

TWC/2015/0836

Land between Arleston Lane & Dawley Road, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire  
Reserved matters application for layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for the  
erection of an Extra Care Facility containing 50no. self contained flats and  
associated communal/public facilities including a shop, restaurant, café, hair &  
beauty salon and hobbies/meeting room and the erection of 95no. residential  
dwellings \*\*\*AMENDED DESCRIPTION, AMENDED PLANS AND FURTHER  
INFORMATION RECEIVED\*\*\*

**APPLICANT**

Helical (Telford) Ltd

**RECEIVED**

15/09/2015

**PARISH**

Wellington

**WARD**

Arleston

**OFFICER** Libby Harper

THIS APPLICATION HAS BEEN REFERRED TO PLANNING COMMITTEE BY  
COUNCILLOR McCLEMENTS

**1. THE PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 This is a Reserved Matters application relating to the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for the erection of an Extra Care Facility containing 50no. self-contained flats and associated communal/public facilities including a shop, restaurant, café, hair & beauty salon and hobbies/meeting room, together with the erection of 95no. residential dwellings.
- 1.2 The proposal has been amended from the original submission; changes principally entail a reduction of 8 dwellings from the 103 initially sought, amendment to boundary treatments, and elevational treatment of both the residential dwellings and extra care facility. The breakdown of the dwellings comprises 16No. 2 beds, 48No 3 beds, and 31No. 4 beds; with a mix of 2 and 2.5 storeys – the majority being 2 storey, and a 3 storey Extra Care 24No. one bed flats and 26No. two bed flats (affordable comprising 15No.one bed flats 15No. two bed flats).
- 1.3 At the outline stage, a series of character areas were devised for the site comprising Boulevard, Back Street, Village and Village Mews with higher densities to the north west area of the site, with a lower density across the remainder. These areas have been revisited through the current application and amended to Arleston Park (combining the former two areas), Grange and Copse. Arleston Park and Grange would be accessed off Dawley Road serving seventy six dwellings. This element of the site includes crossing the lane serving the Serchem factory (manufacturer of hygiene and decontamination products) and the residences of Heathersett and Midfields, together with the Extra Care facility. The remaining nineteen dwellings on the

eastern parcel comprising Copse would then be accessed from a replacement island with an additional spur from Arleston Lane.

- 1.4 The application is accompanied by the following documents:
- Planning Statement
  - Design and Access Statement, together with a Design Principles document relating to amended form of proposals
  - Transport Technical Note
  - Ecological Assessment Update.

## **2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises 7.26ha of private open land roughly 'U' shaped at the southern edge of Arleston, just north of the M54 between Dawley Road to the west and Arleston Lane to the east. To the north sits the residential properties of Kingsland forming the northern boundary of the site, with properties of Arleston Village sitting in the centre of the 'U' shape. A gated access drive flanked by an avenue of established leylandii trees forms the southern boundary of the site leading to the Grade II\* Arleston Manor House and gated properties of Arleston Manor Drive and Arleston Manor Mews at the south eastern corner. Residential development lies to the east of Arleston Lane, with the Wrekin Retail Park further east. Residences of Arleston also sit to the west of the site, on the opposite side of Dawley Road, with Shortwood Primary School and Ercall Wood Technology College beyond. The surrounding residences comprise a mix of detached and semi-detached two storey buildings, with the occasional bungalow. The northern and eastern boundaries principally comprise of hedges and being open to the wider site to the south and west. The site is formed of higher ground in the context of the wider site. There is a factory (Serchem) adjacent to the site, with access road to it and adjacent properties off Dawley Road, which dissects the site.
- 2.2 Access to the application site can currently be gained through the wider site from an existing access on Dawley Road running between Arleston and Lawley, which also forms a Public Right of Way that runs through the wider site through to Toll Road and beyond to Arleston Lane. The existing access serves residential properties and the Serchem factory, which are located to the immediate west of Arleston Village.
- 2.3 Within walking distance of the site there are numerous community facilities, including the aforementioned schools, together with Telford College of Arts & Technology, community centres, shops, doctor's, dentist, open space, public houses, restaurants and play facilities. Also within this distance is Wellington District Centre with bus and rail links and a wide range of additional community facilities.

### **3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 TWC/2014/0057 - Outline planning permission for the erection of 30 No. bungalows for the elderly, replacing the provision of 50 No. extra care housing units permitted under planning permission TWC/2012/0240. Outline Refused 17/06/2014. Appeal Dismissed 18/05/2015 (APP/C3240/A/14/2224981)
- 3.2 TWC/2012/0240 - Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 103no. new dwellings (Use class C3) and 50no. extra care housing units (Use class C2), Provision of 2no. new access roads and associated drainage, open space and landscaping \*\*\*Amended Parameter Plans\*\*\*. Outline Granted 05/10/2012
- 3.3 TWC/2011/0261 – Outline Planning permission for up to 125 dwellings (Use Class C3) a 50. bed extra care facility (Use Class C2) and 2no. new accesses and associated open space and landscaping. Withdrawn 01/06/ 2011
- 3.4 W91/1161 – Outline planning permission for up to 142 dwellings. Refused 15/01/1993
- 3.5 W91/1138 – Outline planning permission for up to 95 dwellings. Refused 15/01/1993
- 3.6 W91/1137 – Residential development for about 95 dwellings. Withdrawn 05/06/1992
- 3.7 W90/0031 – Outline planning permission for 257 dwellings. Refused 11/04/1990
- 3.8 W79/567 – Outline planning permission residential development. Refused 01/11/1979
- 3.9 Pre-application enquiry PE/2015/0822 - Reserved Matters application for the erection of 103 dwellings (Use Class C3) and 50no. Extra Care Housing Units (Use Class C2).

### **4. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT**

- 4.1 National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF)
- 4.2 Saved Wrekin Local Plan:  
UD2: Design Criteria  
UD4: Landscape Design  
OL11: Woodland and trees
- 4.3 Core Strategy:  
CS12: Natural Environment

CS13: Environmental resources  
CS14: Cultural, Historic and Built Environment  
CS15: Urban Design

- 4.4 Telford & Wrekin Local Plan Publication Version January 2016
- C4: Design of roads and streets
  - C5: Design of parking
  - BE1: Design criteria
  - BE4: Listed buildings
  - ER10: Water conservation and efficiency
  - ER11: Sewerage systems and water quality
  - ER12: Flood risk management

## 5. SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### Standard consultation responses

Two periods of consultation have taken place, the first at the outset of the application; the second further to the scheme being amended including the reduction of the number of dwellings entailed.

- 5.1 Wellington Town Council: Object
- Site designated as Green Network in the Draft Local Plan leading up to 2031, proposed development in contravention proposed Policy NE3
  - Proposed development detrimental to the existing wildlife and flora
  - Loss of valuable open space of significant community value
  - Questionable sustainability of extra care facility, development should not proceed in the absence of any service provider
  - Grounds of the decision of the Planning Inspector of March 2015 remain in existence for this proposal - confirm that the proposed development should be refused for the same reasons
  - Highways concerns - increased traffic density and safety issues over and along Dawley Road
  - Identified drainage issues in the locality which would further increase if the proposed development proceeded.
- 5.2 Lawley & Overdale Parish Council: Object
- Highways concerns – Dawley Road suffering from speeding motorists, lack of safe crossing areas, local residents campaigning for years to have these issues addressed, development of this size will create a massive increase in traffic on this road and only add to the existing serious concerns
  - Unnecessary loss of large area of green space - resulting loss of trees and wildlife habitat, requirements of 5 year [Housing] Land Supply already exceeded with no need to lose further greenspace to development in this area.

### 5.3 Ward Councillor - Councillor Angela McClements: Object

- Loss of privacy – concern raised over location of some dwellings, particularly those in proximity to Midfields, surrounded on three sides by new dwellings with a detrimental impact on the residents - have suggested an 8' wall be built along the west of the property to go some way to deal with privacy
- Residents suggestion LEAP located on a different site – next to Midfields, concern too close to busy Dawley Road and M54, dwellings then on the LEAP area
- Drainage concerns (including foul drainage) – pressure on Arleston Village stream through recent heavy downpours, lack of confidence current proposals could cope with increase in rain, concern amendment to drain the Copse into the stream
- Allotments – concern how deep water tank will be underneath allotments – viability reliant on good ground and soil
- Need for updated ecology information – requirement for full survey before planning completed and building commences. Concern Bioscan report has no reference to species, populations or foraging spaces significantly reduced on the Arleston Park area. Habitat changes since original survey completed 2011/12 and should be noted
- Dominance of Extra Care in landscape - developers gone some way to try and change the frontage of the building to try and link it into the unique character of Arleston Village, felt that residents suggestions to lower its profile by stepping or excavation have been ignored and should be considered, similar to that on Holyhead Road site, Wellington
- Inadequate restriction traffic flows along track at Serchem Chemical works – concern usage by cars to avoid congestion at Cock Hotel traffic lights, safety concern due to large lorries making deliveries, picked up by recent Inspectors report and suggested this needs looking at again.

### 5.4 Affordable Housing: Comment

With reference to the scheme as originally submitted, Affordable Housing have identified that there is an established unmet need for extra care housing in Telford & Wrekin, particularly in the north of the borough. The Council's long term strategy seeks to address this. The proposed scheme will provide fifty 1 and 2 bed extra care apartments, of which thirty will be for affordable rent and twenty for leasehold sale. The affordable apartments should be transferred to and managed by a Registered Housing Provider. The respective tenures should be fully integrated within the overall development.

Information has been provided on the space standards for the apartments and some of the communal areas. The space standards for the apartments are slightly below the Housing Learning and Improvement Network (LIN) guidelines. The areas of key communal areas (including lounge and restaurant) meet the guidelines for a scheme of this size, although some

areas (including the kitchen) are below them. The developer/provider should work closely with the local authority on the final design and specification to ensure that this supports frailty/impairment and facilitates way finding. They should also work directly with the local authority on the operation of the scheme through the mechanisms of an approved allocation policy and nominations agreement.

In respect of the second consultation, reference is made to a revised layout following earlier comments, including the internal layout on the ground floor. The size of the individual flats remains slightly below the recommended space standards for one (54m<sup>2</sup>) and two bedroom (68m<sup>2</sup>) apartments in Extra Care housing. There is no additional information on the proposed provider or tenure/size mix. It will be important to ensure that there is an appropriate mix of dwelling side and tenure. Also that the affordable housing and other tenures are fully integrated within the Extra Care housing scheme.

#### 5.5 Highways: Support subject to conditions

Reference the revised proposal, advise that there has been detailed dialogue between the Highways Development Control Team and the applicant/agent regarding the proposals for this site and the related highway matters.

There have been a few concerns raised during the consultation process relating motorised vehicles using the proposed woodland walk, this shall not be adopted as public highway and shall be privately managed. The concerns have been highlighted to the applicant for consideration and action if deemed necessary.

There have been a few concerns raised over the proposed parking provision for both the residential and Extra Care unit. As part of the documentation submitted for this proposal a Transport Technical Note has been produced which looks in detail at the parking levels for this site. This note makes reference to the parking standards in the emerging local plan but also have undertaken a comprehensive demand management study for this type of development and it is this on which the parking numbers for this development are based. The proposed parking provision, when taking into account allocated, unallocated and garages is deemed sufficient for the number and type of dwellings proposed. As part of the outline consent a Travel Plan will be submitted and monitored within six months of the Extra Care unit becoming occupied and targets will be reviewed and monitored on an annual basis for a period of five years. This will assist in ensuring the parking provision for the extra care unit is sustainable.

Aware that the commercial units that are accessed along the public rights of way that runs through the site have raised concerns over the interaction

between commercial vehicles and residential traffic. The cross over point that has been proposed has been designed in such a way that commercial traffic can only enter and leave the site along the rights of way. In addition to this, the layout of this junction shall also make it difficult for residential traffic to use the rights of way as a means of access to the dwellings within this development. Requested condition 5. will ensure details are submitted and approved by the planning authority that clarifies the arrangement at the location and mitigate as far as possible any conflict between commercial and residential traffic.

Aware of a few comments relating to the use of Arleston Lane and in particular the narrowness of this route and the congestion. This principle of this site was approved by the Local Planning Authority at outline and therefore this is not something that is considered at reserve matters stage.

The Highways Authority has raised a few queries/comments with the applicant regarding the use and improvement of the existing public rights of way that runs through the site. The applicant has indicated that would be happy to include a footway link to the proposed LEAP and will be dealt with through condition that will tie into the final design of this LEAP. Concerns were also raised over the interaction between pedestrians using the rights of way and the commercial vehicles accessing the businesses. The applicant is willing to consider improvements to this right of way in consultation with the Highways Authority as well as the Rights of Way officer. The improvements are likely to include passing places and a widened footpath to mitigate the conflict along this route. It has been agreed that details for these improvements will be agreed under condition. There shall also be a requirement for a formal rights of way diversion to be applied for to facilitate the revised route of the rights of way.

Conditions requested for 1. Parking, loading, unloading and turning; 2. Construction Detail (full construction detail of any new roads, footways, retaining features, accesses, street lighting, transition features, full block paved surfacing of shared space areas together with details of disposal of surface water); 3. On-site construction (parking of vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors for instance); 4. details of an improvement scheme to the existing public rights of way; 5. details of the crossing point of the rights of way across the residential roads; 6. Details of footpath link from the existing rights of way to proposed LEAP. Informatives requested reference S278 legal agreement for works within existing highway, and formal rights of way diversion requirement.

5.6 Urban Design: Comment

Response to 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation provides general commentary seeking revision to elevations, windows and string courses, together with a review of house types for each character area and revisions requested.

5.7 Built Heritage Conservation: Comment

Raise no objection to this development due to the arrangement of the site responding to the 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation. Grade II\* Arleston Manor House is identified as being well screened by existing and proposed landscaping/vegetation creating a necessary and appropriate buffer. In addition, the proposed houses to the north are already screened by the enabling development of Arleston Manor Mews. The other two designated heritage assets potentially affected by the development in Arleston Village also benefit from landscaping and some minimal existing development which act as a buffer. The proposed dwellings are broadly traditional in form and take note of key features such as chimneys.

5.8 Drainage: Support subject to conditions

Advise that whilst the developer has submitted a drainage layout for the site, any information has not been provided addressing the rest of the drainage conditions for the site. Will require microdrainage simulations (usually .mdx) for the site, and a plan showing pipe runs for this, would also like to see a drainage plan for the whole site on one drawing and for this to include highway drainage. Detailed designs for all of the attenuation features will need to be submitted as well as details on the future ownership and maintenance of these features and will also need to see exceedance plans for the site. For these reasons, the drainage conditions on the Outline permission still stand.

Further to the submission of amended drainage details, now in a position where

are satisfied that, subject to additional information being submitted, the drainage design is capable of providing the required onsite attenuation to restrict the site to greenfield rates of discharge. Requirements listed for discharge of condition 14. Of outline approval:

- The drainage designs for both attenuation basins include what appears to be a spillway entering the basin for overland flows. There is however no flooding in the model from the drainage system upstream of these features. Submission of details on the function of these features requested and evidence on how these will be maintained as open channels in the future
- A detailed design of the headwall structure at the point of discharge to the unnamed watercourse. Details on how this feature will be accessed for future maintenance should also be submitted
- Details on the ownership and maintenance arrangements of the propped surface water attenuation features on the site. This information should be provided in the format of the Council's SUDS Ownership Form. Due to the

complex nature of the drainage system the maintenance requirements and frequencies for each drainage feature need to be clearly outlined in a detailed maintenance plan document for the site

- A detailed exceedance routing plan should be submitted for events above the 1 in 100 +30% event.

#### 5.9 Ecology: Support subject to conditions

Originally objected to the scheme with a need for additional information relating to habitats, badgers, reptiles and bats through provision of an update to the Ecological Appraisal. Following the submission of an updated assessment and correspondence clarifying bat transect survey requirements, now support the scheme subject to conditions and informatives. Understood that relevant conditions of the outline consent remain in place (condition 19 relating to bat lighting, and, condition 25 relating to the provision of bat and bird boxes). A request is made to carrying through and update condition 24 on the reserved matters decision notice relating to the mitigation strategy, the retention of an additional tree as having high potential to support roosting bats further to condition 26. of the outline permission. Conditions further requested to address the update ecology assessment for the development, management and monitoring of the site wide open space; the retention of trees identified in the update ecology assessment as having low or above potential to support bat roosts; and the undertaking of a badger inspection. Informatives are requested for nesting wild birds, bats in trees and badgers.

#### 5.10 Arboricultural: Support subject to conditions

Advises that the development will be carried out in accordance with approved Tree Protection Plan TPP 1 and 2. With reference to the trees to be removed from TG2 (TPO'd Woodland) to facilitate the 7 dwellings, these will require quantifying. As per condition 18. of the outline permission, advise that Arboricultural supervision is required when the works are undertaken to T9 (TPO'd Oak) to ensure that the operation is carried out with minimum disruption to the tree.

#### 5.11 Parks & Open Spaces: Comment

Comment that the proposed LEAP is likely to be in near complete shade, whilst may somewhat be alleviated by the removal of part of the Leylandii hedge but would wish for a shading survey to be carried out to ensure this is not the case. Should it be shaded this will both impact upon its use and cause maintenance / safety issues such as creating the ideal conditions for slippery moss. The proposed natural play facilities does not necessarily meet LEAP standard and is not likely to be acceptable to meet the requirements outlined in the outline application. Reiterates would welcome the opportunity to be involved in assisting the detailed design (no detail has been provided) of this area to ensure this meets the standard.

Given the proximity of the highway and ease of access to Dawley Road, advised that this facility should be fenced with appropriate children's safety fencing (bow top). Formalised access (footpath) to the LEAP is required in any detailed landscape proposals. Full LEAP details are required, with queries over timing of the LEAP and related to overlooking properties (houses first / concurrently), trigger for LEAP delivery, provision of an activity trail agreed 2012 proposal, confirmation as to who is to maintain the public open space and if proposed to be maintained by a management company (reference to Greenbelt), request that a long term Management plan is provided / conditioned for all of the POS with more detailed than current biodiversity management plan which does not include a variety of standard operations such as litter collection / the principles of community access to POS (the public must have the right to use this LEAP / POS) and a maintenance schedule, mention of a plant specification and maintenance / management.

Related to trees within the proposed highway verge would wish to ensure that highways request £350 per tree to maintain these features. Confirmation requested who is managing the proposed allotments and whether this has a water supply, availability of allotments for the public to use and who is administering the booking system. Mention of use of grass cretes and queried where used, and whether this is to access the SUDs area. Mention of a gateway feature / landmark in a high quality Public Realm queried whether a building or proposed landscape feature, whether SUDs fenced off / have warning signs.

There is likely to be some damage done to the existing vegetation with the installation of the proposed acoustic barrier. More detailed plans for this are required to identify if there is an impact upon the existing hedge.

Identified that there are large amounts of incidental open space such as trees between car parking bays. These often are damaged / removed, better if these were removed and replaced with alternative hard landscaping or shrubs.

- 5.12 Environmental Health Pollution Control: Support subject to conditions  
Reference made to comments for previous application TWC/2012/0240:
- Noise - application was accompanied by a noise assessment dated March 2012 showing residential properties sited within NEC category B with noise mitigation (acoustic fence, double glazing) incorporated within the development to further meet the "good" standard of 30 Db(A) in habitable rooms; request condition be placed on the development to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully implemented.
  - Air Quality – application was accompanied by an air quality report detailing actions to be taken as part of a dust mitigation plan detailed in

section 5 of the report to reduce the impact of dust during the construction phase of the development; request a condition to ensure mitigation measures are fully implemented. The report details that it has not been determined whether centralised heating or power plant will be incorporated into the proposed development. Again if minded to approve the application a suitable condition should be placed on the development to further assess the impact on air quality if centralised heating or power plant is to be introduced.

No additional comment made further to the second consultation.

5.13 Environmental Health Contaminated Land: No comment

5.14 Education: No comment

5.15 The Coal Authority: Comment

Site falls within the defined Development High Risk Area, however the planning application is for Reserved Matters which is listed as exempt from the requirement for consultation. Nonetheless, the Authority have noted that condition 9 of outline planning permission requires the undertaking of intrusive site investigations prior to the commencement of development in order to establish the exact situation regarding coal mining legacy issues on the site along with the identification and implementation of any remedial works and mitigation measures considered necessary to ensure the stability of the site. Attention is also similarly drawn to condition 10 which requires the undertaking of site investigations to identify the locations of any untreated mineshafts and to identify any necessary treatment works. Reiterate these comments remain valid through the second consultation.

5.16 Shropshire Fire Service: Comment

As part of the planning process, consideration should be given to the information contained within Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service's "Fire Safety Guidance for Commercial and Domestic Planning Applications".

5.17 West Mercia Policy: Comment

Comments that from a crime prevention point of view, this planning application must consider the following:

(1) Blank Gable Ends: are a point of some concern as blank gable ends have been proven to encourage loitering, graffiti and general anti-social behaviour, as offenders do not associate a blank wall as belonging to that property.

Without a sense of ownership by a property and without fear of being overlooked, offenders are more likely to commit crime, always recommend that each gable end has at least one window installed, as this will denote a sense of ownership of that wall by that particular property and will also

increase the natural surveillance of the surrounding street, thus reducing the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour;

(2) Car Courts/Parking Issues: Designated parking areas that are set away from the dwellings themselves increase the opportunity for vehicle crime, as offenders are less likely to be seen or overheard. Always recommend that each parking space is positioned outside the front entrance to the corresponding dwelling to minimise the risk of residents having their vehicles broken into;

(3) Dusk-to-Dawn Lighting: Recommend that dusk-to-dawn lighting is installed at head-height by both the front and rear door of each property, thus providing a source of continuous, gentle illumination during the hours of darkness. This will make it more difficult for any intruders to hide in the shadows and also provide the occupants of each house with a greater level of reassurance. Statistically, dwellings with dusk-to-dawn lighting installed as opposed to PIR motion-sensitive lighting are less likely to be burgled. They also cost less to run in electricity costs;

(4) Ambiguous Space & Vegetation: Ambiguous spaces for grass and other vegetation should be avoided. It needs to be clearly defined who is responsible for maintaining these areas, as they can very quickly become overgrown. A neighbourhood that has an unkempt appearance is more vulnerable to an increase in crime, as the implication is that nobody cares about the area so nobody will mind if crime or anti-social behaviour is committed. Also, overgrown vegetation can provide cover and hiding places for intruders. Recommend that any ambiguous space is allocated to neighbouring houses as either front or rear gardens so that there is clear definition of ownership and responsibility of maintenance. With regards to vegetation, hedges should be no more than 1 metre in height and trees should be crowned so that the canopy is at least 2 metres above ground level;

(5) Permeability: Overall site plans that are overly permeable (i.e. too many entry and exit points for pedestrians) should be avoided, as this leaves the houses more vulnerable to burglary, as offenders have increased numbers of escape routes and so are more likely to offend;

(6) Dwelling Boundaries: Front boundaries of a dwelling should separate the private property from public areas by a fence/railing/wall that is no more than 1 metre in height. This will prevent intruders from being able to use them for cover from view. Rear boundaries of a dwelling require fencing and rear garden gates that are a minimum of 1.8 metres in height to prevent intruders from gaining access to the rear of the property. Garden gates should be lockable.

#### 5.18 Severn Trent Water: No objection

Request a pre-commencement condition for the submission of drainage plans for the disposal of foul and surface water.

## Local Groups Representations

### 5.19 Telford and Wrekin Local Access Forum: Object

Identify that it is not clear from the proposed plans how the developer plans to deal with a Public Right of Way (footpath) that runs east-west through the western part of the site. Whether this route has been used recently or not is not of relevance if it is recorded as a legal public right of way with land therefore vested in the local highway authority and on the Definitive Map for Telford and Wrekin. Specifies that it is important that planning is not granted until it is very clear how this route is to be dealt with by the developer, would also like to see it upgraded to Bridleway status so that it can lawfully be used as a safe off-road route by cyclists and therefore sustainable transport. This should be a condition of grant of the planning application or tied to a s106 agreement.

Needs to be assured also, that no overly restrictive furniture is placed on any of these routes that would hinder access by those who are less mobile, in mobility buggies, or pushing prams for example. Whilst the development is being constructed it would also be unlawful to restrict access to this Public Right of Way as the land that is walked upon is not owned by the developer in law to a depth of two spade spits. A temporary legal order would be needed to restrict the public's access through the site during the construction period. I suggest Telford and Wrekin Council's Senior Rights of Way Officer is consulted as a matter of urgency to advise on all the matters concerning Public Rights of Way. Recommend that the application be refused unless the developer addresses this issue.

## Neighbours representations

### 5.20 A total of 56 neighbour representations (including two petitions) objecting to the scheme have been submitted further to the first period of consultation, and 24 for the second consultation, a number of which relate to the same household. Concerns summarised as follows:

- Lack of need – development in Lawley / Lightmoor / Horsehay / paddocks on Arleston Lane, new extra care provision Lawley and Lightmoor, saturation outlying areas, no backer for extra care with concern development would comment to limit of 23 dwellings then request to change restriction and push for more properties before start on extra care, most if not all people preference to remain in their own homes as long as possible, facilities proposed such as hairdressers and community rooms well catered for in local environ, existing businesses will suffer if proposals allowed, extra care at Millennium Village complete and open but does not appear fully occupied, 5 year housing land supply now exists with support for development of brownfield sites to release pressure on greenfield land, request for time limit

- Better location for extra care in a town centre – site has poor bus services and isolated, town centre location preference with opportunities for shopping, a railway station, socialising, churchgoing, old bus station would have been ideal
- Lack of consideration to appeal decision – ignores Planning Inspector’s view of unique Arleston Village, Green Network including its contribution to the environment, listed properties, encroachment on land near Listed Arleston Manor, Inspector noted large amount of objections to development number of signatories on petition
- Non-compliance draft Local Plan – land designated as Green Network in draft local plan to 2030, developers required to assess aesthetic quality and needs of site responding to local character and identity
- Increase in traffic – concern over difficulties to commute, existing issues of traffic backing up on Dawley Road and locality, issues 8.15am - gone 9am school run and people getting to work, excessive traffic on Dawley Road and Arleston Lane from Lawley, proximity to TCAT and football ground with high volume pedestrian generation, believed motorway and newer A5 put in place to ease congestion along Bennetts Bank/Watling Street but not the case, more traffic noise, existing disturbance at night with traffic noise. Reduction in residences requested, traffic issues hugely magnified with planned development, upgrade to Cock Hotel junction required
- Concern over nature neighbouring highways – request to reposition traffic island at end of Lidgates Green closer to Arleston Lane or remove, narrow carriage to Lawley (steep, narrow bank, single file majority of length, restricted views, dangerous and poor conditions in places) with car accidents experienced and concern increase no. of accidents and potentially death with more commuters, Arleston Lane dangerous when conditions bad including vehicles having been stranded in icy/snowy conditions, sight lines poor from Lidgates Green (No’s 3, 5, 7) further exit/entrance requires careful design, access on blind brow of hill
- Relationship with Serchem factory – lack of traffic survey for cartway used by lorries over 20 tonnes including reversing context, likelihood of becoming third access, no survey traffic to and from factory
- Insufficient visibility for zebra crossing with trees and proposed garages – child killed stepping out into the road behind the hedge at the end of Toll Road a few years ago, questioned how pedestrians walking along Toll Road gain access to the crossing
- Poor access to retail facilities for extra care residents – downhill walk to Wrekin Retail Park, return journey with shopping uphill
- Bus service reduced to one per hour, tortuous and lengthy journey to town centre, considered for a cut
- Concerns antisocial behaviour / security issues – including concern new residents accessing properties of Arleston Manor Drive / Arleston Manor Mews gated community

- Increase in air pollution
- Noise and disturbance
- Production high levels of light pollution
- Impact on health of existing residents
- Loss of green / open space / Green Network protected under saved policy OL3, contradictorily included 5 year housing land supply only on basis extant planning permission TWC/2012/0240 dependent 50 bed extra care facility being funded and built
- Open Space not green open space – includes things like public footpaths, roads and gardens
- Lack of need for allotments – local groups found to be unnecessary after consultation with local people, impact on neighbours
- Loss of wildlife and habitats – including badgers, bats, foxes, falcon hawks, buzzards, owls, pheasants, partridges, raptors, field mice, frogs, voles all inhabit site, impact on wildlife removal wild hedges replaced by landscaped plants and fences, removal green edge Arleston Village as recognised by Inspector for appeal
- Inappropriate timing of tree survey – September, questioned whether many inaccuracies could arise
- Loss of well used dog walking facility to local community
- Loss of asset popular with families with young children
- Loss of rural look for top of Arleston
- Concern impact on drainage – increasing flood risk, houses and gardens already been subject to flooding in bad weather - Old Hall Close already experiencing regular flooding, waste water / flooding issues to north of site, 2008 brook overflowed to neighbours gardens and onto the road, sandbags required to prevent water in house, flooding adjacent Buck Head football ground, sum £5,000 to maintain stream soon be exhausted and concern over future with hard landscaping provision, failure of current sewerage system and worsened by increase in usage - foul drain in village only 6 inches / 4 inch - 100mm [different sizes identified by different parties] has blocked in the past with current load and cannot take more, passes through garden at foot before joining the main drainage system, proposed ponds overflow in bad weather and pungent when warmer, safety factor
- Lack of water pressure Arleston Manor Mews – worsened by number of houses proposed around Arleston Lane
- Impact on views
- Request for improved boundary treatments existing residences
- Inappropriate design:
  - garages along Dawley Road not in keeping with gateway site and loss of trees entailed
  - no evidence of housing mix or different house designs in each zone
  - no consideration of Wellington Gateway site

- continuation of green strip line of lime trees similar to Dawley Road should be considered and extended to motorway bridge
- proximity play area to motorway (questioned provision of sign stating 'No Ball Games') / busy main road / factory vehicle access
- dominance of extra care over Arleston Village (topography and location on bank) reduction in height to no more than 2.5 required in line with planned housing and set into ground to avoid perched look, looks 3.5 storey with pitched areas in roof space, or move to front Dawley Road concern impact of illumination of building, provision of solid screening (baffle mounds), relocating to lower position, build into topography
- inappropriate density 103 houses with a care home on a green lung site
- three bed semis not appropriate for properties on Arleston Lane in vicinity of listed Arleston Manor with houses at top of Arleston Manor all executive detached houses minimum of 5 bed executive detached houses expected to fit in with area
- conditions stipulated when Arleston Manor Mews and Arleston Manor Drive built that the houses would be built using similar style and characteristics of listed Arleston Manor proposed houses do not look similar style and characteristic
- loss of privacy and overlooking of existing properties on Arleston Manor Mews, gated property, residents paid premium prices for homes, loss of exclusiveness
- intensity building and hard landscaping in west conflicts spirit of green network
- need for more soft landscaping as a buffer
- Lack of street lighting top of Arleston Lane and needs to be catered for
- Impact on listed buildings – including three listed buildings in Arleston Village
- Concern over construction phase plans unclear vehicular access, 24/7 traffic control required with Dawley Road and Arleston Lane commuter and school routes, Plans for waiting/holding/turning places for delivery vehicles and construction vehicles and overnight parking of vehicles will need to be carefully assessed (no room / covenants Lidgates Green), construction traffic from southern end Arleston Lane should not be allowed – poor state of repair, no construction works in evenings or at night
- Footpath provision inappropriate - lack of need for another footpath next to existing footpath providing same route, footpath too wide for pedestrians on foot with concern usage for motorised vehicles causing issues for nearby residents, antisocial behaviour concern, too close to Arleston Manor Mews and Arleston Manor Drive properties with loss of privacy and access to privately gated residence, use of kissing gates requested at intervals along route

- Extra care not subsidised by market housing, questioned if an extra care facility body has funding available, affordable housing in extra care placing burden of affordable on body funding extra care facility
- Insufficient medical– difficult to see GP when needed.

Additional comments raised through the 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation

- Lack of exceptional circumstances – original application (TWC/2012/0240) granted on basis of exceptional circumstances through care home benefits to the community, view care home will not be built at present so goes against policy at that time, view original permission no longer applies and should be rescinded
- Lack of need for care home in area – many care homes constructed in area, understood no-one interested
- Relationship with Serchem factory – chemical production plant producing detergent products for the Health, Catering and Hospitality industry, large number of heavy vehicles delivering and collecting raw material/finished products. Staff of nearly 15 individuals who drive forklifts loading and unloading the heavy goods vehicles. Concern proximity of dwellings surrounding factory obstructing fire exit, supporting roads including slicing through access road used by HGVs/delivery vehicles, safety of residents, likelihood would form third access to the site, mitigation (raise curbs and staggered layout) not likely to prevent traffic in and out, lack of traffic survey for cartway used by lorries over 20 tonnes, attempts to restrict household traffic flows onto Serchem track inadequate
- Insufficient educational infrastructure – Shortwood / Lawley / Ercall Wood schools oversubscribed and going to get worse
- Retention existing footpath requested – allows access to woods and should be retained for both private individuals who use woods for bird watching and wildlife trust organisations
- Loss of natural woodland – including helping with flooding, mature trees already felled
- Loss of wildlife – further animals cited, squirrels, woodpeckers, great crested newts, and other wildlife. Shropshire Wildlife & Conservation Trust informed of sightings
- Inadequacies of ecology information – no reference to species, populations or foraging space – significantly reduced Arleston Park - in the January bat survey, absurd to suggest no habitat changes since original survey done 2011/12
- Lack of need additional footpath – existing ancient footpath running from Dawley Road to Arleston Lane leading directly to the proposed playground near Dawley Road, light pollution from street lighting with impact on bedroom accommodation due to levels, concern width accommodate car and certainly motorcycles provision required to prevent use with existing problem with illegal motorcycles in area, use of barriers of kissing gates,

also low picket fence either side of path to limit the width of use by vehicles as a shortcut between Arleston Lane and Dawley Road, never been a bridleway

- Inappropriate drainage – land has always been prone to flooding, brook variations of water flow depending on weather, climate change and flooding, request for independent survey drainage systems, concern Grange and Park draining into small old problematic drains into Arleston Village, amendment to drain Copse into stream seen as backward and hazardous step
- Land contamination
- Inappropriate design
  - style and colour of extra care mean both highly visible and dominate whole area for miles around, not blending with locality and unique historical Arleston Village – including listed buildings, rise and fall of land; compared to beach huts / block of flats, use of materials and colour that blend into existing environment
  - questioned houses in keeping with listed manor house Concern over boundary treatments - proposed new boundary treatment within boundaries existing properties and should be outside, request for developer to maintain/repair replace proposed boundary going forward, strong quality and involvement design of fencing and type of planting
- Impact on unique character of Arleston Village – danger of being subsumed into another housing estate, need for linear mounds with tree planting, hedge and shrub to maintain green feel and maintain green corridors for wildlife
- Light pollution – rise of land meaning bedroom windows at ground level of development, lights required 24/7 in flats with lighthouse effect for Wellington and surrounding area
- Nature of application complicated
- Reduction no's welcomed but shame 6% reduction not applied to extra care – key issue local people take exception to, reduction highly localised in north west and south east corners minimal impact unique character of Arleston Village seen as highly significant by Inspector
- Nature of extra care non sustainable – doubted will function as defined, mockery of outline permission bringing exceptional benefits to the community
- 3 separate developments reinforced by names Arleston Copse, Arleston Grange, Arleston Park - segregation
- Concern over security, loss of privacy, sunlight and overlooking – removal of landscape barrier leaving property exposed (property previously burgled), car lights shining directly into bedroom windows, allotment users able to look directly into bedrooms, more substantial long term landscape buffering welcomed on boundaries, loss of privacy and exclusiveness Arleston Manor Mews as privately gated residence

- Concern construction phase – noise, smell, fumes
- Deferral requested.

## 6. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Having regard to the development plan policy and other material considerations including comments received during the consultation process, the planning application raises the following main issues:

- background to the present application
- design and layout including impact on the living conditions of neighbours
- heritage
- highways and traffic issues
- flood risk and drainage
- ecology and trees

### Background to the present application

6.2 This site has a lengthy planning application history dating back to the late 1970s seeking residential development on the land, a series of refused permissions culminated in 2012 with an approved outline planning permission for up to 103no. new dwellings and 50no. extra care housing units. Key to the scheme being considered acceptable was the reduction in the proportion of the land subject to built development. A significant quantum was identified to be retained as open land (3.6ha, in the region of 50%, previous refused scheme 40% and up to 125 dwellings) including provision of 10 allotments, together with the inclusion of an extra care facility incorporating 30 affordable units and a number of community facilities. The extra care was identified as a key factor in providing community benefits for the proposal, and along with the environmental and ecological benefits of the development, was considered sufficient to outweigh the loss of approximately half of the site as green space, and green network in this locality in accordance with saved Wrekin Local Plan policy OL4. The proposal was further considered by Members to assist in the provision of extra care in the north of the Borough with a high population of elderly residents. Notably, the use of the extra care premises has been specifically restricted for personal or nursing care by reason of physical or mental capability and for no other purpose including any other purpose in Use Class C2.

6.3 In 2014 the applicant then sought permission to enable an alternative form of development to come forward on the land proposed for the extra care provision. Through the form of S106 agreement requested this sought to add a further option to the development mix should a provider not come forward as had been proving to be the case at that time, rather than making the extra care option obsolete. The alternative comprised 30 affordable bungalows for

the elderly. Members of Planning Committee duly refused this application on three grounds - a lack of exceptional community benefit derived from the proposed bungalow, which fails to outweigh the sites designation as Green Network (1), the proposal fails to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate the lack of viability for the approved Extra Care Facility (2), and the proposal has failed to adequately assess the impact of the proposed development on Dawley Road which would be caused by the greater number of traffic movements associated with the individual bungalows in contrast to the more limited number of movements associated with the Extra Care Facility (3).

- 6.4 The decision was taken to appeal the refusal, and was duly dismissed by the Inspector concluding that the location, configuration, use, function, ecology and character of this element of the 'green network' would align very well with the aims and purposes of policy OL3, remaining a statutory policy. The Inspector considered that the proposed bungalows for the elderly, although likely to demonstrate 'best practice' and be affordable, would neither be particularly exceptional nor contribute to the aims of the 'green network' sufficiently to satisfy the requirements of policy OL4.
- 6.5 Hence, an overview of the background to the current planning application is set out here, and whilst the outcome of the potentially divergent application and appeal is acknowledged, the current planning application relates to consideration of the Reserved Matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) subsequent to the approved 2012 outline scheme. The application has been submitted in accordance with the timeframe defined by the preceding application to which it relates, with the extra care including a shop, restaurant, café, hair & beauty salon, and hobbies/meeting room. A number of representations have sought to attach weight to the outcome of the 2014 application and appeal, together with questioning the need for an extra care facility in this location bearing in mind the under construction scheme at Holyhead Road; Members of Planning Committee are duly advised that these do not constitute material considerations and the principle of development of this greenfield, and indeed green network, site having been established through the 2012 application.
- 6.6 During the early stages of this application, the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan Consultation version was being consulted upon (03/08/15 – 25/09/15), this identified the site as part of the Green Network as recognised within a number of representations on the application. This was however, an error in the context of the emerging plan, with the site being committed for development through the outline approval. The Publication Version of the Local Plan has now completed the consultation process and the subsequent Proposals Map now identifies the site as whiteland.

- 6.7 The position of the two access points to serve the development was further established at the outline stage, one off Dawley Road towards the north western corner of the site, with a second at the eastern edge from Arleston Lane. Procedurally, no divergence from these positions is within the scope of this application noting such a request in the local representations. Further, as part of the outline application, consideration was given to the land use zoning of the site with the submission of a Parameters Plan indicating the areas of residential development, extra care facility, open space, existing and proposed vegetation, together with the LEAP.
- 6.8 The Parameters Plan also presented the height of buildings, with up to 2 and 2.5 storeys presented for the C2 Use Class residential areas and up to 3 storeys for the C3 Use Class extra care. Local representations together with the Parks & Open Spaces Officer have requested the reconfiguration of the site to include relocating the extra care unit and the LEAP to an alternative position, Officers have indeed reviewed the scope to alter the position of certain elements of the scheme. However, as the changes would be beyond marginal ie. exceeding tens of metres, a potential risk of challenge existed. This is particularly as the location of the extra care was specifically addressed in the debate by Members at the outline stage, with the application having been deferred for the Planning Authority to negotiate further regarding the position within the site boundary of the shaded area encompassing the extra care unit based upon a concern that its siting would be overbearing on neighbouring Kingsland. Thus the position of the zoning was considered at the outline stage and contained within the approved plans, it stands.
- 6.9 The S106 for the preceding outline approval comprises the following:
- Education £208,794 to provide additional primary education facilities within the vicinity of the development
  - Affordable provision - provision of 30 affordable extra care units within the extra care facility
  - Drainage – deposit of £5,000 to the Council for ditch de-siltation works
  - Open Space - provision of open space (to include an area to be provided sufficient for 10 allotments) and play facilities on site and off site play area contribution of £25,000
  - Art - public art contribution of £10,000 towards the provision of public art in the local vicinity
  - Highways – pedestrian crossing contribution of £600, a travel plan contribution amounting to £5,000.

Thus the principle of the development was established through grant of the outline approval with a range of obligations applying.

## Design and layout including impact on the living conditions of neighbours

- 6.10 The NPPF distinguishes the importance of planning positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes (para. 57). It communicates a need to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character, create safe and accessible environments, and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping (para. 58). In terms of local planning policy, Wrekin Local Plan policy UD2 provides guidance to assess whether or not proposals are of an appropriate design quality and relate positively to their context, followed through in policy BE1 of the Publication Version Local Plan. Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy, amongst other issues, states that development will assist in creating and sustaining safe places, positively influencing the appearance of the local environment.
- 6.11 As a Reserved Matters application, the above factors come to the fore, how it will ultimately look and function, as to determining the acceptability of the proposal. In respect of density and layout, the scheme has been subject to amendment; the original proposal identified the provision of 103 dwellings as per the suggested level indicated through the outline proposal. Officers have sought the reduction in the number of dwellings, with certain areas in a further worked up scheme appearing overdeveloped at the outset of the application, with a lack of relief between stretches of dwellings and garages. Thus a request followed to free up the layout, and a reduction in the scale of development, with 8 dwellings lost equating to the 95 dwellings now being sought (in addition to the extra care).
- 6.12 The need for amendment to the scheme was further compounded by the nature of the site, being such that it bounds and relates to a range of styles and periods of architecture including variation in plot size, and elevational features, topography is also subject to change across the site and related to the neighbouring areas. To address this variation, an approach of establishing character areas was set out in the Design & Access Statement for the outline scheme, namely the four areas of Boulevard, Back Street, Village and Village Mews were identified and carried through to the Reserved Matters submission. Notwithstanding this, through the current application Officers have sought further exploration of the areas. A greater emphasis on considering the form of Kingsland has been sought related to the north western element of the site, with more formal unity to the north western area and an increasing relaxation through the site to more greatly reflect the character of Arleston Village alongside the properties of Arleston Manor Mews.

- 6.13 The character areas of the site have duly been renamed to Arleston Park (originally Boulevard and Back Street), Grange (originally Village) and Copse (originally Village Mews) seeking to provide revised streetscapes, a lesser density generally, a more formal uniformity for the former, and further acknowledging the relationship with the woodland backdrop of the eastern parcel of the site for the latter. The removal of the 8 units has been generally spread across the scheme, to provide a density (excluding the extra care facility, and a netter development area of land) of 27.4 dwellings per hectare (from 29.6 dws/ha at the outset), which is considered to be an appropriate density, with a denser form to the west across Arleston Park, and will be in keeping with the density and character of the respective residential areas to the north and east of the site.
- 6.14 The proposed layout comprises a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bed units, including a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached properties, with 1 and 2 bed units within the extra care, particularly noting the emphasis of policy HO4 of the Publication Version Local Plan for major development to deliver a mix of house types and sizes. Some of the three and four bedroom properties comprise detached garages (some double related to two properties), focussed around the Copse and Grange character areas and in keeping with the character of Arleston Manor Mews. A number of representations reference garages from Dawley Road, provision only relates to one plot (plot 38) and is considered acceptable in a setback position and adds modest variation to the streetscene.
- 6.15 Variation of the storey heights from 2 to 2.5 is proposed for the dwellings, the emphasis being on 2.5 related to key nodes within the site. This includes at the entrance to the site on Dawley Road and in the vicinity of the extra care, it will aid avoiding the 3 storey extra care appearing as a stark extremity in the skyline. Officers consider that the mix will work particularly well with the slope northwards down Dawley Road as demonstrated by the streetscene provided. Added detail is afforded through provision of chimneys as requested by the LPA, dormers on some units, and the inclusion of a number of gable fronted (and of various forms) units - but reduced from that originally proposed acknowledging that gables are a more ad hoc feature along Kingsland and Dawley Road.
- 6.16 Modest variation in the materials is also included with feature rendered gables or full frontages, and a mix of red and grey roofs. The elevational treatment, position and height of the units fronting Dawley Road at the western entrance seek to work with the avenue of trees (taking a cue from the avenue form of Dawley Road) along the immediate internal stretch of road in the site to develop a sense of arrival, sense of place and legibility, whilst framing this edge of the extra care through a long vista. The LPA have suggested that the

art work secured through the outline S106 be positioned at the front of the north west corner of the building, and has been indicated as such, to further improve legibility and encourage local residents and visitors from beyond the site to be drawn towards the community facilities on offer within the building.

- 6.17 The extra care facility is generally U-shaped, the longest solid edge to the north. It is proposed that the area fronting the building be paved and bound by bollards, a row of trees then inset. A glazed projection would be installed across the majority of the frontage, either side of the main entrance, serving the restaurant and lounge. Through the course of the application changes have been sought to make this area a greater focus of activity, enhancing the interaction between the public face of the extra care with its immediate external space and the wider area. Notably at the pre-application stage the main entrance was shown on the inner edge of the building - reducing legibility and anticipated interaction with residents of the development and beyond.
- 6.18 The ground floor full height glazing will integrate the internal and external areas. The landscaping features will help soften the front, and in turn the mass of the building. Modification of the extra care has further sought to provide a more informed identity and articulation of the elevations; amendments have been made to the projecting elements to afford a greater reflection of the Arleston Park style with fewer half pitch projections and the addition of flat roof projections, including linking with open flat roofed porch canopies as a particular feature of this character area. A balanced approach has also been sought to the elevational colours, reinforcing legibility and an emphasis on interaction, whilst being toned down with a focus around entrances and the public areas.
- 6.19 Beyond the principal frontage, the form of gables, materials, a mix of full height and varied size windows has been followed through, thus helping to break up the mass of the building. The narrowest elevation has been orientated towards Arleston Village. Internally, revision has been made to the layout with the size of the individual flats remaining slightly below the recommended space standards for one (54m<sup>2</sup>) and two bedroom (68m<sup>2</sup>) apartments in Extra Care housing, with a need for the developer/provider to work closely with the local authority on the final design and specification to as required through the S106 agreement, and ensure that this supports frailty/impairment and facilitates way finding.
- 6.20 Servicing of the building comprises the majority of parking being set behind the front projecting wing of the building, including an ambulance drop off area, and undercroft parking. The space would be broken up with trees and herringbone pavements to reduce the formality and harshness of the space, this

then leads to the backdrop of a landscape courtyard; providing a more private space serving the amenity needs derived from the use. Staff parking and access is positioned to the opposite side of the building. The design also incorporates private amenity space for residents, with patio areas for a number of ground floor units, and balconies for a number of the first and second floor units. At the upper levels these relate to the projecting elements, thus furnishing features with a specific function, and added interest in terms of different coloured renders to the projections. Further accesses are then dotted around the building, which in combination with the amenity areas, will help create activity around different areas of the building. The refuse pick up point serving the building is positioned to the northern side in close proximity to the refuse area located within the building.

- 6.21 The need for reconfiguration of the street enclosures around the extra care was identified at the pre-application stage, the surrounding residential development now more positively frames the building - generating a stronger relationship. Properties front the streets configured through a back to back and back to side relationship, meaning the stretches of rear garden visible in the streetscene are limited, with an emphasis on walled boundaries where this does exist, and then broken up by unallocated parking and trees to add variety to the streetscene. The initial stretch adopting an avenue context recognises the character of Dawley Road.
- 6.22 Moving through the site, the dwellings within the Grange and Copse character areas have also been enhanced from the pre-application feedback, and during the course of the application, to present a more refined character that reflects their larger plot sizes and layout. Plots have been reorientated to positively address the bend in the road, such as plots 56, 66/67, 89, and in the case of plot 76, to positively address the neighbouring open space whilst having a defined front boundary to clearly distinguish public and private space. A more varied set back from the road also applies. Elevationally, further gateway features and secondary active side elevations have been incorporated across the Grange and Copse areas, also acknowledging the concern of West Mercia Police (as well as on Arleston Park plots, for instance plot 16 with habitable windows). An informal character is present in the Grange with a variety of building forms and a greater emphasis on paved roads and hedging to mark garden boundaries. Variation in the ridgeline is present with a courtyard / mews typology bearing in mind proximity to Arleston Manor Mews. The building form is mainly detached houses arranged informally around semi private areas with varying setbacks from the street.
- 6.23 The proposal will utilise a mix of red brick, render, red hung tiles and Tudor boarding (and in combination); grey / slate coloured and red weathered roof tiles, a mix of stone and brick soldier headers and cills, with a range of door

and window styles including casement and horizontal bar leaded casements. The render pallet has been simplified from that proposed during the course of the application. A total of 20 different house types (10 across Arleston Park, 8 across Grange and 7 across Copse) are proposed comprising a mix of elements of contemporary detailing and a greater emphasis on traditional detailing across the eastern areas. For the Grange and Copse, details and features have been rationalised such that they do not visually compete and conflict with one another.

- 6.24 The outline approval included a condition necessitating additional materials details for the appearance dimension of the reserved matters. Specific architectural details plans have been submitted, which together with confirmation of rainwater goods, provide sufficient detail for the purpose of condition 5. of the outline permission.
- 6.25 Amendments have been made to the access arrangement to rear gardens of the residences, to ensure each has an appropriate gated access, together with seeking the provision of parking in as close proximity to units as possible. Where rear access is proposed through parking areas of neighbouring units, the widths have been widened across the layout and will allow for demarcation to clearly spaces associated with each property.
- 6.26 The application is accompanied by a levels plan identifying finished floor levels. This indicates a notable (5 metres) but essentially a gradual rise from the north western corner of Arleston Park progressing south. There would then be in the region of a metre rise in the finished floor levels from Arleston Park to Grange. A gradual increase is present across the latter area amounting to in the region of a metre adding modest variety to the streetscene. Within the Copse character area, the south eastern area is subject to a 1.2 metres rise in the finished floor levels; and within the north eastern area amounting to 0.6 metres, again relating to relatively gradual fluctuation. The overall change in levels within the character areas is gradual and in conjunction with landscaping in place and proposed will not derive an overbearing impact between existing and proposed properties.
- 6.27 The proposal involves appropriate separation distances and relationships with existing properties, including according with the parameters plan as approved through the outline permission, together with proposed properties. Relating to Arleston Park at the north western edge of the site, the minimum distance entailed is 27 metres related to Midfields where development will be positioned to the north, west and south, the distance cited relates to the west where additional screening is proposed. Elsewhere in this character area, the distances increase to a minimum of 30 metres to 70 metres related to Arleston Village, with 25 metres for Kingsland for plot 1 with habitable

windows on the ground floor only and the plot is bound by established landscaping to be retained, for the remainder a minimum of 36 metres applies. Related to the Grange character area, a minimum of 30 metres applies relates to Midfields, and 50 metres for Heatherset. For the Copse character area, the distances have been improved through stepping away the units further and the reintroduction of landscape buffer, affording a minimum of 24 metres related to Callow House (originally 19 metres), and 20 metres for Haddon House with a back to side relationship of the proposed dwelling and no side windows entailed.

6.28 A number of residents neighbouring the site have raised a concern as to the loss of privacy and potential overlooking related to the opening up of areas of presently private greenspace. Concerns are particularly raised with regard to the provision of a footpath link through the north eastern end to the central area, the omission of a landscape buffer between the existing properties off Arleston Manor Mews and proposed properties in line with the outline proposals. The nature of the boundary relating to the original approval of the dwellings adjoining the listed Arleston Manor is such that elements of garden areas and habitable windows would entail a particular loss of privacy. The applicant has taken on board the concerns raised, and duly provided a mix of additional fencing, a wall and soft landscaping within the site along the areas of particular concern, together with reinstatement of the landscape buffer to the north of Arleston Manor Mews. In respect of Callow House and its relationship with the listed building, provision of willow fencing is considered an appropriate form of screening as a temporary measure to allow the establishment and growth in height of the native shrub planting to create a suitable soft landscaped privacy boundary bearing in mind the proximity of the listed building and open space backdrop. Planting is also proposed around the edge of the site related to Midfields, the Serchem factory, Heathersett, the north eastern edge related to properties of Arleston Village to the east and particularly related to the allotments with existing vegetation retained where possible, with existing planting retained elsewhere at the edges of the site. The soft landscaping plan indicates a notable depth of planting, with the type defined on the later planting schedule to provide a good mix and height of planting, the LPA consider this to represent an appropriate arrangement related to privacy and overlooking.

6.29 The Reserved Matters scheme includes areas of open space including 10 allotments, a LEAP (Local Equipped Area for Play) and areas of open space including attenuation in line with the Parameters Plan approved at the outline stage. Officers note that the detail of these areas was conditioned through the outline, specifically to define the form, equipment and provision for future maintenance of the equipment (condition 29.), together with a scheme for the creation and improvement of open space and provision for future

maintenance (condition 30.) and remain in place acknowledging the Parks & Open Space (POS) feedback. Notably the acoustic barrier was agreed and conditioned at the outline stage with reference to the comment relating to the hedge from POS. Management company arrangements were also established at the outline stage, with the inclusion of maintenance tasks of the open space that will be elaborated through discharge of condition 30. and as related to the S106. The S106 further sets out occupation and management arrangements for the allotments, and requires provision of a water supply.

- 6.30 The landscaping scheme defined through the Reserved Matters proposal indicates the use of a range of planting to address the nature of the areas entailed. This includes a dense planting area to the rear of plots 8-16 backing on to Kingsland taking on board concerns raised by West Mercia Constabulary and Urban Design feedback, with particular regard to Secured by Design guidance. The planting arrangement will provide a landscaped buffer at the rear of the properties whilst addressing the need for maintenance access to the neighbouring dry pond.
- 6.31 The application is accompanied by a planting schedule setting out the detailed form of landscaping proposals. Provision of a range of tree species is proposed including field maples / silver birch / willow / lime / English oak, new trees would be located within the residential streets – to establish rows along streets referencing the avenue context of Dawley Road and including placement to help break up the mass of parking banks, as well as, pockets of trees around the open spaces recognising the removal of existing trees from the site. Alongside the trees, a wide range of species planting is proposed.
- 6.32 On the basis of the above, Officers are satisfied that the proposal complies with Saved Wrekin Local Plan policies UD2, UD3, UD4, Core Strategy Policy CS15, Telford & Wrekin Local Plan Publication Version policy BE1 and HO4, alongside the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework with specific reference to paragraphs 17 and Chapter 7 – noting the context above relating to para's 57 and 58.

### Heritage

- 6.33 The area adjacent to the listed Arleston Manor (and notably not the principal elevation) is proposed to be retained as open space within the scheme. The nearest plots comprise No's 77 - 81, with plots 81 - 79 entailing a back to back relationship with the residences of Haddon House and Callow House (relating to enabling development of the Manor house), it incorporates a landscape buffer between and relates to a minimum separation distance of 24 metres for windowed elevations. The remaining plots back directly on to the open space flanked by a proposed boundary wall and areas of planting, the units are set

away from the existing properties, and entail separation distances exceeding 32 metres. A minimum separation distance of 54 metres to the boundary of the garden for Arleston Manor applies, with residential gardens between, and residential properties where related to views from the Manor itself.

- 6.34 The Conservation Officer has no objections to the development due to the arrangement of the site as discussed here, such that the site is well screened by existing and proposed landscaping, together with existing residences which duly revised its setting along the eastern edge. Attention has been further drawn to the other two designated heritage assets potentially affected by the development in Arleston Village, noting that these too benefit from landscaping and some minimal existing development which act as a buffer. The proposed dwellings are considered to be broadly traditional in form and take note of key features such as chimneys. The LPA are satisfied that the scheme pays due regard to the heritage assets present in the locality, thus satisfying the requirements of CS14, policy BE4 of the Publication Version Local Plan and section 12. of the NPPF with particular regard to the setting of listed buildings.

#### Highways and traffic issues

- 6.35 Representations received have raised highway concern related to increased traffic and congestion in the locality including the level of traffic generation from the site, with notable reference to existing and intensified congestion at the Bucks Head and Cock Hotel junctions, together with Bennetts Bank, the narrowness of the carriageway leading to Lawley and restricted views, the relationship with the Serchem factory and neighbouring residences.
- 6.36 The principle of residential development in combination with an extra care facility, greater than the level now sought through this application, was established at the outline stage. Further, access was applied for through the outline proposal with two vehicular accesses identified and agreed to serve the proposed site. The first from the western edge of the site off Dawley Road serving plots 1-76 together with the extra care. The second from the eastern edge of the site off Arleston Lane opposite Lidgates Green with a replacement roundabout provided with a further arm added which would then serve plots 77-95. Both accesses connect the site with Wellington and the wider area.
- 6.37 Pedestrian access to the site can be gained along Dawley Road from the new access, which would be related to a new traffic signal controlled pedestrian crossing provided as required by condition 6. of the outline approval, with pavements then provided either side of the internal road. A new footpath running through the site as required by condition 33. of the outline permission links through to Arleston Lane thus affording access to and from the site at the

eastern edge. An existing pedestrian access from Dawley Road towards the south western corner of the site also exists linking through to Arleston Village and then through the eastern half of the site again through to Arleston Lane. The proposal therefore provides good connectivity with the wider local highway network with a clear route to the community facilities available at the extra care facility; the new pedestrian link will improve accessibility through the site providing a link to the LEAP and neighbouring green space which will be opened up for public access, as well as permeability through the site to the neighbouring residential areas and the facilities beyond.

6.38 The Highways Authority has raised a few queries/comments with the applicant regarding the use and improvement of the existing public rights of way that runs through the site, the applicant has indicated that they would be happy to include a footway link to the proposed LEAP (likely the western edge of the LEAP) and will be dealt with through condition to tie into the final design of the play space. This will facilitate a more direct access for users of the LEAP when accessing from this end of Dawley Road. The applicant is also willing to consider improvements to this right of way in consultation with the Highways Authority as well as the Rights of Way officer to address concerns over the interaction between pedestrians using the existing rights of way and the commercial vehicles accessing the business, a conflict with the existing neighbouring residences is also made within the representations. The improvements are likely to include passing places and a widened footpath to mitigate the conflict along this route; and it has been agreed that details for these improvements will be agreed under condition. Furthermore, highways have confirmed that the cross over point has been designed in such a way that commercial traffic can only enter and leave the site along the rights of way (as opposed to through the new development). In addition to this, the layout of this junction shall also make it difficult for residential traffic to use the rights of way as a means of access to the dwellings within this development. A specific condition is requested to ensure details are submitted and approved that clarifies the arrangement at the location and mitigates as far as possible any conflict between commercial and residential traffic. There shall also be a requirement for a formal rights of way diversion to be applied for to facilitate the revised route of the rights of way.

6.39 In response to the Reserved Matters application, the supporting Transport Technical Note and subsequent points of clarification material, the Local Highways Authority (LHA) has not raised any objection. The note considers the refuse servicing arrangements for the site based upon the size of vehicle required by the LHA, which is then accompanied by a swept path analysis confirming vehicles used by the Council are able to access and manoeuvre within the site. The level of parking provision for the extra care facility is set

out having regard to parking ratios for similar consented developments elsewhere, and the residential dwellings in line with DCLG research.

- 6.40 The note concludes with consideration of the design of the layout in order to maintain the access that crosses the site serving the commercial premises occupied by Serchem (together with two residences). Returning to the parking ratio, the extra care facility is defined as being in excess of the average level of provision at other comparable sites either constructed or received planning consent. Whilst in terms of the dwellings, additional demand from the residents could be accommodated in the 30 (12 of which are double serving 24 plots) garages provided on the site.
- 6.41 Specific parking is now provided to serve the allotments; two spaces have been created adjacent to the road through to the gated allotments. Usage will be secured for allotment users via a bollarded system. Above and beyond this, users could use nearby unallocated parking where necessary.
- 6.42 The application is also accompanied by a Refuse Strategy Plan, indicating refuse vehicular movement sweeps, and on street refuse collection points. All properties are provided with secure storage of bins and recycling located in rear gardens. Direct street access through garden gates is provided to move bins on collection days. Where collection travel distances from the highway exceed the required standard, a collection point is provided in a designated storage facility. The LPA are satisfied that this approach ensures safe and convenient storage within a close proximity to the highway, allowing for refuse collection to take place at the roadside and seeks to prevent the ad-hoc storage of bins on the pavement.
- 6.43 A number of parties have raised concern during the consultation process relating to motorised vehicles using the proposed woodland walk, this shall not be adopted as public highway and shall be privately managed. Options to limit access have been considered including use of metal elephants ears (hoops), kissing gates as per a neighbour suggestion; however, without fully fencing in the open space or indeed the footpath itself, the impact of these measures would likely be ineffective. The background to the application highlights the importance of creating public open space as to the acceptability of the proposal, attention has also been drawn by the Local Access Forum as to need to avoid hindering access by those who are less mobile, in mobility buggies, or pushing prams, and appreciating the feedback of the Bridleways Association; hence the nature of the area entailed would be notably altered by the installation of fencing. Alternatively, improvements have been made to orientate units towards the open space and create active frontages at either end to facilitate self-management.

- 6.44 The access points for the site were defined and approved through the outline permission. The proposed development has been assessed in relation to the detailed layout and parking proposals. The proposed level of parking in this location, when taking into account allocated, unallocated and garages is deemed sufficient for the number and type of dwellings proposed. Feedback to remove visitor parking from rear courtyards has been taken on board; with refuse arrangements in place; staff parking, resident and visitor parking for the extra care facility with refuse pick up point identified, and duly acceptable. As part of the outline consent a Travel Plan will be submitted and monitored within six months of the Extra Care unit becoming occupied and targets will be reviewed and monitored on an annual basis for a period of five years. This will further assist in ensuring the parking provision for the extra care unit is sustainable. The scale, layout and landscaping for the development are duly considered acceptable in respect of servicing and parking.

#### Flood risk and drainage

- 6.45 The outline application proposed to discharge foul drainage to mains sewer, with surface water conveyed to a number means of disposal including mains, existing watercourse, and sustainable drainage system (SUDs). The application was accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment, including the identification that the entire site is located in Flood Zone 1 – Low Probability where the principle of residential development is considered acceptable, the existing site is not at significant risk of flooding from land or sewers, or groundwater flooding, with opportunities for the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) within the site to attenuate surface water runoff during extreme storm events with three dry ponds proposed, together with permeable paving and underground storage.
- 6.46 The Assessment further identified that there are no existing formal piped drainage system located within the site boundaries, existing surface water runoff flows overland within five catchments that outfall onto the surrounding roads and a ditch centrally located within the site. The Council's Drainage Engineers considered the proposals to be acceptable in principle with a number of conditions requested, the drainage regime for the site was duly conditioned (condition 14. and within condition 4.). Through the Reserved Matters scheme the applicant has sought to demonstrate the means of drainage sufficiently related to condition 4. of the outline approval. There has been discussion between the Council's Drainage team and the Drainage Consultant leading to revisions to the drainage design that subject to additional information being submitted in relation to condition 14. of the outline, that the drainage design is capable of providing the required onsite attenuation to restrict the site to greenfield rates of discharge and therefore not increase the risk of flooding, particularly acknowledging the concern within

neighbor representations as to the stream (capacity and previous flooding issues) running through Arleston Village.

- 6.47 The proposed approach accords with Core Strategy policy CS13 in avoiding increasing the risk of flooding, together with according with the principles established in policies ER10, ER11 and ER12 of the Publication Version Local Plan, together with section 10. of the NPPF ensuring the development can be delivered in a manner which would not increase flood risk elsewhere.

#### Ecology and trees

- 6.48 The outline application was accompanied by relevant ecology survey information, with conditions imposed to address lighting to ensure that the foraging / commuting and roosting of bats is not adversely affected, together with retention of trees where entailing potential bat roosts works in accordance with the ecology mitigation strategy, provision of a series of bat and bird boxes, the development / management and monitoring of the open space in accordance with the biodiversity management plan to ensure the protection of habitats.
- 6.49 In terms of the detailed scheme as now proposed, this is backed by an ecology update together with bat transect survey requirements further to an objection by Ecology. On this basis, support subject to conditions is offered concluding that the site has not significantly changed in respect of habitats, bats, nesting wild birds, reptiles, amphibians, and invertebrates, such that the ecological constraints have not changed and the design acceptable. Conditions are duly requested in light of the controls imposed through the outline consent, and on this basis Officers are satisfied that the detailed design of the scheme appropriately protects the wildlife on site through mitigation measures where required, according with policy CS12 in protecting and enhancing biodiversity, policy NE1 of the Publication Version Local Plan, and section 11. of the NPPF including minimising the impact on biodiversity and opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments (para's 109., 118.). Notably in respect of conditions in place, provision of lighting along the footpath has been raised as a concern by neighbours, condition 19. of the outline approval relates to aforementioned lighting strategy prior to the commencement of development and will suitably address the issue. This condition will also address lighting as raised by West Mercia Constabulary.
- 6.50 The site is subject to a Tree Preservation Order relating to two woodland areas (W1 and W2) and three individual trees (T1 - T3). W1 is located on part of the eastern site, south of Toll Road and west of Arleston Lane. W2 is

located within the central southern area. Pockets of trees are also dotted around the site, together with boundary planting. The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report and associated Tree Protection Plans, and a planting schedule.

- 6.51 The tree removal table (p.6-7) of the report identifies the reason and impact of respective loss / part loss of trees and hedgerows on site. A principal reason cited relates to providing access from Dawley Road and Arleston Lane (including the roundabout) – with access approved under the outline permission. Facilitating units and parking, and to provide attenuation pond are further reasons. In all cases, low / moderate impact is defined, including retention of surrounding trees screening loss, limited stature of the trees entailed. Tree 14 (south eastern edge) is also proposed to be felled due to being poor quality with limited viability, removal being deemed low impact due to existing damage and limited amenity value.
- 6.52 The level of tree loss required to develop the site is broadly the same as indicated through the outline consent. The report defines that this application does not represent a deterioration in the impact; the western and southern areas contain much self-sown vegetation of very limited quality and significance, and limits the magnitude of the impact of the proposed tree removal. The level of tree retention is identified as high and the key trees and features will be retained with ample space to prevent pressure to fell or prune in the future, the tree loss primarily relates to young self-sown scrub vegetation that is only just beginning to have an impact on the locality. In addition, the submitted landscaping scheme demonstrates that a high level of compensatory planting is possible due to the provision of retained open space. The application is supported by the Council's Tree Officer subject to quantifying the loss of trees from TPO'd woodland W1 (identified as TG2 in the report), and supervision of works to a notable TPO'd Oak on site to ensure works to create the access to a number of Copse units are carried out with minimum disruption to the tree.
- 6.53 The issue of potential overshadowing of the LEAP is acknowledged, in order to address this, the removal of the initial stretch of leylandii trees within the ownership of the applicant's land is identified with a native buffer mix alternative in place to provide lower level screening and a soft backdrop to the space.
- 6.54 The proposed development has been assessed in relation to its arboricultural impact. Officers are satisfied that on balance the scale and form of landscaping to be lost is acceptable, focussed around where limited stature visibility and viability exists. The level of tree retention is high and retains a woodland context for key areas of the site, together with the majority of

boundary landscaping, and where lost, compensatory native planting is proposed and replacement trees in a more formal and managed setting. Measures have been identified to protect existing landscaping, with a particular emphasis is placed upon the conditioning of the Tree Protection Plan. It is concluded that the proposal accords with saved Wrekin Local Plan OL11, CS12 and NE2 of the Publication Version Local Plan for the retention, securing the protection and appropriate management of existing trees, hedgerows and woodland. This is together with the NPPF including the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment (para. 61).

### Other matters

- 6.55 A concern over noise, pollution, and vehicle movement arising from the construction phase has been identified through the neighbour consultation. Officers can confirm that as part of the outline consent a Site Environmental Management Plan condition was imposed. Through the discharge of this condition, a developer is obliged to set out certain aspects and controls regarding the construction phase, including measures to prevent mud being deposited on the highway, measures for the control and reduction of noise from construction works, and the hours of operation of construction works and other works on the site. Noise attenuation to protect the amenity of future residents was also conditioned through the outline permission along the Dawley Road edge. The proposal is supported by Environmental Health (Pollution Control) subject to the application of the recommendations for the outline application which included the implementation of mitigation measures. The recommendation was addressed through the approval, thus it is considered that controls over the construction phase have been suitably addressed, including requested condition 3. of the Highways Authority relating to construction traffic.
- 6.56 All other objections raised in the consultation process have been considered but do not raise any issues that would warrant a review of the analysis of this proposal.

## **7. CONCLUSIONS**

- 7.1 In conclusion, Members are advised that in determining this application it must be borne in mind that the principle of development has been established through grant of outline planning permission for residential development, constituting a 50no. self-contained flats extra care facility and 95No. residential dwellings. This means that the latter appeal decision relating to this site is not a material consideration for the determination of this application, the acceptability of the scheme on the basis of appearance, scale, layout (beyond

the principles established by the approved Parameters Plan), and landscaping apply. Whilst the opportunity to consider the reconfiguration of elements of the proposal, focussed around the position of the LEAP, would have been appreciated, the nature of the outline consent encompassing the Parameters Plan did not allow for such an opportunity.

- 7.2 The applicant has nonetheless worked with the LPA to provide amendment to the scheme where possible, including its reduction by 8 dwellings. In turn, this has enabled a freer form of development to be attained in keeping with the character of the surrounding areas; such that the scale of development is determined to be acceptable. The elevational treatment has been refined to create varied character across the site, with street formations moving from a formal emphasis to more curved formations west to east, aiding a greater sense of place and legibility; whilst retaining cohesion through the use of a number of consistent materials including red brick and grey / red roof tiles, appearance and layout are therefore considered acceptable matters of the scheme.
- 7.3 Soft landscaping proposed will enhance the retained areas of green space through its intensification with a range of plant and tree species, with an emphasis elsewhere on the retention of the TPO'd woodland at the north and centre of the site, and loss of existing trees / hedgerows focussed around low value provision. Different forms of hard landscaping materials will provide complimentary variation across the development, in the context of roadways, footpaths, parking areas, together with boundary treatments to add variety to the scheme. Changes have been made to deliver measures – including a number of additional elements during the course of the application - to ensure the privacy of proposed and existing residents can be secured through the development. Landscaping is therefore deemed to be an acceptable matter. On this basis, Officers resolve that the planning balance finds favour for the details of this scheme, according with local and national planning policy – including the principles of the Publication Version Local Plan, and is therefore recommended to Members for approval.

## 8. RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 Based on the conclusions above, the recommendation to the Planning Committee on this application is that DELEGATED AUTHORITY be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the following conditions (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):

1. A02: Time Limit – Reserved Matters
2. B011: Samples of materials
3. B012: Sample brick panel
4. B049: Highways - details of crossing point of rights of way across residential areas
5. B049: Highways – details of footpath link from existing rights of way to proposed LEAP
6. B049: Highways - construction detail
7. B049: Highways – details of improvement works existing rights of way
8. B134: TPO Tree – Arboricultural supervision extent of works T9 TPO'd Oak
9. B139: TPO'd woodland - provision retention and removal plan for TG2
10. B142: Landscape Biodiversity Management Plan
11. B149: Ecology – ecological method statement potential bat roost trees
12. C13: Parking, loading, unloading and turning
13. C089: Trees – works in accordance Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report and Tree Protection Plans (excluding TG15 within red line boundary – felled, and no break in fencing T19)
14. C091: Works in accordance with ecological survey
15. C109: Ecology – retention tree 4 bat roost potential
16. C109: Ecology – pre-commencement badger inspection
17. C38: Development in accordance with deposited plans

### Informatives

I08 Highways Licence  
 I09 Diversion of public right of way required  
 I23 Bats in Trees  
 I25a Nesting Wild Birds  
 I35 Badgers  
 I35 Crime Prevention  
 I35 Discharge of Condition 14. Outline Approval TWC/2012/0240 Drainage Requirements  
 I35 Position reference conditions TWC/2012/0240  
 I40 Conditions  
 I43 Reasons for Reserved Matters Approval  
 RANPPF2 Approval Following Amendments - National Planning Policy Framework

### **Discharged**

2. Time Limit - Submission of Reserved Matters
3. Standard Outline – all reserved matters
4. General details required
5. Reserved Matters – appearance details
33. Footway link Dawley Road to Arleston Lane

**Extant**

1. Time limit
6. Highway construction details
7. Highway details
8. Travel Plan
9. Shallow mineworkings
10. Untreated mineshafts
11. Land contamination
12. Location of southern well
13. Foundation design
14. Scheme of foul and surface water drainage
15. Programme of archaeological work
16. Trees – protective fencing
17. Trees – services root protection
18. Tree removal – part discharged in respect of details of number of trees for removal, HERAS fencing, details of tree replacement scheme
19. Lighting Strategy
20. Site Environmental Management Plan
21. Noise attenuation
22. Trees - Soil levels
23. Trees – no burning
24. Works in accordance with ecological survey
25. Bat and bird boxes
26. Tree retention related to bat roosts
27. Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan
28. Extra care – minimum Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3
29. Scheme and delivery of play area
30. Details and delivery of open space
31. Development in accordance with deposited plans
32. Extra care – restricted use