

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 24 February 2016 at 6.00pm in the Haybridge Restaurant at Telford College of Arts and Technology (TCAT), Haybridge Road, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NP

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chair), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher,
J Loveridge, N C Lowery, P J Scott, M J Smith and C R Turley.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors S Burrell (for planning application TWC/2015/0950)
and J M Seymour (for planning applications TWC/2015/0505)

PC-085 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

PC-086 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor J Loveridge declared that in respect of planning application TWC/2016/0033, she was the Ward Councillor for Brookside and was a member of Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council but she indicate that she had not engaged in any prior discussions and, therefore, she would not be withdrawing from the meeting for that item.

Councillor C Turley declared that in respect of planning application TWC/2016/0033, he was a member of Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council but he indicate that he was not on the Planning Committee and had not engaged in any prior discussions and, therefore, he would not be withdrawing from the meeting for that item.

PC-087 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 3 February 2016 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC-088 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

TWC/2015/0694 - Halfway House, The Wrekin, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 5AL

The Planning Officer reported to Members that although progress had been made on this application, it had been very slow. This being the case, the amendments to the application would not be ready in time for the next meeting on the 16th March and Members were asked to defer this application for one further cycle.

Upon being put to the vote it was unanimously:

AGREED – that in respect to TWC/2015/0694 that this application be deferred for one further cycle.

PC-089 **SITE VISITS**

None

PB-090 **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 planning application TWC/2015/0950, Site of Honey House, Tibberton, Newport, Shropshire.

(a) TWC/2015/0505 – Lower Huntington Farm, Little Wenlock, Telford, Shropshire TF6 5AP

This was an application seeking a change of use from agricultural and caravan park to plant hire storage (sui generis), conversion of 2no brick barns to storage (building B) and offices (building D) and the erection of 2no buildings (E and C) following demolition of existing derelict agricultural buildings and associated 2.0m high fencing.

Councillor J Esp, Little Wenlock Parish Council, raised concerns regarding the increase of movements by low loader vehicles. The development was situated in a rural area and accessed by narrow lanes. The Parish Council requested that the routing agreement be widened to include the village of Little Wenlock.

Councillor J Seymour, Ward Member, asked Members to note that she was related to the objector who lived at Damson Tree Cottage, and that he was her brother but she was not there to represent her brother, but solely to represent her Ward as Ward Councillor for New Works and Little Wenlock. Councillor Seymour did not object in principle to the development but raised concerns with regard to the use of low loader vehicles along the narrow lanes to this site. The previous use as a caravan site and brownfield land was inaccurate and misleading as caravans had only been on the site between 1986 and 1990 and there had been no caravans on the site for 25 years. The state of the farm was dilapidated, but it was not classed as brownfield land. The area was just recovering from land fill and open cast mining. Councillor Seymour requested that the low loaders were kept to the main roads and the M54 but she was concerned that drivers using sat navs may fall into difficulties with the route if they were unaware of the roads. She requested that the sum of £1,000 for signage be increased back to £5,500 in order to include Little Wenlock. Councillor Seymour further requested that the operation hours be changed to 7.00 am to 7.00pm Monday to Friday and 7.00am to 1.00pm on Saturdays.

Ms E Attwood, Applicant's Agent, explained to Members that following her Client's notice to vacate their yard in Doseley that the masterplan for the application was to renovate the listed farmhouse and locate the business within the development. The objections had been noted, however, there was a principle for development supported by national and local policies. There would be fewer vehicular movements than if the farm was a working farm due to the machinery remaining on site and only being returned to the base for repairs or prolonged holidays ie Christmas. The Applicant had supplied invoices to the Planning Officers which

showed 86 two way vehicular movements in 1 year. The machinery raised no income whilst in the yard so it made no economic sense to keep the machinery on the development but this was out on site as much as possible. A sum of £1,000 had been agreed for signs and road lining. The Applicant would live on the site and consideration had been given to the neighbours who had not objected to the second consultation and it was assumed that the concerns had now been overcome. The proposed development conformed to national and local policy and was a sustainable development on a brownfield site. The development would enable the business to remain in Telford and continue its current employment levels. It would also allow the application to have a live/work investment which would remove the derelict buildings and tidy up the site.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the development conformed with the NPPF and CS7 together with the emerging local plan which supported the creation of employment and the use of brownfield land. The vacant Grade II listed farmhouse would become work/live accommodation. Negotiations had taken place for a zoning plan which would zone equipment to an area with a 2.5m high bund and hedging to screen the larger equipment. The Officers were satisfied with the scale of the development and there were no technical or highway safety issues. With regard to the concerns raised around low loader movements, further information had been requested from the Applicant regarding the movements of such vehicles and there had been 86 two way movements in one year compared to the movements surrounding Upper and Lower Huntington Farms which were dairy units and would have had 365 HGV movements per year, together with vehicular traffic from the food supplies, together with tractors, livestock movements and general farm duties which would be 7 days a week any time 24 hours a day. Officers considered the significant harm and highway safety and weighed this against the existing usage as farm land and concluded that this was an acceptable use subject to conditions. A condition for a scheme for road signs and lining had been agreed with the Applicant and limited to £1,000 following planning condition and CIL tests taking account of the existing movements associated with the site and the proposed which would be lower than the existing movements. Further consideration was given to the management of employment and concerns raised regarding the living conditions and as the nearest neighbouring property was 200m away the Officers concluded there would be no significant impact and any concerns could be addressed by the use of conditions. The Planning Officer requested that the application be approved subject to the conditions.

Members raised concerns regarding the operation hours and the vehicular movements through the Village of New Works. Although Members were not against seeing the business expand they wished to protect the local area. It was suggested that both New Works and Little Wenlock be included on the routing plan and signage to prevent large vehicles travelling through the villages and the hours of operation for HGVs entering and exiting the site be revised to 7.00am to 7.00pm Monday to Friday and 7.00am to 1.00pm Saturdays.

It was confirmed that the Applicant was happy for the hours of operation to be amended to meet these concerns.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0505 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) and subject to the change to the operation times being 0700-1900 Monday to Friday and 0700-1300 Saturday.

(b) TWC/2015/0950 Site of Honey House, Tibberton, Newport, Shropshire

The Planning Officer asked to consider an outline application for the erection of 2no detached dwellings with all matters reserved. The indicative plan illustrated two detached, two storey dwellings with Plot 1 to the front of the site and Plot 2 further into the site to the side of Honey House. A Section 106 Agreement for highways contributions of £500 per house towards Traffic and Speed Management Scheme on the B5062 would be entered into if the application was approved. The main issues were considered to be suitability and character due to the preservation of Duke of Sutherland cottages and officers were satisfied that the impact on the setting and character of Honey House could be accommodated on the site without having an unduly harmful impact and therefore there were no technical reasons to refuse the application. The final design of the dwellings was not known at this stage as this would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage. Members were asked to approve the application.

Councillor J Berry, Parish Councillor for Tibberton and Cherrington, spoke in opposition to the application. Honey House was one of the best examples of the 22 Duke of Sutherland houses within the village and had been extended very tastefully. The proposed development on land south east of the property was of a very misleading scale. Photographs were displayed on the screen to show the area of the proposed development around the 50ft hedge. The Parish Council felt that this house was enormous and bigger than the existing Honey House and that the development to the south west also had a much greater footprint. They considered this development to be contrary to NPPF 53 and also questioned policy HE26 and H10.

Councillor S Burrell, Ward Member for Edgmond and Ercall Magna, spoke in opposition of the application and questioned whether the development could be classed as an infill site. He suggested that this application was more of a ribbon development due to the line of the development which extended to the road but had no continuous line, the gaps between the properties were staggered but were linked when viewed from the road. This application failed to benefit the street scene and Councillor Burrell questioned whether there was a need for 4 and 5 bedroomed houses within the village as there were already houses of this size on the market and he could see no community benefit for these large unaffordable houses. There were another 6 active planning applications for a further 40 homes within the village, together with 35 houses in various other parts of the village as well as the Planning Appeal for a further 24 homes, doubling the size of the Village by over 100 houses.

Mr N Eyles, Local Resident, raised concerns with regard to the Duke of Sutherland cottages within the village and concerns with this particular application around the amount of space either side of the property which would house the development. Honey House was an unspoilt Duke of Sutherland Cottage and he considered that the development would go against Policy HE26. He further considered that the development was of a dramatic and disproportionate scale and would jeopardise Honey House and intrude on an unusual example of the legacy of Duke of Sutherland Houses within the village and would affect the visual and historic environment.

Ms E Attwood, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application which complied with policies CS1, CS7 and paragraph 14 of the NPPF. The development was within garden land, not open countryside, and there was no environmental or technical impact. It was an attractive development and provided adequate separation distance. A financial contribution of £1,000 towards improvement of junctions would be paid by the applicants via a Section 106 Agreement. Ms Attwood considered that policies HE26 and H10 were not relevant as they were out of date and asked that the application be approved.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this plot was a bit of an anomaly as it was set back from the road and confined the residential buildings to the domestic curtilage and did not encroach into the countryside. With regard to the design, this would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage. The plot could accommodate 2 dwellings allowing adequate space and officers were satisfied that it complied with the Core Strategy Policy and the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan. The Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved.

A discussion took place and members raised concerns regarding overdevelopment of the site, together with the size and scale of the dwellings, the impact the development would have on Honey House, the impact on the street scheme following the removal of the hedge. Discussion also took place regarding whether the development was considered to be infill housing and whether it would create a visual encroachment.

The Chair asked Members if they considered it necessary to attend a site visit in order for them to better understand the development and look at the visual impact. Members did not consider this was necessary.

Upon being put to the vote, the vote was tied. The Chair therefore used his casting vote and it was:

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission subject to the following:

- a) **The applicant/landowners entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to:**

- (i) Highways contribution of £500 per dwelling towards a Traffic & Speed Management Scheme on the B5062 in the vicinity its junction with the access roads into Tibberton. The monies are to be paid upon commencement of the development, indexed and any unspent monies after 5 years refunded to the applicant.**
- b) The conditions and informatives set out in the Report and update Report.**
- (c) TWC/2016/0033 – Telford Town Park, Hinkshay Road, Dawley**

The Planning Officer addressed the Members that this application sought a change of use of former coal yard to a wood storage compound and erection of 2.4m high fence (part retrospective) on Council land within the Town Park. A 2.4m high fence and gates were required to secure the site and the current footpath re-routed around the site to join the Silkin Way. The site was to be used for a tree felling and maintenance depot operated and run by the Council. Due to the continuous use of operation on this site for 20 years the Officer requested that the application be recommended for approval.

Councillor G Sinclair spoken on behalf of Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council who were opposed to the application. The Parish Council raised a number of concerns regarding the nature and the historic station platform within the Town Park and its LNR Status. The fence was very large and although the fence was to stop theft a question was raised as to whether the income generated from the sale of the wood would balance the cost of the fence and the loss of visual amenity. Further concerns were raised regarding the use of articulated lorries, timber hoarders and pick up trailers along Stirchley Lane which was a narrow residential lane with speed bumps and the possible damage this may cause together with the blocking of the lane whilst delivery/pick up took place. The Parish Council considered that this retrospective application was 20 years too late as the operation had been ongoing for over 20 years. Cllr Sinclair considered that officers deciding Local Authority Applications did not sit well with him.

The Planning Officer addressed the Members and explained that the value of the fence was not a consideration for the Planning Committee. She also reassured Members that local authorities determining their own planning applications happened regularly as it was the only body that was able to approve such applications in the first instance.

During the discussion concerns were raised regarding the retrospective application that had taken some 20 years to come forward, access to the site which was along a narrow lane, protecting the bridge and the re-routing of the footpath. Further concerns were raised regarding the protection of the historic station platform and the loss of visual amenity. A question was raised as to why the fence was only now being erected.

The Development Manager Service Delivery Manager addressed member concerns informing Members that this application could have come forward as a Lawful Development Certificate and if this was the case officers could not impose conditions

on a Lawful Development Certificate. As planning permission had been sought for the fence conditions could be imposed.

The Planning Officer explained to Members that due to recent thefts the fence was required in order to secure the site. The fence would be set down and the visual amenity would be protected. With regard to the concerns regarding the narrow lane and the bridge, the Highways Authority had not objected to the application and it was expected that the existing situation would continue, but that this could be conditioned not to intensify. The alternative footpath was considered to be a safer route. She reminded Members that this site had been used as a coal yard prior to becoming the wood yard and the original objections had now been withdrawn. If this site was not fenced off there was the potential of danger to the public due to the continuance of wood being removed from the site.

A further comment was made regarding the colour of the fence and a member asked if this could be green to complement the surrounding area and school fence.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2016/0033 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 7.09pm

Chairman:

Date: