for Newport South and East, considered that there was irrefutable evidence before the Committee to reject the application. The outline application was dated 2011 but this did not come forward to Committee until November 2012 subject to the contribution of 35% of affordable housing. St Modwens brought the application back to Committee in 2014 for 215 houses with a reduction to 17% affordable housing due to economic viability. It had now been 4 years and no full plan had been produced. Cllr Meredith considered that enough time had been wasted and that the application should be rejected.

J Rossiter spoke on behalf of the applicant, St Modwens Properties, in favour of the application and the officer's recommendations in the report. This land had been identified within 'Shaping Places' and was chosen for the principle reasons of location, accessibility, affordable houses and being a sustainable housing development. The applicant had taken part in discussions with the public and this had resulted in the provision of the sports pitch and open space. Newport Town Council had also been offered land to be put into their control on the existing Shukers Field site together with a fully equipped play area. A full size playing pitch would be provided at Burton Borough School which would be transferred to the Council. The delivery of the housing was in accordance with policy CS1, and would assist in meeting the identified provision of 60 dwellings per year. There were no objections from the Councils engineer., and the site benefitted from an open drainage system.

The Planning Officer confirmed that consultation had taken place with Sport England, Severn Trent Water, Shropshire Council, the Environment Agency, Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council, Newport Town Council and TWC Environmental Health. Newport Town Council had objected to the application and additional comments could be found on the update report.

Members were informed that objections had been raised on the separate Station Road, Newport application in respect of policy OL6, Open Space, and the Planning Officer added an additional comment regarding this. Audley Avenue's loss of a playing field under OL6 had been offset by private open space being brought into public use, together with the provision of allotments and the sports pitches. A balance had been applied with regard to the Policy conflict with OL6 as the development was sustainable and near to the town centre and services. It conformed with the Development Plan and the NPPF. In light of the 5 year housing land issue, new development was needed in order to secure Newport's role as a market town and this was sustainable in terms of the NPPF, even with the policy conflict.

Members were asked to grant the outline planning permission subject to the recommendations on page 12 and 13 of the main report and the conditions from the previous report and the update report changes.

Cllr P J Scott commented that this application made the most sense out of the three and the sports provision was needed, it gave the allotments to the Town Council and made much needed improvements to Shukers field. However, added to the other housing development proposals, there would be 616 new houses in one small area of Newport. He considered that affordable housing was being used to pass these applications and each time it was subsequently being taken out or reduced. He wanted to see Newport grow, but was concerned with putting all these houses in one small patch of Newport and therefore it was suggested that this application should be deferred.

Cllr N A Dugmore commented that he remembered the site well from the site visit which took place and his concerns had not been mitigated through the update report around Policy OL6, the NPPF, planning balance and appropriate weight. He was concerned about the loss of employment, and suggested that more suitable areas

were considered. The development would constrict the Cemetery's expansion and once full a new cemetery would have to be found. There were also drainage problems around this area. Local school places were full, and the size of the development was not sustainable. Previously there had not been a 5 year land supply, but now this had come into play, it was an opportunity to make sure that the development was in the right place. Cllr Dugmore considered that this was not a sustainable development and should be rejected.

Cllr E J Greenaway expressed her concerns regarding the viability of the scheme and the 35% affordable housing target in Newport. Policy CS6 was now relevant due to the 5 year land supply. This development only contained 17% affordable housing, and it was questioned whether this was enough to justify the use of a greenfield site.

Cllr C R Turley reminded Members that this application was for 215 houses only. There was a pressing need to support and encourage the younger working population, and provide both market and affordable housing, to achieve a balanced stable community, which this application did provide. Greenfield development was part of the Core Strategy on the built up edge of Newport and was consistent with policies CS1 and CS6 and the NPPF. The application was sustainable, was in line with both national and local policy and the S106 conditions, as shown in the recommendation in the update report, provide enhanced benefits to the local community.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist commented on some of the points raised. He reiterated Cllr Turley's point that this application was one of three being considered and was for 215 houses as all other applications were separate. Members had previously approved the site and the technical detail and there had been no significant changes to form a different recommendation. This was an accessible location and near to other developments with open space and community facilities with much needed affordable housing. With regard to viability, this provision was within the boundaries of planning law. The Officers were satisfied that the viability assessments were suitable. The only way of providing affordable housing was through the approval of market housing. The S106 provided affordable housing on national policy through the NPPF. This development was therefore considered sustainable as set out in the NPPF.

Upon being put to the vote, it was:

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0827 that authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission, subject to:

(a) the applicants/Council as landowner entering into a Section 106 agreement/Memorandum with the Council (terms to be agreed by the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management) relating to:

- **Affordable housing – 17% for viability reasons**
- **£314,072 for highway works to the A518/A41 (South) roundabout and its approaches and the links along the A518 between this roundabout and**

Audley Avenue and between Audley Avenue and the proposed new access for the Station Road site (ref: TWC/2011/0871)

- **£120,000 towards Newport Town Centre bus subsidy**
- **£10,000 towards Public Transport infrastructure for bus shelters along Audley Avenue**
- **£5,000 towards Travel Plan monitoring**
- **Primary education element (£291,433) to Newport Infants expansion and secondary element (£238,445) to Burton Borough expansion**
- **£162,000 off site NEAP children's play area on Shukers Field**
- **The provision of Open Spaces to include (if that option is exercised by the applicant) a transfer of the open space and recreation areas to the Council at a suitable time, and with payment of a commuted sum for maintenance to be agreed. Or alternatively, provide for a residents' management company to maintain those areas**
- **Transfer of land to the Council for new sports pitch at Burton Borough School for dual school/community use**
- **£225,000 towards improvements to Shukers Playing Field, with any underspend to go towards affordable housing**
- **Transfer of 0.22ha of land to Newport Town Council for extension to existing nearby allotments**
- **Transfer of 1.6ha of land to Telford & Wrekin Council to be used for continued sports pitch provision as part of the enhanced Shukers Field playing fields area**
- **£9,000 towards planning and financial monitoring of planning conditions and Section 106 agreement (this is a maximum figure and may be changed if, in the opinion of the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management, such change is required).**

(b) to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and the update report, with authority to finalise and impose additional conditions to be delegated to the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management.

b) TWC/2011/0871 – Land East and West of Station Road, Newport

This application was for the erection of up to 350 no dwellings (Use Class C3); extra care housing (Use Class C2); 4.5ha of employment land (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8); public open space and landscaping provision including sports pitch and landscaped park; demolition of existing industrial buildings; highway works and associated infrastructure development (Outline to include Access).

The supermarket aspect of this application had now been removed and withdrawn.

This development first came to the Committee in December 2013 when permission was granted subject to the signing of the S106 conditions, but this had not been completed.

Cllr S Stacey spoke on behalf of Church Aston Parish Council who expressed their concerns that this application had been brought back to Committee some 18 months on. The Parish Council had previously agreed the development but since this time

there was now a sufficient supply of houses until 2022 and sufficient planning approvals until 2031. Following the judgment from the recent Tibberton Inquiry, these 350 homes were considered to be an urban development within Newport. The residents of Church Aston valued their open land and it was of local importance and had been the subject of a village green application. The Development Plan open land Policy OL6 sought to protect green space. With regard to sustainability there was insufficient jobs within Newport to justify 600 new homes within the next 5 years or so. This development could mean an extra 900 people living in Newport as a result of the new houses. As the employment land was potentially being built on this development was considered unsuitable. There was not the need for a further 350 houses and this development was not sustainable and there would be a loss of the visual separation between Church Aston and Newport, together with the loss of a much loved local resource.

Cllr A J Eade, Ward Member for Church Aston & Lilleshall, reminded Members of the Secretary of State's ruling. He commented that there was no longer a shortage of housing as the Council now had a 5 year land supply and that there were no considerable material considerations. The position had clearly and fundamentally changed and now came under Core Policy CS1, CS6 and CS7 as Newport was a rural area. This development was on a greenfield site and not a brownfield site and Policy OL6 should not be ignored. The policy was now up-to-date and this was open land and incidental land next to built up land. All members were aware of the value of open green land to local people and OL6 was relevant to this area. With the development of 350 houses the open land would be lost and it would be detrimental to the area. Now that the Council had an 8 year land supply this development did not need to take place and the development between Newport and Church Aston could be resisted. Cllr Eade asked Members to use their independence when making their decision.

Cllr A A Meredith, Ward Member for Newport South and East, commented again on the "irrefutable evidence" against developing this land with regard to Policy OL6 relating to open space. The Draft Local Plan sought to retain open space in the Borough and this was a large part of the green open space which was in under-supply. The Court of Appeal rejected arguments and confirmed that OL6 did apply to this land. If this development was approved it may have to go back to the High Court which would be unjustifiable costs and add to the £1.5m already spent.

Anna Bend, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application and the Officer's recommendations. The land was allocated within Shaping Places and the application had previously been approved for 350 houses with an element of affordable housing. The dwellings occupied less than half the site and there was an 80 bed extra care facility. A playing pitch had been allocated within the site and a contribution towards the bus service and highway improvements. This development included 35% affordable housing and was a one-off opportunity for a balanced settlement. The impact of the loss of ground had been addressed. The development would take several years and would take place in a co-ordinated manner and contributed to the employment offer in Newport in order to sustain economic prosperity and tenants would be offered the chance to re-locate within the development. Improvements to the A518 would take place. This development was economically sustainable and would be an £9.41m spend in Newport and would be

of significant benefit. There would be employee opportunities of 300 jobs during and after the build. A consultation process had been undertaken.

The Planning Officer informed Members that a consultation had taken place with Newport Town Council, Environment Agency, Natural England, Severn Trent Water, Shropshire Fire Service, Telford and Wrekin Council Drainage Engineers and Save Newport. Letters of objection had been received from Mark Pritchard and 48 local residents. The S106 had been amended in order to make the highway conditions more specific and there had been an update to the Education provision.

Despite the 8.2 year land supply, Newport was still under-delivering and fell short of the CS1 target. The land supply needed to be continued beyond the 8.2 years. The development was sustainable and brought housing and employment which would help to maintain Newport's role as a market Town and its existing services. There would be a qualitative improvement on both formal and informal recreation facilities. The update report contained information regarding the relevance of policy OL6 in the determination of the previous supermarket application. The Appeal Judge ruled that the Planning Inspector for the Audley Avenue supermarket application was entitled to form her view regarding the relevance of OL6 to that application, but did not rule that it was a reason for refusal. With regard to the land consisting of the designated public footpath (Hutchinson Way) and the permissive paths that crossed it, although these areas were considered locally important as informal recreational resources, there was no legal right to enter the surrounding land other than along the paths, and therefore the land could not be treated as an open space. This application had a qualitative gain with regard to the provision of informal and formal open spaces and play areas and the pitches and this was weighed against the NPPF. This development would be a significant boost for the land supply and was a material consideration. There were no significant changes to the development and there was a need for housing supply within Newport and this was a sustainable development. The Planning Officer asked Members to approve the recommendations contained within the report and the changed to the S106 in the update report.

Cllr P J Scott re-iterated to the meeting that they were discussing 616 in total as a development for 215 houses had just been approved in Audley Avenue. Cllr Scott was not completely against development within Newport and employment was also needed, but as the Council now had a 5 year land supply and this application was for 350 houses, he suggested that the application be deferred until it was needed. If the application could not be deferred then he would have to refuse the application.

Cllr N A Dugmore was disappointed that this development had not been put forward for a site visit as it was for some 350 dwellings and employment land.

The Chair expressed his concerns about a site visit and a vote then took place as to whether a site visit was needed in the circumstances. With the majority of members not being in favour of a site visit, the motion for a site visit was defeated.

Cllr Dugmore referred to the update report with regard to Policy OL6 and the weight that was given on Policy CS1, CS6 and CS7. When the development had previously come before the Committee there had been a lack of a 5 year land supply. He considered that this development was not sustainable due to the lack of school

places. He was also concerned with the access onto the road for the extension to the employment land. Cllr Dugmore was of the option that as no site visit would take place and due to the fact that the Council now had a 5 year land supply that this development was unsustainable and should be refused.

Cllr C R Turley reiterated that the housing land supply figure was a minimum. He referred the Committee to the benefits that would come from the S106 agreement both in the original report and the update report. This was a substantial investment into Newport.

Cllr E J Greenaway commented that the amount of money contained within the S106 agreement was only necessary due to the land being developed. Shaping Places was not relevant to this development as Policy OL6 was more relevant. The employment units would be demolished and would take 15 years to re-build. There was no ability to expand this employment land further.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist addressed the Committee with regards to the 5 year housing land supply. The Council needed to plan for the longer term as set out in the NPPF as the 5 year land supply was a short-term measure as there needed to be a continuous flow of housing. The figure of 5 years was chosen as it was considered to be a reasonable amount of time. There was a continuing need for housing in the longer term. With regard to Policy OL6 and open land, it was clear at the public examination of the Core Strategy that greenfield land would be needed and that this land was not always publically accessible and a distinction needed to be made between "public accessible land" and "open space". This development brought an extra care facility and new employment opportunities and the issue of new employment land would be addressed within the Local Plan. No issues had been raised with regard by Highways or Education and they were satisfied with the development. The Development was sustainable under the terms of the NPPF and the open space brought forward new areas for the community in excess of what they already had access to. The Assistant Director considered that there was sufficient evidence for Members to come to a decision on the recommendations before them.

Following the discussion it was:

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0827 that authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission, subject to

(a) the applicants/Council as landowner entering into a Section 106 agreement/Memorandum with the Council (terms to be agreed by the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management) relating to:

- **£820,596 towards Highway works to the A518 Station road roundabout and its approaches and the links along the A518 up to Audley Avenue (but not contributing towards the cost of works the proposed new access for the Station Road site (ref: TWC/2011/0871));**
- **£10,000 for public transport infrastructure for bus stops along Station Road;**

- £7,500 for Public Rights of Way diversions and associated enhancements and footway improvements for on-site sections;
- £360,000 for public transport service enhancements towards diverting local bus services into both parcels of the site;
- £10,000 for Travel Plan monitoring (comprising £5,000 (C class uses) + £5,000 (B class uses));
- Commuted maintenance sum for the Station road PUFFIN crossing;
- £100,000 for Public Art within the site or within vicinity of site;
- Primary Education element (£474,425) for remodelling of Church Aston Primary School and Secondary Education element (£388,166) to Burton Borough Expansion;
- Open space/landscape maintenance sums to be agreed, depending if land to be transferred to the Council;
- 35% of affordable housing;
- £20,000 towards planning & Financial monitoring of planning conditions and section 106 (this is a maximum figure and may be changed if, in the opinion of the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management, such change is required);
- In the event that the North Audley Avenue application TWC/2011/0827 does not commence, that land for the sports pitch for joint community/school use at Burton Borough school be transferred and a memo of undertaking is produced by the council as land owner, requiring the provision of the sports pitch before the 75th dwelling is constructed;
- An appropriate obligation (if required) to secure that a four-arm roundabout is constructed on Station road to ensure that adequate highway features are in place to address potential traffic arising from this development in the context of other developments which may or may not involve accesses on to Station Road in this location; and

(b) the conditions and informatives set out in the report and the update report.

- c) TWC/2013/0855 – Land to the rear of Willow Tree Cottage, Station Road, Newport, Shropshire

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that this was a different scale of development to the previous two. This was a triangle shaped piece of land that was surrounded by application TWC/2011/0871, land east and west of Station Road, Newport. The development was for 51 dwellings with a single access point and originally came before Committee in 2014 where the Committee granted the application subject to the signing of a S106 Agreement.

Cllr A A Meredith, Ward Member for Newport South and East, addressed the Committee that the Council now had an 8.2 year housing land supply and that this application was not needed. He also suggested that this development was of a high density and poorly laid out and that the Council should demand a better development from the Developer concerned.

Mr G Wade, local resident, confirmed to the Committee that this application had been considered some 14 months previously. He commented that he was not against proportionate growth, but that this application was not proportionate. He re-affirmed his concerns at the loss of privacy and light and the negative impact that this development would have. There were issues with regard to drainage, foul water, sewerage and with the access on the development. Mr Wade was concerned regarding adverse health issues and contamination from the building site. He considered this development to be overly urban and high density and redundant due to the 5 year housing land supply. Mr Wade suggested that a site visit took place.

Mr H Thorn, Applicant's Agent, informed the Committee that this application was detailed and was only for 51 dwellings and was for less than 10% of the applications approved earlier in the meeting. He considered that even with an 8 year housing land supply that officers have confirmed that the development accords with policy and was consistent with the NPPF. Access issues would be discussed if planning consent was granted. A house close to the boundary had been removed from the plans and replaced with parking spaces and an amended application had been submitted. The application would be sustainable as the development would be built quickly and this would enable them to house people quickly.

The Planning Officer confirmed that a further consultation process had been undertaken with Severn Trent, the Police, Drainage Engineers, Newport Town Council and Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council. There had been 25 letters of objection. The development was still considered to be sustainable and was close to facilities and services and helped to address the housing situation in Newport despite the 8.2 year housing land supply. The objections around Policy OL6 had already been discussed but any loss would be offset by the provision of financial contributions for off-site children's play equipment which was deficient within Newport. The loss of this land did not constitute a reason to refuse the application. With regard to the land ownership issues and the access, this did not need to be resolved prior to approval of the application. This would be a civil matter. There were no material considerations to warrant refusal of the application. The Planning Officer asked the Committee to grant permission.

Cllr P J Scott commented that this development would be surrounded by 565 houses already approved, with a further 150 likely to be approved on two further sites across the road. This would be a concentration of 770 houses in one small area of Newport. Cllr Scott suggested that this application be deferred until it is known what housing was needed within Newport. He considered that Newport had now received more than their allotted share of development and that he could not support the application.

Cllr N A Dugmore also commented that Newport had been forced to have more than their fair share of housing, which he considered was to generate income from the new homes bonus. This particular plot of land was high density and it would work out at 32.7 dwellings per hectare and that this was at the extreme end of the density. Cllr Dugmore was concerned with the ground levels of the land as it was situated on the old railway line. He commented that if the development was of a much lower

density then this may be more acceptable, but that in its current form he could not approve the application.

Cllr E J Greenaway expressed her concerns with regard to the over-development of the site and had great concerns regarding the corner properties. She considered that this application was not acceptable in this area and was a poorly designed development. She raised concerns with regard to the parking which were close to the main road and with the ground levels. Cllr Greenaway also confirmed that it would be more acceptable to have a development that was less dense which could be more considerate to the people living in the area.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist addressed some of the concerns that Members raised. The design was a presentation of the co-ordinated views of officers who were satisfied with the proposal. There was a need for housing and in particular the affordable housing was important due to the household growth and the need for homes as presented earlier in the evening. There was proportional development taking place across the Borough and this was proportional to the numbers already in the Local Plan. There were no defensible reasons to refuse this application.

The Planning Officer commented regarding the housing numbers and that policy CS1 was a delivery target that expected 60 dwellings per year to be built and come out of the ground in Newport. Granting these housing applications did not mean that the 60 per year target had been exceeded, because all the housing granted at the meeting would not all be built in one go. It would take several - outline applications have to be followed by reserved matters and this can take up to 3 years to submit. The Chair asked about the time projection for this development. The Planning Officer suggested that an average build rate on site was 30 houses per year, so 350 houses would take about 10 years to build.

Following the discussion it was:

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0855 that authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission, subject to

(a) the applicants entering into a Section 106 agreement/Memorandum with the Council (terms to be agreed by the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management) relating to:

- £63,320 for Highway works to the A518/Station Road roundabout and its approaches and the links along the A518 up to Audley Avenue (but not contributing towards the cost of works to the proposed new access for the Station road site (ref: TWC/2011.0871));
- Primary Education element (£67,333) for remodelling of Newport Junior School and Secondary Education element (£46,895) to Burton Borough £29,400 towards offsite play to Wallshead Way Play area recreation and a commuted sum towards future maintenance to be agreed;
- 33% affordable for viability reasons (11 affordable rented and 6 shared ownership dwellings);

- **£10,347.45 towards planning & financial monitoring of planning conditions and section 106 (this is a maximum figure and may be changed if, in the opinion of the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management, such change is required) monitoring costs;**
- **An appropriate obligation (if required) to secure that a four-arm roundabout is constructed on Station road to ensure that adequate highway features are in place to address potential traffic arising from this development in the context of other developments which may or may not involve accesses on to Station Road in this location; and**

(b) subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and the update report.

d) TWC/2015/1093 – Site of Lyndale, Middle Lane, Cold Hatton Heath, Telford

Cllr S Bentley, Ward Member for Edgmond & Ercall asked Members to consider a deferment on this application in order for the officer to consider the additional information submitted at the meeting and for the applicant to continue to re-consider their application.

A vote took place and it was:

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/1093 it was unanimously agreed that a deferment take place in order for the developers to re-consider their proposals.

e) TWC/2015/0039 – The Wrekin View PH, Milners Lane, Dawley Bank, Telford, Shropshire

This Application was on the site of The Wrekin View Public House, Milners Lane, Dawley Bank, Telford, Shropshire for the erection of a retail unit (use class A1) with ATM servicing, refuse and plan area with associated car parking, access, landscaping and diversion of footpath.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this was an area on the site of the public house. A petition had been received containing 250 signatures. A supplementary Sequential Assessment had been submitted by the applicant which had been assessed by Development Plans team, who concurred with the report.

Cllr D Blackburn spoke on behalf of Lawley & Overdale Parish Council. He expressed concerns regarding bus stops, access points and no restrictions on the 30 mph limit. Concerns were also raised regarding the car parking at the shop and the public house together with concerns regarding delivery lorries near to the play area. The Parish Council also raised the possibility that the shop could lead to anti-social behaviour issues. Cllr Blackburn also raised concerns regarding the Rights of Way in this vicinity. Concerns were also raised with regards to Policy S25 and the design statement and it was considered the shop should be 100 metres away. There had been a contradiction of policy viewpoints and a lack of coherent consultation. The Parish Council were concerned on the impact of other nearby shops and there could

be the loss of an established business. Cllr Blackburn asked the Committee to reject the application.

C Wright, Applicant's Agent, confirmed to Members that this Scheme was an additional community facility which would secure the long-term future of the public house. The report addressed the matters raised by objectors. The development fully accorded with Policies and was sustainable. Its character would sit comfortably within the street scene. Concerns regarding competition with other local shops was not before the Planning Committee for determination as this development was not large enough to regulate competition. With regards to car parking, there were 12 spaces for the shop customers and 17 spaces for the public house. This level of parking was considered to be more than adequate by the site visit and no objection had been raised by highways. The playground area was considered to be open and safe to use and there were no objections from the Parks and Open Spaces officers. A 2 ½ metre wide open strip would be left between the park and the shop and a high close boarded fence would be erected on the boundary of the play area. The Rights of Way issues had been addressed and incorporated within the scheme. The development fully accorded with the national and local policies and there were a number of benefits to the local community including consumer choice, 20 local jobs and the long-term security of the public house. The Committee were therefore asked to approve the application.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this development was on white land which was not restricted from development. It conformed to the policies within the local plan and the NPPF to enable a strong competitive economy and a sequential approach had been taken as this was considered an edge of town centre development and there were no other suitable sites available or accessible for community use. The proposed retail unit supported the local economy, would create local jobs, bring additional choice and support the future of the public house. The Officer asked Members to approve the recommendation.

Cllr N A Dugmore confirmed that he was not against the development in principle, but had concerns regarding traffic and hours of operation. The convenience store would create a greater flow of traffic. With regard to the creation of jobs, this would only be beneficial if there was no loss of employment with other shops close by. Cllr Dugmore suggested that hours of operation of the shop be fixed as well as conditioning the construction /operational hours of the development as these both needed to be controlled. Cllr Dugmore also raised concerns regarding the 29 parking spaces and that customers may park on Milners Lane if the car park was congested and considered double yellow lines should be requested if the development was approved. .

Cllr E J Greenaway asked if a retail impact assessment had been undertaken. She was concerned about anti-social behaviour issues and how this would be regulated, and there were concerns with regard to the play area, the bus stops and long operating hours and the rights of way near to older-people's properties. She was in favour of promoting jobs but was concerned about the impact on other nearby shops.

The Planning Officer confirmed that a retail impact assessment only needed to be undertaken with developments creating 2,500 sq metres or more retail floor space

and as this development fell below this threshold officers were unable to request the information. It was reminded that the NPPF encouraged healthy competition, and the role of the applicant to pursue if viable. Condition 12 to the report related to opening hours of the retail unit and Condition 7 related to hours of construction..

Cllr Dugmore raised the concern of the footpath created around the rear of the store and considered external lighting should be provided.

Cllr C R Turley stated that the viability of the store would be determined by market forces and that concerns raised with regard to anti-social behaviour, traffic and parking were unfounded. Other retail facilities with a similar set up had no issues with parking and traffic on the main through roads. Cllr Turley welcomed the development which was bringing £1m of investment and 20 new jobs into the area and he supported the application.

Following the discussion it was:

RESOLVED: that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0039 planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and the update report.

- f) TWC/2015/0265 – Land adj and rear of The Crown Inn, 10 Hodge Bower, Ironbridge

This application sought the erection of 5 no dwellings on land adjacent and rear of The Crown Inn, 10 Hodge Bower, Ironbridge, Telford, Shropshire.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this application was for 2 pairs of 2 semi-detached houses and 1 detached house to the rear of the public house which had recently been granted consent for conversion. This site had been purchased as a whole and was within the World Heritage Site but the applicant had decided in order to move the development forward, due to necessary reports required on this site, that it would be undertaken in two separate applications - and this application was the second for the area to the rear of the car park.

Cllr J M Seymour spoke on behalf of Cllr N Lowery, Ward Member for Ironbridge Gorge, who had given her apologies. Cllr Seymour informed the Committee that this application had an inextricable link to the Grade II listed public house and she asked why these applications had been considered separately. She queried whether the design and access of the site was stable within the Ironbridge Gorge as it was off the beaten track. She considered that this development did not reflect the surrounding properties within The Gorge and was concerned with the increased usage of the lane as this would be detrimental to safety and cause congestion. Highways had not been consulted on the viability of this becoming a sub-street. Compliance with HE3 was required for development within a conversation area. It appeared that a degree of leniency had been used in order for the development of the Grade II listed being undertaken. The Article 4 Direction had been introduced to protect Heritage sites and Cllr Seymour suggested that this application be deferred in order for this to be considered.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this development was on green network although it was a car park and had no historic value or ecology and could be considered as previously developed land. With regard to the development, this had previously been submitted as 6 dwellings; and more recently been reduced to 5 dwellings with a property being removed at the front of the site in order to respect a neighbouring habitable window and remove the cramped formation on access. As the density of the development had been reduced a further consultation process was undertaken and some of the objections removed ie The Gorge Parish Council, conservation and neighbour objection had been reduced from 32 to 13 letters of objection. The pub had operated on a caretaker operation in order to ensure the safety of the listed building through occupation. The principle of development had been established and the land was now redundant and had no value as green network as it was a hard surfaced. With regard to the land stability and, the information submitted showed that this area was not affected and no special mitigation requirements were needed. The officer also confirmed there would be no further highway safety impact than that already existing; there was poor justification to say that intensification of traffic would be an issue due to the size of the car park associated with the pub as this could have been a popular venue and had 26-28 parking spaces. It was considered that the 5 units would not intensify the traffic at Hodge Bower with the junctions of either Lincoln Hill or Madeley Road. With regard to the fatality reported by the neighbour, there was no record of this, and no further comment could be made. The design had been amended, but it was not considered that any form of standards had been relaxed. With regard to Cllr Seymour's comments relating to the Article 4(2) Direction, which specifically removed certain residential permitted development rights, the officer clarified this application was a distinctly different application that required consent. Furthermore, the conditions proposed would remove all residential permitted development rights, going further than the Article 4(2) direction if permission was granted. The Planning Officer asked Members to recommend the development for approval.

Cllr J A Francis asked if there was a total of 12 properties to be developed on this site, 7 from another development and 5 for this development. She raised concerns regarding the possibility of 24 cars using this junction as it stood and with the constraining wall, boundaries and levels.

Cllr E J Greenaway raised concerns regarding the development land being in Instability Zone 3 and the Local Development Plan stabilisation measures.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this area had undergone a 12 month monitoring period and that there had been no movement within this time that required protection measures.

Cllr Greenaway asked about preserving and re-enforcing street patterns in respect of the outline of the map on page 311 of the Agenda and Policy UD2.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the World Heritage Site was not built on a distinctive building line and was of different forms and shapes. The properties were in clusters and not modern streets. Officers were satisfied with the proposed development reflected the character of the area.

Cllr N A Dugmore raised concerns with the parking to dwellings ratio and expressed that it was presumptive to presume that there would be only 1 car per dwelling in the centre of Ironbridge in relation to the listed building conversion. He was happy that 1 dwelling had been removed from the development site, but was concerned that cars may park on Hodge Bower if spaces were limited. Cllr Dugmore also raised concerns with regard to traffic getting in and out of the main road and asked if there were any extra traffic measures that could be introduced on this site.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the 5 units had sufficient car parking facilities, and that the application for the converted Listed Building had been approved with sufficient parking to the front of the building. The sizes of the units in the Listed Building, or the level of parking provided for them were not part of this consideration and that it was this application site alone that was for Members' consideration.

Cllr C R Turley made a general comment regarding the lack of parking within Ironbridge. He considered that if the listed building was left untouched it would become an eyesore. There were no objections from The Gorge Parish Council or the Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust or the Severn Gorge Countryside Trust.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist confirmed that this former car park was on brownfield land within the World Heritage Site. This was a positive development which would secure the future of the adjacent listed building which was an important part of the street scene. Highways Officers were satisfied with the development and had raised no objections; this development would have a positive impact on the World Heritage Site.

RESOLVED: that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0265 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and the update report

g) TWC/2015/0309 – Land adjacent Grangefields, Hay Street, Tibberton, Newport, Shropshire

This application was for outline planning permission for 3 no detached dwellings with all matters reserved on land adjacent to Grangefields, Hay Street, Tibberton, Newport, Shropshire.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this application had been submitted for an extra 1 dwelling over and above what had already been permitted, but was a low density site within which the 3 units could be accommodated. There was no impact on the rural area and officers were satisfied with the proposals.

Cllr N A Dugmore asked which was the extra unit and were these now a different design or house type.

The Planning officer explained that this plan just showed how the units could be accommodated.

Cllr Dugmore raised that in application TWC/2014/0236 that the Inspector had said that Tibberton was less sustainable due to its remoteness and lack of services and

the reliance on private transport. Policies CS1 and CS7 needed to demonstrate a specific need and this development would be against policy.

The Planning Officer confirmed that on this occasion consent had already been given for 2 units - these could be erected and at a later date an application to infill with an additional unit could be submitted.. Policy CS7 identified High Ercall/Waters Upton and Tibberton as suitable settlements where development in the rural area was focused, and the appeal decision acknowledged this but did not agree with the scale of development the appeal proposed, or its location. .

Cllr P J Scott confirmed that every area needed to take a certain amount of housing. He raised concerns regarding the junction of Hay Street and the B5062 but as this was not introducing a lot of traffic this should be acceptable. This was a beautiful area and as the development would work he was happy to support the application.

Cllr E J Greenaway commented regarding the Highways and the visibility splay at unit 1. She was concerned that if the tree was removed and not replaced then there would be nowhere for the visibility splay to be placed.

The Planning Officer confirmed that application was for outline consent only and no access points had yet been confirmed and that the reserved matters would deal with the landscaping. The trees were category C trees and of medium quality so there was a possibility that these trees could be removed and replaced. There may be considerations with regard to hedge protection and the visibility splays could be set back, but this was for the reserved matters application.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist confirmed that the appeal decision was important, but the scale of the proposed application, together with Tibberton being a key settlement should also be considered. The site and scale was relevant and this scheme was considered proportional.

Following the discussion it was:

RESOLVED: that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0309 outline planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

h) TWC/2015/0196 – Car Park, Chapel Street, Oakengates, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought a change of use from a car park to a hand car wash (Sue Generis) at the Car Park on Chapel Street, Oakengates, Telford, Shropshire.

Members had attended a site visit prior to the meeting.

Cllr E J Greenaway expressed severe concerns regarding safety, foul water and deliveries onto Oxford Street.

Cllr J A Francis expressed the view that this land was unsuitable for the purpose.

Cllr N A Dugmore was concerned with the whole site with regards to blocked drains, sinking paving, taps, services, electric cabling under the block paving which was only half submerged and left unconnected in the centre of the site. He commented that other than a car park, this land could not be used for any other purpose and he was against the application.

Cllr P J Scott expressed his concerns with regard to drainage and the state of the land, loading and unloading of lorries and considered this to be a totally unsuitable use.

Cllr J Loveridge moved a recommendation that this application be refused.

The reasons for refusal were as follows:

- inappropriate use
- intensification of site prejudicing highway safety
- conflict with neighbouring uses
- inappropriate infrastructure to support use by virtue of water supply and drainage.

It was:

RESOLVED: that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0196 it was unanimously agreed that this application be refused on the grounds of inappropriate use, intensification of site prejudicing highway safety, conflict with neighbouring uses, inappropriate infrastructure to support use by virtue of water supply and drainage.

The meeting ended at 8.49pm

Chairman:

Date: