

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Wednesday, 15th March 2017 at 6.00pm in the Telford Suite at
Shropshire College Hotel School Ltd (The Telford Whitehouse Hotel),
Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NJ

A

Present: Councillors J C Minor (Chair), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, J Loveridge, N C Lowery, L A Murray, P Scott, Cllr S J Reynolds and C F Smith (as substitute for C R Turley).

Also Present: Councillors K Blundell (for planning application TWC/2015/0843) and A Lawrence (for planning application TWC/2016/0568).

PC-061 Apologies for Absence

Councillor C R Turley.

PC-062 Declarations of Interest

In respect of planning application TWC/2016/0535, Councillor P Scott advised that he was a member of Newport Town Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

In respect of planning application TWC/2016/0568, Councillor N Dugmore advised that he was a member of Donnington & Muxton Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

Cllr N Lowery declared an interest in planning application TWC/2016/1125 as she was speaking and indicated she would withdraw from the meeting during the determination thereof.

PC-063 Minutes

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 22 February 2017 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC-064 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC-065 Site Visits

RESOLVED – that a site visit takes place at 3pm on Wednesday, 5th April 2017 at The Quarry, Pave Lane, Newport in respect of planning application TWC/2016/0437.

PC-066 Planning Applications for Determination

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report.

(a) TWC/2015/0843 Land off Peregrine Way, Leegomery, Telford, Shropshire

This application was a reserved matters application for the erection of 100 houses and landscaping off Peregrine Way. Outline planning permission had initially be granted in 2008, which had been renewed in 2012. This application had been deferred at the meeting held on 22nd February 2017 in order for the applicant to further consider the buffer zone, construction management plan and access, the installation of the traffic lights, the design and the proximity of Plot 23. A site visit had taken place on the afternoon prior to the meeting. The applicant had agreed to the removal of the garage but the retention of the parking spaces at Plot 23.

Cllr K Blundell, Ward Member, spoke against the application and raised concerns in respect of the impact on the local infrastructure, access and egress to the site, the installation of the traffic signals, impact of construction traffic, the need for a separate temporary access, noise of construction traffic, the buffer zone and was disappointed that the concerns of residents had not been taken on board.

Cllr A Twyford, Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding drainage, traffic management, the ecological assessments, the woodland and nesting, the buffer zone, mixed species edging and planting and that there should be no fences, the environmental management plan and the special nature of the area.

Mr Jonathan Harris, speaking on behalf of the Apley Preservation Association, spoke against the application as there were fundamental issues that had not been dealt with. Apley was a special place and concerns were raised in respect of the character and design, the access and issues of congestion, the buffer zone, visitor parking, hedgerows and habitats, barrack style housing and the lack of protection for this historic site and he asked for a further deferment of the application.

Mr Marc Hourigan, Applicant's Agent, spoke in support of the application and informed the Members that there were no reasons to further defer the application. The requirement for the buffer was 20m at B3 and varying buffers between 31.7m and 51.9m were to be provided. A traffic management plan would be put in place for the construction traffic. An alternative access was not possible as this would mean demolishing a heritage stone wall and hedgerow. The installation of the traffic lights was not an issue to be considered at the reserved matters stage.

During discussions, some Members considered that they been put in a difficult position as they were unable to defer as the applicant may appeal for non-determination. Other Members were disappointed that the Parish Council and local residents' concerns still remained regarding the buffer zone, design and layout, proximity of Plot 23, infrastructure, traffic lights and the site management plan. Other Members felt that following the site visit the buffer zones were now acceptable and were pleased to see that the garage had been removed from Plot 23.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority:-

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0843 that the reserved matters application be granted subject to:

- a) The removal of the garage within plot 23
- b) Obscure glazing where necessary on plot 23

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

(b) TWC/2016/0535 – Site of units 3, 3A, 4, 5, 9, 10 & Yard 5, Springfield Industrial Estate, Station Road, Newport, Shropshire

This application was for 100% affordable rented accommodation comprising 22 no. houses and 11 no. apartments with associated parking, highway works and landscaping following the demolition of the existing buildings. The site was situated within a sustainable location with the town having a good range of services and facilities including shops, schools, restaurants and pubs as well as strong public transport links to the rest of the Borough. It was considered to be a good use of a brownfield site and a noise survey had been undertaken and boundary treatments such as walls and fencing would be put in place together with the use of acoustic glazing.

A viability assessment had been undertaken and there was a need for significant financial intervention in order for this site to come forward and Nuplace would need to apply to the Council via a separate application process to access the S106 contributions, where off-site contribution have been made in lieu of on-site provision, in order that the development become viable if Members were minded to approve the application.

During discussion, some Members considered this to be a positive use of the land and brought much needed affordable rental housing into the area and that the local schools and play areas would receive funding from the development. This was a suitable use for an unused industrial site. Concerns were raised with regard to the additional pressure from traffic on Station Road and the viability of the application together with the level of the financial intervention.

The Viability Officer explained to Members that actual figures could not be given on the level of financial intervention due to the confidential nature of the application, but that the viability had been appraised and it was considered that the application was good value for money.

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

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2016/0535 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the following:

- a) The Council submitting a signed Memorandum of Understanding relating to:**
 - i) Parks and Open Space contribution of £19,800 towards the enhancement of the Wallshead Way Play Area/playing field**
 - ii) Education contribution of £94,181 comprising of Primary contribution of £57,690 allocated towards Newport Infant Remodelling, and Secondary School contribution of £36,491 allocated towards Burton Borough changing rooms**

- iii) **Highways contribution of £5,000 towards the implementation of double yellow lines in the vicinity of the site frontage and nearby junctions**
- iv) **The provision of 100% of the units for affordable rent in perpetuity**

b) The conditions and informatives contained in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

(c) TWC/2016/0568 Land East & South of 74-86 (even) Wellington Road, Muxton, Telford, Shropshire

This was an outline application for residential development of up to 150 dwellings and associated access with all other matters reserved.

An application for non-determination had been sent to the Planning Inspectorate. The report was for information and for Members, if minded, to endorse the Officers' five recommendations for refusal, being:

- The site was in the countryside outside the built up area of Telford
- The developer failed to demonstrate that affordable housing would be provided consistent with development plan policy or the emerging Telford & Wrekin Local Plan
- The access would have a harmful impact on the landscape and on the character and appearance of the area
- The development was not sustainably located and had unresolved pedestrian links
- Insufficient information to demonstrate the development could be accommodated within the existing highway network

Councillor L Dugmore, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council, spoke against the application which went against policy, the site had significant drainage issues which would be exacerbated by the development, loss of ancient hedgerow and would be detrimental to an area of natural beauty, highway issues and traffic speeds, no suitable access and it was a significant risk to traffic and pedestrians.

Councillor A Lawrence, Ward Councillor for Muxton, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the objections by local residents to the application, access and highway issues, the impact on local facilities such as schools, doctors and services and asked Members to refuse this application.

Mr P Loughlin spoke against the application on behalf of local residents and expressed their feelings which were described in a series of words such as "inappropriate, unacceptable, destructive, illogical . . ." and asked Members to refuse the application.

The Planning Officer confirmed to Members that there had been a slight error in the report which referred to the Agricultural Land Classification as "3a" but informed Members that this should have been classed as "2 and 3b"

During the discussion, some Members considered that there were strong defensible reasons to refuse the application in that it was outside of the built up area and encroached into the buffer zone between Muxton and Lilleshall and went against

policy. Other Members raised concerns regarding the pedestrian links, the drainage and the sustainability of the application.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a unanimously:-

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2016/0568 that based on the recommendation to the Planning Committee that had an appeal for non-determination not been submitted that outline planning permission would have been refused for the following reasons:

1. The site lies in countryside outside the built up area of Telford, where new development is to be controlled, and outside the settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton where new development within the rural area is expected to be focused. As such the development proposal fails to secure sustainable development contrary to Core Strategy policies CS1 and CS7, Policies SP1, SP3, SP4, and HO10 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (Publication Version), and the NPPF.
2. The developer has failed to demonstrate that affordable housing will be provided consistent with development plan policy or the emerging Telford & Wrekin Local Plan. As such the development proposal fails to secure sustainable development contrary to Core Strategy policies CS1 and CS7, Policies SP1, SP3, SP4, HO1, HO5 and HO10 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (Publication Version), and the NPPF.
3. The proposed housing development and the formation of the proposed new access will have a harmful impact on the landscape and on the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal is contrary to Wrekin Local Plan policy UD2, Core Strategy policy CS15, Policies SP4, NE2, NE7 and BE1 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (Publication Version) and the NPPF.
4. The proposed development is not sustainably located, unresolved pedestrian access links will further result in residents being more likely to be car dependant with the potential to create social exclusion contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS9, Policies C3 and C4 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (Publication Version) and the NPPF.
5. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development can be accommodated within the existing highway network and that the proposed access arrangements for the development can be adequately provided. As such the development proposal is contrary to saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies UD2 and T22, Core Strategy policy CS15, policies C3 and C4 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (Publication Version) and the NPPF.

In order to give officers flexibility during the progress of this appeal, the Development Management Service Delivery Manager (or any other officer authorised by him), be authorised to add to, change or amend the reasons for refusal and add to, change or amend the above-mentioned heads of terms for the Section 106 planning obligations, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee.

(d) TWC/2016/0583 Land rear of Wrap Film Systems Ltd, Hortonwood 45, Hortonwood, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for the erection of 7 no industrial buildings (use class B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial) & B8 (Storage or Distribution) totalling 11,600sqm with associated landscaping and parking.

Councillor J Smart, spoke on behalf of Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council, who did not object to the application but raised concerns regarding the peaceful rural environment which over time had become a semi-industrial area and asked that some sensitivity be given to residents near to the development. Further concerns were raised regarding the movements of HGVs, light and noise pollution and asked if these issues could be conditioned.

Mr J Butler, a member of the public, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the loss of established trees which had rotten away in the swale and those that remained had no lower branches and that this could be detrimental to local residents and may cause sleep deprivation from the noise and light nuisance. Further concerns were raised regarding the access on Hortonwood 45/Hortonwood 60 and drainage.

The Planning Officer confirmed to Members that this site was recognised as an employment area in the Adopted Wrekin Local Plan, and was identified as a Strategic Employment Area within the emerging Telford and Wrekin Local Plan and that it was mindful of local residents and that a Noise Impact Assessment had been undertaken. The application could be conditioned with regard to acoustic fencing and a bund. Additional conditions were recommended to have a noise survey undertaken and any noise mitigation, if necessary, put in place prior to occupation and a condition that a lighting plan be undertaken which may include columns and baffles. With regard to operational hours, officers had considered that Monday to Friday 06:00 to 20:00, Saturday 06:00-13:00 with no Sunday or Bank Holiday opening as appropriate in light of the operating hours of other nearby businesses on Hortonwood.

During the discussion, some Members raised concerns regarding light and noise nuisance, access, the use of the units, the height of the bund, planting of trees, the hours of operation. Other Members welcomed the creation of new jobs but were mindful of the concerns of local residents.

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

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2016/0583 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the following:

a) Highways:

- **£5,000 towards Travel Plan monitoring and support**
- **£64,687.50 towards Pedestrian / cycle route improvements between the development and the existing segregated pedestrian / cycle route on Hortonwood 30**

- **£102,370.23 towards the Telford Growth Point Strategy improvements works consisting of duelling of the A442 between Leegomery Roundabout and Hadley Park Roundabout**

The monies to be indexed and paid prior to the occupation of development

- c) **The conditions and informatives set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager).**

- (e) TWC/2016/1125 51 Wellington Road, Coalbrookdale, Telford, Shropshire TF8 7DU

This was a retrospective application for the erection of a 1.83m high fence, next to a set of historic steps which led to Holy Trinity Church within the Ironbridge World Heritage Site, where an Article 4(2) Direction was in place and planning permission for a fence was required.

Councillor N Lowery, Ward Councillor for Ironbridge Gorge, spoke against the officer recommendation to refuse retrospective consent and considered that the fence was of good standard and was made of feathered edged board and suggested that the panels were reversed in order that the correct side was facing outwards. The fence was a positive enhancement on the surrounding area and provided privacy and security for the property and could not be seen from Wellington Road or Church Road. Colour and soft planting could be used to soften its appearance. The applicant had faced a lot of challenges during this application and was not aware that separate planning permission for the fence was required. Members were asked to consider going against the officer recommendation and approve the application.

Mrs Newill and Mrs Lloyd, the applicant's neighbours, spoke against the officer recommendation and asked Members to approve the new fence. The fence was not in a public area and there was now a mix of different heights and types of railings, bricks and wooden fences to secure property boundaries within the World Heritage Site and this fence tidied up and improved the character and appearance of the surrounding area. A letter from the Council had not been received by the applicant and he was unaware that he needed separate planning permission for the fence. The applicant was happy to undertake planting to soften the appearance of the fence.

Mr Thomas, the applicant, spoke against the officer recommendation. He had applied to remove 27 leylandii trees which were beginning to die back and replaced these with posts, gravel board and fencing. Communication had not been received from the Council and on the 4 November 2016 a visit from the Council took place informing him that he did not have permission for the fence and it would need to be taken down. He confirmed that the fence was only 1.68m in height and the trees were 3 metres and the hedge had encroached onto the path. The path was now used 24/7 and railings would afford the family no privacy. He considered that the fence gave the property the privacy and security it needed as the front garden was open and led onto the main road.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there had been some confusion over the receipt of the letters and the enforcement team had given the Applicant the opportunity to

submit a planning application and that each site was different and officers considered the fence to be prominent.

During the discussion some Members considered that the fence could not be seen from Wellington Road or Church Road and that the fence could be shaded and softened with planting if necessary. Other Members considered that this did not set a precedent and questioned why green trees were acceptable but not a green fence and the application could be conditioned, if approved.

The Planning Officer confirmed that if Members were minded to approve the application conditions to paint the fence and undertake planting, within say three months, could be imposed.

Upon being put to the vote, the recommendation for refusal was defeated. Subsequently a recommendation for approval was made and seconded from the floor. Following the vote it was, unanimously:-

RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2016/1125 that planning application be approved (with authority to finalise conditions regarding the softening of the effect of the fencing, such as painting and landscaping to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

The meeting ended at 8.01 pm

Chairman:

Date: