

TWC/2016/1190

Land between Arleston Lane & Dawley Road, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire
Erection of an Extra Care Facility containing 51no. self contained flats and associated communal/public facilities including a shop, lounge / dining / activities room, hairdressers, residents lounge / multi use room, buggy store, and the erection of 92no. residential dwellings with associated access landscaping, drainage and all ancillary and enabling works ***AMENDED PLANS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED***

APPLICANT

Redrow Homes Limited, David Bent

RECEIVED

13/06/2017

PARISH

Wellington

WARD

Arleston

OFFICER Libby Harper

THIS APPLICATION IS BEFORE PLANNING COMMITTEE AS IT IS SUBJECT TO A S106 AGREEMENT.

1. THE PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This is a full proposal for the erection of an Extra Care facility containing 51no. self-contained flats and associated communal/public facilities including a shop, lounge / dining / activities room, hairdressers, and residents lounge / multi use room, buggy store, WCs. The erection of 92no. residential dwellings (3 and 4 bed dwellings) is further sought with associated access landscaping, drainage and all ancillary and enabling works.
- 1.2 The application site is subject to a notable planning history, and was last presented to Planning Committee in May 2016 comprising a Reserved Matters scheme (TWC/2015/0836) for a slightly higher level of residential dwellings standing at 95, together with a 50no. flats Extra Care facility. With the exception of the lounge and dining functions being rolled into a multiple use room compared to being separate in the approved scheme, a parallel range of facilities applied. In respect of the spread of development, three units have been lost from the western section, with a further two added to the central area, and two less in the eastern section.
- 1.3 The current proposal further differs from the extant permission with a greater emphasis on detached properties comprising a mix of 56no. detached, 16 pairs of semis, and one run of 4no. terraces; from 33no. detached, 26 pairs of semis, and three runs of 3no. terraces; the design of the extra care related to a U-shape form to now being a H-shape form; and the revision of the housetypes with the developer Redrow now on board to deliver the scheme. The Extra Care facility has been revised from the approved 24No. one bed flats and 26No. two bed flats (affordable comprising 15No. one bed flats 15No. two bed flats); to 39No. 2 beds and 12No. 1 bed units (all 51 proposed to comprise affordable units), having comprised 42No. one bed flats and 8No. two bed flats during an earlier stage of the application. A potential end user of

the Extra Care facility is further identified, this had been Fair Home Group during part of the application, and latterly revised to Housing & Care 21. The Reserved Matters scheme is an extant permission and a material consideration for this application.

- 1.4 Two accesses are proposed to serve the development as per the existing reserved matters scheme, the first towards the north western edge of the site off Dawley Road serving the western portion of the development (the 51 units of the Extra Care facility and 75No. dwellings); the second off Arleston Lane serving the remaining properties (17No. dwellings). Drainage is proposed as mains sewer in respect of foul provision, and a combination of mains sewer, sustainable drainage system, existing watercourse and pond/lake for surface water.
- 1.5 Amendment has been made during the course of the current application. At the outset, the proposal related to what had been termed a Wellbeing Facility, whilst the description explicitly identified an Extra Care facility, alongside the 92no. dwellings. In essence, a brand of 'home for life accommodation' for residents over 55 was proposed related to the proposed housing provider Walsall Housing Group, this did not include care. Accommodation would have comprised self-contained apartments, proposed alongside activities to encourage broad community participation and specialist services (e.g. exercise classes, individual support planning and coordination of services) with less communal spaces than traditional extra care schemes, no restaurant facility or 24 hour response services were proposed unless this were funded as part of a personal budget arrangement.
- 1.6 The Wellbeing Scheme arose from there having been no real interest or appetite for bringing forward the extra care element of the scheme. Since the point of submission, however, as set out in the Extra Care Delivery Statement accompanying the application, the developer has decided to revert back to a fully serviced extra care facility in light of new interest received, with the layout duly amended in this respect. The 51 units are proposed to be affordable, compared to 30 of the previous scheme.
- 1.7 Enhanced boundary treatments, and a landscape buffer area between properties off existing Arleston Manor Mews and the proposed properties to the north, have been reintroduced. A pedestrian link through to Kingsland connecting within the site to the internal greenspace and service road beyond is now proposed, linking via the residential road through to the facilities of the local centre of Arleston at the southern end of Dawley Road.
- 1.8 A number of documents have been submitted in support of the application, including:
 - Planning Statement (Amended)
 - Design & Access Statement (Amended)
 - Extra Care Delivery Statement (Amended)
 - Transport Assessment with associated Framework Travel Plan (Amended)
 - Ecological Appraisal

- Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Amended)
- Flood Risk Assessment (Amended)
- Noise Assessment
- Air Quality Impact Assessment
- Coal Mining Risk Assessment.

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 south-eastern 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.
- 2.2 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 an access road to it and adjacent properties off Dawley Road, which dissects the site.
- 2.3 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 with a pedestrian link through to the Wrekin Retail Park to the east. The existing access serves residential properties and the Serchem factory, which are located to the immediate west of Arleston Village.
- 2.4 Within walking distance of the site there are numerous community facilities, including the aforementioned schools and retail park, 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/2015/0836 - 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. Reserved Matters Granted 02/06/2016

- 3.2 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)
- 3.3 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
- 3.4 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
- 3.5 W91/1161 – Outline planning permission for up to 142 dwellings. Refused 15/01/1993
- 3.6 W91/1138 – Outline planning permission for up to 95 dwellings. Refused 15/01/1993
- 3.7 W91/1137 – Residential development for about 95 dwellings. Withdrawn 05/06/1992
- 3.8 W90/0031 – Outline planning permission for 257 dwellings. Refused 11/04/1990
- 3.9 W79/567 – Outline planning permission residential development. Refused 01/11/1979

4. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

- 4.1 The NPPF is a material consideration in this case because all of the borough's development plan policies have to be viewed in the light of this more recent national guidance.
 - Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes,
 - Section 7: Requiring good design,
 - Section 8: Promoting healthy communities
 - Section 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
 - Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
 - The relevance of the presumption in favour of sustainable development is referred to later in this report.
- 4.2 Saved Wrekin Local Plan policies
 - UD2: Design Criteria
 - UD4: Landscape Design

- H23: Affordable Housing
- OL11: Woodland and Trees
- OL12: Open Land and Landscape – contributions from new development
- OL13: Maintenance of Open Space
- LR6: Developers contributions to outdoor recreational open space provision within residential developments
- T4: Development Principles
- T22: Planning Obligations

4.3 LDF Core Strategy policies

- CS1: Homes
- CS2: Jobs
- CS3: Telford
- CS9: Accessibility and Social Inclusion
- CS10: Community facilities
- CS11: Open Space
- CS12: Natural Environment
- CS13: Environmental Resources
- CS14: Cultural, Historic and Built Environment
- CS15: Urban Design

4.4 Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (Publication Version)

Given that the Inspector's draft Main Modifications have now been published the plan is at an advanced stage. A significant amount of weight should now be given to those policies that are not subject to change within the proposed main modifications and the weight should be given to those policies that are included in the list of modifications will depend on the nature of the proposed modification and the likelihood of consultation resulting in a further change.

The emerging policies that are relevant to this application are:

- SP1: Telford
- SP4: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- HO1: Housing requirement
- HO7: Specialist housing needs
- NE1: Biodiversity and geodiversity
- NE2: Trees, hedgerows and woodlands
- NE4: Provision of public open space
- COM1: Community facilities
- C1: Promoting alternatives to the car
- C3: Impact of development on highways
- C4: Design of roads and streets
- C5: Design of parking
- BE1: Design Criteria
- BE4: Listed buildings
- ER11: Sewerage systems and water quality
- ER12: Flood Risk Management

5. SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Standard consultation responses

5.1 Ward Councillor Angela McClements:

In response to original consultation:

Wishes to strongly object to this planning application, key reason why this planning application was granted was on the basis that it included the erection of an Extra Care facility and therefore was deemed as 'exceptional circumstances'. When the developer could not find a provider for this facility they put in an application for bungalows. This application was turned down by Plans Board and the developer appealed against the decision. The Council won the appeal as the erection of bungalows were not deemed exceptional circumstances by Inspector Cummings because the bungalows for the elderly failed to provide the exceptional community benefits and were a major reason for breaking into the Green Network.

Now have a planning application before us which isn't an Extra Care facility, but a Wellbeing Scheme, this is expressed in the Extra Care Delivery Statement, suggest this is very misleading as it does infer that it is an Extra Care Facility in the title. However, on reading the document it clearly states that 'Walsall Housing Group will deliver a scheme as a Wellbeing Care Facility, this being subject to receipt of funding from HCA. It also states that "a Wellbeing scheme does not follow the design of traditional style care or extra and offers homes for over 55s.", but the most worrying part of the document is that it states "It doesn't provide care". It also doesn't apparently include additional facilities such as a restaurant or 24 hour response.

The planning application also indicates that the initial number of properties to be built has risen from 20 to 60 before they start to build the Wellbeing Centre. Clearly this contravenes the 106 Agreement and now becomes a profit making undertaking for the developer rather than providing any benefit to the local community. Know that many residents have raised specific points about how it impacts on their properties. These are detailed in their objections and ask that these are taken into consideration when considering this application.

5.2 No comments received in response to later consultation. Wellington Town Council:

In response to original consultation:

Object on the grounds that the outline planning that had been originally approved on the basis that there had been an exception for the proposed development for an Extra Care Facility. The proposed development as a Well Being Facility does not provide the minimum requirements of being considered a suitable exception to accordingly permit development in the Green Network. The Council also wished to raise the further comments that

there would be difficult access to and from the development site; an increase in the number of traffic movements both along Dawley Road and Arleston Lane; that the plans were inaccurate as they had included land not in their ownership; that there was a lack of additional community facilities that had been included on the original outline approval; and that the site had not been designated as housing land in the new draft Local Plan.

In response to a later consultation:

Advised that the Town Council wished to maintain their previous objections, whilst it was welcomed that the proposal would see the reversion to the Extra Care Facility instead of the Well-being facility. However, felt that the proposed Extra Care Facility was of an overpowering and over dominant in the locality. It was also considered that the current access road to the Serchem factory and that heavy goods vehicles would need to cross over the estate road within the development would compromise the safety of residents. It was also considered that the proposed staff car parking provision was inadequate when the size of the Extra Care facility was considered which if as provided would prove to be of insufficient number which would then adversely affect the local residents.

5.3 Urban Design: Comment

Raised initial concern and objection with an opportunity to critically review what has been proposed before, with Design & Access Statement submitted considered to be poor in regard to presenting, explaining and justifying this latest scheme with a poor substitute for the approved scheme proposed.

Following the submission of revisions to the proposal, it is advised that the applicant has taken on much of the advice given previously and as a result the scheme has improved, with a few outstanding issues warranting further improvement and clarification:

- Extra Care - has been improved and now relates much more closely to the surrounding dwelling types albeit that it is three storey and the surrounding dwellings are only two; however it is considered the proposed treatment of the elevations and the amended roof form helps to bring the scale and the mass of the building down visually,
- Southern part of the site - as previously commented upon, this is the most disappointing part of the site as it was intended to be informal, green and village like, but this is undermined by the dominance of the road and frontage parking. Whilst the carriageway is to be block paved, the presence and detailing of the standard turning head as well as the setting back of the houses to accommodate the cars undermines the quality of this part of the development and the poor level of enclosure may allow greater vehicle speed due to increased forward visibility. As it stands it is considered a real missed opportunity for creating a more attractive place that would be more sympathetic to the informality and green open space to the east of this area.

- Proposed Dwellings: whilst it is noted and welcomed that the amended dwelling types submitted now feature chimneys, there are a number of dwellings where blank side elevations or token windows are proposed which need to be improved to provide informal surveillance to reinforce community safety. Key plots requiring further improvement in this regard are plot 16, plot 50, and plot 67.
- Surface materials: clarification sought as to surface materials related to the junction adjacent to the extra care, the area in front of the extra care.
- Barrier: details requested relating to the proposed retaining wall and acoustic barrier along Dawley Road.
- Summary: whilst there have been improvements since the initial application, in terms of the layout, built form and landscaping, the scheme essentially remains as one featuring a standard range of dwelling types across the three parts to this site in contrast to the previous consent which promoted different dwellings and character areas. This is disappointing, but is characteristic of the approach taken by this and other national housebuilders. Consequently whilst it does respond to the context overall, it is questionable whether it will actually “*enhance the quality of the local environment*” as outlined by local policy UD2. If the application is to be approved, then please condition materials and landscaping.

5.4 Highways: Support subject to conditions

No objection to the principle of the proposal subject to conditions relating to the delivery of the car parking prior to the development being brought into use, provision of visibility splays 2.4m x 65 metres prior to the development being brought into use, the submission of full construction detail of 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 to a suitable outfall, on-site construction details, details of off-site highway works, the submission of a Travel Plan for the Extra Care facility, details of an improvement scheme to the existing Public Rights of Way, details of the crossing point of the rights of way across the residential roads.

Informatives are requested relating to a legal agreement for S278 Highways Act 1980 works, a formal rights of way diversion under S257 Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and contact with the Local Authorities Waste Collection team in order to come to an agreement as to how the waste/recycling will be picked up from the un-adopted section of the development that sits in the southern section of the site (properties labelled 60-65 on the site layout plan).

Section 106 financial contributions are sought comprising £10,000 towards improvement works to three bus stops that are situated along Kingsland, in close proximity to the site. A contribution of £5,000 for the provision of support and monitoring of the Travel Plan required under condition 6 above. A contribution of £7,000 towards the re-location of the 40mph speed limit along the Dawley Road, which will cover the costs associated to the necessary

amendments of the associated signing and lining and the amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order. The monies are to be paid upon the commencement of development, indexed and any unspent monies after 5 years refunded to the applicant.

5.6 Affordable Housing: Comment

The provision of an extra care housing scheme as the affordable element of this overall development is welcomed. The most recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for the borough highlights the projected significant rise in the number of older people in the period to 2031. While some people will continue to live in their own homes with appropriate support and adaptations, the SHMA states that this increase will require a doubling in the amount of specialist housing and accommodation (including extra care housing) in the borough between 2014 and 2030 (+ 2,900). Discussions have been held with Redrow and a number of potential housing providers on the design and operation of an extra care housing scheme on this site.

A number of detailed points have been considered including: - the balance of one and two bedroom apartments - the size and content of the communal facilities, including their accessibility and suitability for the wider local community. - how the design will reflect the requirement of older people, including those with specific needs The scheme will be 100% affordable with a mix of tenures including affordable rent and shared ownership. Based on the information provided, the above points are all acceptable in principle. The Council will work with the selected provider to help them to deliver and operate a successful scheme.

5.7 Drainage: Support subject to conditions

Advise that development should continue in line with the principles identified in the Flood Risk Assessment, with a full drainage scheme to be submitted. Conditions requested for a scheme of foul and surface water drainage; provision of a SUDS management plan which will include details on future management responsibilities, along with maintenance schedules; and provision of an exceedance flow routing plan.

5.8 Environmental Health Contaminated Land: Support subject to conditions
Request land contamination condition.

5.9 Environmental Health Pollution Control: Support subject to conditions
Request conditions relating to the timing of construction works avoiding Sundays, bank and public holidays, construction hours, emergency work, delivery times, re-running of the noise model and mitigation measures set out, floodlighting and fume extraction.

5.10 Ecology: Support subject to conditions

- Habitats – ecology report recommends
- Bats – number of trees with low, medium and high bat roosting potential, climbing inspections have not identified any confirmed bat roots on the site and the trees identified as having highest potential are within the retained areas of woodland, site used by low number of foraging and community bats

based on surveys. Retention of central woodland area recommended, that lighting on the site should maintain suitable dark corridors and that 20 bat boxes should be erected

- Great crested newts – no ponds suitable for great crested newts on or around the site and no further surveys are required
- Nesting wild birds – an assemblage of bird species using the site recorded, vegetation removal recommended avoiding nesting season and 20 bird boxes should be provided
- Hedgehogs – recommend 5 hedgehog domes are provided
- Reptiles – no evidence found through survey
- Badgers – confidential response to planning officer applies, conditions recommended
- Landscaping – central and northern woodlands and boundary hedgerows retained and appropriately managed in the long term, landscape planting should be focussed on native species and appropriate long term management apply.
- Conditions requested – erection of artificial nesting/roosting boxes for bats, birds and hedgehogs; Woodland Habitat Management Plan; Landscaping Design; Lighting Plan, and Badger Mitigation. Informatives reference Badgers, and Nesting Wild Birds requested.

5.11 Arboricultural: Object

Have objected due to removal of T9 a TPO'd Oak growing around 35m from the eastern access with previous retention demonstrated through TWC/2015/0836 with an encroachment of around 18% into its root protection area; raised the layout for plots 64-74 with rear gardens facing onto a row of Leylandii that will affect the reasonable enjoyment of the garden amenity space and anticipated high hedge complaint. Revised comment anticipated for Planning Committee further to ongoing discussion with reference to TPO'd trees.

5.12 Built Heritage Conservation: No objection

No objections to this development due to the arrangement of the site. Grade II* Arleston Manor House is 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 have some traditional features in form and scale and take note of key features such as chimneys.

5.13 Healthy Spaces: Comment

- Proposed development will reach the trigger level that would require on-site play provision in the form of a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP) with the current layout proposing a significantly smaller facility in the form of a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP)
- Earlier applications agreed to provide an offsite financial contribution towards meeting this need and is referred to in the Planning Statement, may be acceptable mitigation subject to entering into a S106 to make the

contribution and agreeing the sum, otherwise a NEAP would be required with a 30m buffer zone between the boundary of the NEAP and boundaries of residential properties

- Location of LEAP likely to be in near complete shade, ideally this should be relocated or the high hedge removed, may be alleviated by the removal of part of the adjacent high Leylandii hedge but would wish for a shading survey to be carried out to ensure this is not the case – shading would both significantly impact upon its use and cause ongoing maintenance / safety issues (such as creating the ideal conditions for slippery moss)
- No design of the proposed onsite play facilities or of the surrounding landscape design which currently indicates that this area is not well overlooked which limits natural surveillance and which can lead to inappropriate use of the play facilities leading to nuisance, visitor car parking obscures the play area from the only 2 overlooking dwellings and obscures the views across the highway to the adjacent footpath network and should be relocated. The design of the LEAP should be conditioned
- No provision for art in the proposed development – may be possible to include some form of artwork in the LEAP or alternatively in features such as walls throughout the development, play area design should include landscape detail because limited overlooking, given proximity of highway and ease of access to Dawley Road, this facility should be fenced with appropriate children's safety fencing (such as bow top) as hedgerow on its own is an unsuitable barrier; as well as further obscuring natural surveillance.
- No landscape details / plans / specifications provided as part of the application. Therefore, it is difficult to comment upon the appropriateness of the proposed landscape, landscape details should be conditioned
- Significant amount of proposed public open space and no long term landscape management plan, should be conditioned
- Footpath network not connected throughout the development and disappears in a number of places (paths grassed over in front of dwellings), not conducive to creating a healthy space, may discourage walking, amendment requested
- Pedestrian access onto / from Kingsland to mown grassway likely to create a link through the proposed hedgerow between plots 10 and 11 as this will be created unofficially anyway, footpath in high used areas should be a hard surface to avoid muddy desire lines
- Number of trees on land adjacent to Highway which may be adopted by the Council, where the case need to secure £350 per tree for ongoing maintenance
- Open space adjacent plot 18 does not appear to be accessible or if it is this may become a neglected or an inappropriate meeting area for young people leading to nuisance. As such, this area should be considered for inclusion in the allotments area or opened up to view
- Condition requiring applicant not to sell any overlooking properties to the proposed play provision (whether this be a LEAP or a NEAP) until the play provision has been built requested to ensure prospective purchasers are fully aware of the play provision in proximity to these properties at the time of purchase

- Queried when the LEAP is to be built, need to condition a trigger for the LEAP to be built by say 50% of development
- Activity trail to be provided through previous outline approval, would be ideally located on the mown walkways, would ask whether a small amount of trail provision / outdoor gym equipment be provided along this route to increase the health of the proposed new residents
- No sports provision on site and no contribution to offsite sports facilities proposed, suitable sum to request would be £600 per property to maximise the potential for sport nearby.

5.14 Education: No objection

Given the number and type of dwellings, a contribution towards primary education facilities in the vicinity of the development of £248,663.

5.15 Shropshire Council Policy & Environment Sustainability: Comment

Request a condition seeking a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) as the site is known to hold archaeological interest.

5.16 Coal Authority: No objection

Initially objected as the required Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report, or equivalent had not been submitted as part of the application relating to an application site falling within the defined Development High Risk Area. The relevant assessment has duly been submitted (and led to the objection being withdrawn); this concludes that there is a potential risk posed to the development from past coal mining activity. It recommends that further intrusive site investigations be carried out on site in order to establish the exact situation in respect of coal mining legacy issues, the nature and extent of which needing to be agreed with the Coal Authority as part of the permissions process.

Condition requested requiring prior to the commencement of development:

- The submission of a scheme of intrusive site investigations for approval;
- The undertaking of that scheme of intrusive site investigations;
- The submission of a report of findings arising from the intrusive site investigations;
- The submission of a scheme of remedial works for approval; and
- Implementation of those remedial works.

5.17 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".

Neighbour representations

The following address summarised representations of the consultations undertaken, including site notice, press notice and direct neighbour consultation.

5.18 1st consultation (and through to 2nd consultation) – a total of 54 objections have been received (including a residents petition from 8 households counted individually, and a 2nd petition from 13 staff of the Serchem factory counted individually):

- Loss of privacy, exclusiveness, overlooking, security and quality of life – to properties of Arleston Manor Drive and Arleston Manor Mews, including too close to lane which is gated for security and lack of landscape screening, footpath adjacent to rear of properties in Arleston Village giving direct access to properties, impact mowed driveway from housing road through allotment to attenuation pond, lack of detail around form of planting to understand if adequate for privacy and protection request to be involved in options, impact flats overlooking Kingsland
- Development out of character – three bedroomed semi-detached properties and three storey homes not characteristic with Arleston Manor (listed building) as stipulated for Arleston Manor Drive and Arleston Manor Mews properties when built – expect at minimum five bed executive detached houses, take away rural setting, no reference to preserving the character of Arleston Village, gateway site development would spoil access to ancient market town of Wellington and ancient village of Arleston, no "Street Line" giving proposed elevations
- Better alignment of dwelling [plot 81] with 5 Lidgates Green than other scheme (TWC/2016/0840)
- Dominant nature of Extra Care remains – needs to be scaled down, reconsider planned levels, lack of sections, precedent for this type of building Holyhead Road site, now more imposing and dominant than those seen in the past, more detailed consideration should be given to site boundary treatment and adjacent properties – removal of substantial Oak tree near boundary to make provision for allotments and should be reconsidered
- Overshadowing of Arleston Village from flats [Extra Care facility] and light pollution
- Increase in houses on east west road approaching Arleston Village – increased headlight pollution into low lying property closer than plans show, without a significant barrier could be intolerable with impact on quality of life
- Lack of need – number of large scale developments nearby, should be left as green land to be used for walking and enjoying the countryside, several care homes already built which are not fully utilised
- Inappropriate location - considerable isolation for the residents with limited mobility i.e. no car, poor bus service, good walking distance to shops, more appropriate location would be centre of Wellington, giving a much needed boost to the local shops. Context of a "wellbeing" facility should include ability to enjoy a fruitful independent existence with easy access to shops, library, doctors, public transport etc.
- Inspector's decision to previous application – comments that this development should not have been granted in the first place
- Loss of Green Network / green space – asset to the community of Arleston, understood green network to stay in place until 2030
- Alternative options for site – suggest conversation with local residents should take place around the idea of a low rise retirement village
- Insufficient local infrastructure – already difficult to see a GP, closure of A&E

- No street lighting on top of Arleston Lane – needs to be catered for
- Risk of flooding and drainage concerns – excess surface water needing to escape somewhere, sewers already at capacity, brook through Arleston Village has variations of water flow depending on the weather with houses and gardens already subject to flooding in bad weather, no proper drain survey undertaken in the village, money set aside for servicing the Stream to assist in the Land Drainage, held by the Authority would soon be exhausted, it is insignificant, when considering future maintenance to keep the Site properly drained & to manage rain water run off via the village
- Existing water pressure issues properties of Arleston Manor Mews – situation would be made worse
- Impact of construction - noise disturbance, damage from construction vehicles, odour and fumes
- Excavation of water storage tank adjacent Arleston Village – impact on water table for house foundations and specimen plants in garden
- Highways - increase in traffic, already excessive along Dawley Road especially at school times, traffic builds up beyond new access and Serchem factory as a hazard, impact ongoing Lawley development and other areas, motorway and newer A5 put in place to ease congestion along Bennetts Bank / Watling Street but not the case, will cause many accidents on Arleston Lane not designed for such a heavy volume of traffic with accidents already, disruption to Serchem factory – impact on business / employment / financial security of employees, no specific information on the crossing of the lane that allows access to Midfields / Serchem and Heatherset which carries large vehicles reversing up and down making deliveries to the properties in particular to Serchem several times per day – inherent danger to people crossing, never properly addressed, public footpath goes down this lane, 24 hour access to emergency vehicles required. Triangle in Lidgates Green should be painted, not a structure
- 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, no lights on the footpath and needs to be rectified, 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, request to be developed further away from Arleston Manor Mews for privacy and security reasons, concern could lead to anti-social behaviour by young children, never been a bridleway
- Nature of Wellbeing Facility – none of the facilities / less communal space of the Extra Care key to previous break into this area for development, advised then agencies not found for similar developments, reliance on funding from HCA (funded by the taxpayer not the applicant) and if cannot afford to do it should not be given planning permission to do it, a block of flats that dominates the overall landscape and sits uncomfortably in the midst of a tightly packed housing estate, similar in nature to failed earlier bungalow application rejected by Planning Inspector for failing to provide exceptional community benefits, comparison with Walsall Wellbeing schemes should apartments greater in size and four storeys – plans not reflecting what could

eventually be built, residents may be much more active and mobile than an extra care facility and may own more cars – likely to require additional parking spaces

- Proposed changes to S106 triggers - increase building timescale sought until funding sought and not guaranteed, building work could be going on for years causing noise pollution and upset for Arlestone Village residents not a benefit for the local community, later completion trigger sought, could be a fresh application for residential development on the land originally sought for the extra care facility, original triggers should apply
- Concern loss of woodland – including noise from motorway with trees gone
- Loss of wildlife
- Play area too close to M54 – risk balls being kicked onto motorway
- Lack of additional boundary treatment previously agreed – The Woodlands (vertical hit and miss fencing), Callow House 6ft fence placed approximately 3ft from boundary with expectation to be maintained, repaired and replaced by development company going forward, willow fencing to be a strong quality and be involved in design, no mention of six foot wall plus two foot topping to protect the western boundary of Midfields as previously agreed – protection from light and dust pollution, property dates back to 1800s and warrants some protection
- Incomplete DAS – no mention of listed buildings of Arlestone Manor and those within Arlestone Village which would be partially surrounded by the development and potentially grossly overlooked by the proposed extra care / wellbeing facility
- Lack of explanation to community what is going on with three current applications on the site - 0836 Full Planning June 2016, 0840 135 houses without an Extra Care Home-extended to 17 March 2017, 1190 92 houses and over 55 Flats
- Should be referred to High Court as variation of what was refused by an Inspector [TWC/2014/0057]
- Plan shows boundary encroaching on rear of Serchem industrial building and garden of Heatherset.

5.19 2nd consultation – key being elevational amendments, reintroduction of an Extra Care facility (removal of Wellbeing Facility), additional concerns as follows from 30 objections (including petition from 16 staff at Serchem, counted individually):

- OS maps not up to date – hedge between No. 1 and 3 Lidgates Green, No. 1 has own access to Arlestone Lane
- Access arrangements - hoped triangle in the entrance to Lidgates Green is painted on not a structure, 2 entrances from Lidgates Green shown on 3D Axio drawing with one shown on plans, request for 4 way traffic light for access to the site from Arlestone Lane given light but constant access from Lidgates Green, request for limit where lorries will queue to get into the site as no space for them to queue unless routed from Dawley Road [looks to be with reference to construction phase]
- Use of proposed new footpath – concern usage to transport materials from a supply dump to construction site behind property, if wide enough for construction vehicles then can be used by other vehicles creating noise, dirt

and pollution, queried what will be done to prevent this, and if widened whether then restricted in width at a later date

- Need to ensure proper car park provision is made, mess of parking in Lawley area
- Design - care home still 3 storeys high dominating the whole village area, should be levelled to minimise the impact, move from the edges to a more central position makes it even more visible from all aspects of the village compounding dominating effects on the existing and new properties, finish of extra care building should be brick and not cement rendered with paint finish that will decay as years pass
- S106 – fears that restrictions and requirements will be ignored
- Construction plans – request for Arlestone Village to be involved in formulating plans to minimise impact on each individual property
- Impact of construction – anxious that building timescale is kept to plan and shortest time possible to avoid maximum disruption, also taking into account any delays in the construction of the Care Home [Extra Care Facility], impact on school and nursery run
- Drainage concerns – foul / surface water drainage will not take intended load for connection to the village, no drain survey carried out including tortuous route drain takes before connection to the main drain system never been looked at or even considered, Severn Trent Water does not know the route of this drain, only been recently adopted under changes in rulings regarding foul water drains, until surveyed not qualified to give a view on suitability or ability to cope with any additional load, house built 35 years ago and under question then about ability to take load of one additional property, brook eventually passes under Telford Football Ground having water problems in periods of continued wet weather contributed to by the brook, watercourse not a ditch with major problem culvert passing under Watling Street when doing gas main renewal – acknowledged by relevant authority but not properly annotated on drawings
- Highways – issues remain with road crossing lane to Serchem factory, Heatherset and Midfields, gas main will have to be crossed
- Need to ensure proper protection and provision of high land east of the village forming part of the Green Network as losing a large part of the Green Network with this development, with legal caveats in place
- Nature of Care home [Extra Care facility] - providers notorious for going bankrupt, previous bungalow scheme rejected with a care village being a bungalow development by any other name with same objection and should be upheld
- Lack of need community facilities – already community centre / shops / hairdressers / places to eat
- Question whether new application should apply – selling of site for peppercorn shows applicant not interest in care complex and distancing themselves from the reason the planning permission was given in the first case breaking into green network

6. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- The principle of the development;
- The design and layout of the proposal;
- The impact on neighbours and the living conditions for the occupiers of the proposed houses;
- Ecology and Trees;
- Highway Impacts;
- Heritage and Archaeological issues;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Contamination and Geotechnical Issues;
- Open Space & Play facilities;
- Planning obligations;
- Other matters.

The principle of the development

6.2 This site is subject to a notable planning history, with the principle of residential development having been established for a number of years. Most latterly, a Reserved Matters scheme relating to a combination of residential dwellings, an Extra Care facility and open space was approved by Members of Planning Committee in May 2016. This extant consent is a material consideration relating to the current application, with the fundamental components of development remaining as approved.

6.3 The site is within the built up area of Telford which is the focus for new housing development both within adopted policies (CS1, CS3) and emerging policies (SP1, HO1). The site is currently identified as Green Network on the adopted Proposals Map. However, the emerging Local Plan identifies the site as 'white land' removing the Green Network allocation. The Main Modifications to the Local Plan do not identify amendments to policy NE6 Green Network, so significant weight can now be attached to the 'white land' status of the site. Notwithstanding this, an extant planning permission exists on the site despite the Green Network designation and this fall-back position is a significant material consideration.

6.4 Local representation has continued to reference loss of a recreational / play facility through development. Any official public current use of this site is limited to the public footpath but in any event planning permission has already been granted for an Extra Care facility and dwellings. The current application will continue to retain 3.6ha of public open space, 10 allotments, and a LEAP. The current proposal will open up more of the site to the local community to promote the benefits of access to high quality semi natural environment, along with an area of more formal equipped play facilities and there will therefore be a net gain and benefit to the community in relation to this proposal, in accordance with guidance in NPPF relating to promoting healthy

communities. Concern has been raised as to the loss of woodland through the scheme, in this respect the current application accords with the approved scheme through the retention of the vast majority of woodland (central and north eastern edge).

- 6.5 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 was 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 in the outline consent (TWC/2012/0240).
- 6.6 The current scheme further provides an enhancement in respect of community benefit. The original wellbeing facility identified the full provision as a 100% affordable scheme, delivering an additional 20 affordable units into the scheme. Through the reversion to an Extra Care facility, this commitment remains, with community facilities comprising a lounge / dining / activities room, hairdresser, shop, multi-use room (residents lounge) with provision supported by policy CS10, and emerging policy COM1. It is proposed that the lounge and dining area will be fitted with 'moveable walls' to ensure flexibility in design and use for a range of uses and functions. This combination and the revised layout has been drawn together through the involvement of a fresh potential housing provider – Housing & Care 21 (HC21) - who has an existing presence in the Borough, specialising in the provision of housing for older people and is a leading provider of Extra Care facilities in England.
- 6.7 This involvement is addressed through an addendum to the Extra Care Statement, and identifies that all communal facilities have been designed to work with past experience of HC21 in other schemes they operate nationwide. Typically each apartment will be occupied by an individual or couple under either a tenancy agreement or shared ownership lease. Innovation in flat layouts has been encouraged. Open plan living space (including demountable walls) are utilised to ensure flexibility in living arrangements. Typically a 1 bedroom apartment will have a minimum size of 51m² and a 2 bedroom apartment will have a minimum size of 62.5m². All apartments will be wheelchair accessible and level access bathrooms will be provided in each.
- 6.8 The representation of the Affordable Housing Officer welcomes the provision of an extra care housing scheme as the affordable element of the overall development, with the most recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) highlighting the projected significant rise in the number of older people in the period to 2031, with a requirement for doubling the amount of specialist housing and accommodating (including extra care housing) in the Borough between 2014 and 2030, the development will contribute to meeting such a need in accordance with emerging policy HO7 and will not lead to the over concentration of similar accommodation in the street or neighbourhood. The balance of one and two bedroom apartments, the size and content of the communal facilities (the internal layout will be reviewed in the run up to Committee to accommodate more WCs, Members will be updated), including their accessibility and suitability for the wider local community, how the design

will reflect the requirement of older people including those with specific needs (Dementia for instance), has been considered and are all acceptable in principle.

- 6.9 Local representations have raised comments about the need for a fresh application / referral to the High Court, the Inspector's decision to a previous appeal on the site (TWC/2014/0057), a suggestion that discussion take place with local residents around the idea of a low rise retirement village, the loss of green network and lack of need and insufficient local medical infrastructure. These are duly acknowledged by the Local Planning Authority. However, Members are advised that the principle of the development remains acceptable bearing in mind the above points and the extant planning consent on the site.

The design and layout of the proposal

- 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).
- 6.11 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.
- 6.12 The pattern of development largely follows the approved scheme, with primarily semi-detached properties interspersed with detached units staggered along three cul-de-sacs at the site frontage onto Dawley Road. Parking now fronts the properties, in combination with at the side of residences, as opposed to the majority being on the opposite side of the respective residential streets as approved. Again a tree lined avenue off Dawley Road, punctuated by the Extra Care building with the ground floor fully glazed, would sit off the Dawley Road access. This would be fronted by a paved area with a residential street then wrapping around either side of the extra care facility.
- 6.13 To the rear of the Extra Care would remain the allotments and a balancing pond. There will be a new pedestrian link from the southern street, through an area of public open space to the rear of plot 16, with a break in the hedgeline leading to the residential area of Kingsland, the local bus route, and onto the local centre of Arleston. This is further to a request by Officers to secure a connectivity enhancement, appreciating that Kingsland and the setback

section of Dawley Road provides a more pedestrian friendly link to local facilities.

- 6.14 Moving through the site, a greater prominence of detached properties arises, with the central area of the site again formed of two cul-de-sacs, one in a looped formation. The layout of this area is of a more engineered and formal approach than the approved scheme, with amendment having been encouraged by the LPA. Change in this respect has been limited; however, taking into account that noteworthy revision has been made elsewhere to the scheme, for instance the Extra Care facility further to concern raised by the LPA, on balance this does not warrant an unfavourable position on the development.
- 6.15 The majority of the public open space remains towards the centre of the site including the larger of the three balancing ponds dotted around the site, swales, a pedestrian footway, which in combination with the internal road network would afford a connection to Arleston Lane to the east; alongside a mix of woodland, rough grassland linking through to the TPO'd woodland in the eastern area.
- 6.16 Relating to the eastern parcels of development these have been amended to comprise all detached properties more in keeping with the neighbouring development, and acknowledging local representation as to semi-detached units being out of character with the locality. Officers can confirm that no three storey homes are proposed in this area of the development. Units are staggered within the streetscene and a mix of housetypes proposed.
- 6.17 A total of 12 housetypes are proposed based around the Redrow heritage range, with variation within these relating to finishing materials and position of windows; with the addition of feature windows welcomed as an amendment to the scheme. Whilst the extant consent provided a more bespoke response to the site, it is concluded that the design does respond to the context overall and does not warrant refusal on this basis.
- 6.18 The position of the Extra Care is in line with the position agreed through the outline scheme and the applicant has not wished to diverge from this position. The emphasis of the application is around the introduction of Redrow housetypes to the scheme, and amendment to elevational treatment. The form of the Extra Care facility has been subject to amendment, ultimately proposed as an irregular H-shape with involvement of the Housing & Care 21 prospective provider.
- 6.19 Further to concern raised by Urban Design, the massing of the building has been broken up. Projecting gables are proposed to break up the roofline; in combination with projecting canopies (further serving as outdoor space for a number of units) on all sides, balconies, a mix of glazing approaches and materials finish (including red brick, blue engineering brick, modest sections of grey and white render). In respect of glazing, this includes full height ground floor glazing relating to the communal facilities to aid interaction with the immediate locality and through to Dawley Road.

- 6.20 Whilst details of a number of materials have been identified through the proposal, further details and samples are proposed to be controlled through condition.
- 6.21 A number of concerns raised in the latest Urban Design commentary has sought to be addressed by the developer. This included the presence of a number of blank elevations where informal surveillance would be anticipated and to reinforce community safety. Additional windows have duly been added to the side elevations of plots 16, 50 and 67 to address the concern in this respect.

The impact on neighbours and the living conditions for the occupiers of the proposed houses

- 6.22 The proposal involves appropriate separation distances and relationships with existing properties, together with proposed properties. At the north western edge of the site, the minimum distance entailed is 26 metres related to Midfields (marked as No. 24 on the site plan) where development will be positioned to the north, west and south, the distance cited relates to the west where additional screening is proposed. For Plot 1, 23 metres applies related to the side of 131 Dawley Road with a landing window present only on the side elevation, with established boundary planting to be retained relating to the garden area. Relating to plot 9 and the front elevation of No's 86 and 84 Kingsland, at the closest point a distance of 17.5m would apply. This however relates to a parallel housetype to Plot 1 with no habitable windows present on this side elevation.
- 6.23 For the remainder, a minimum of 22 metres applies, here related to a mix of non and habitable windows on the side elevation of Plot 16 to a frontage of Kingsland, in respect of the first floor where greater loss of privacy would be envisaged this relationship relates to an en-suite and secondary bedroom window seeking an increase in informal surveillance and reinforcing community safety by those using the footpath as advised by through Urban Design commentary, and in the majority of cases exceeds 30m.
- 6.24 Elsewhere in this area of the development, the distances increase to a minimum of 40 metres to 99 metres related to Arleston Village. The Cottage and No. 20 Arleston Village sit in closest proximity to this edge. For the former, Plot 15 is the closest plot sitting at a distance of 50m.
- 6.25 Related to No. 20, it is appreciated that the built form of the existing property was not accurate on the basemap for the approved scheme. The applicant has sought to rectify this issue by surveying the property on site and providing a section from the property through to the nearest dwellings and the Extra Care facility. This demonstrates a closer relationship than the approval amounting to 41.5m to the nearest dwelling (Plot 17 as was) and 53.5m for the Extra Care, now standing at just under 42m to the nearest dwelling (Plot 17) and just under 52m for the Extra Care relating to the principle massing of the building, and 50.5m relating to a corner section of balcony. On balance,

this is not considered to represent a reason for refusal, particularly as the depth of the building has been narrowed; and whilst the Extra Care is a three storey structure with a level difference present the distance exceeds the guide level of 28.8m (27.5, 3 storey structure + 2m of every 1m rising ground – this amounts to 11.3m) and is broken up by the Extra Care building sitting amongst the staggered residential properties.

- 6.26 Related to the central area (plots 53-75), a minimum of 26 metres applies related to Midfields (No. 24 Arleston Lane), and 52 metres for Heatherset with proposed landscaping between. For the eastern cluster of residential development accessed off Arleston Lane, an improved form of separation has been secured in line with the approved scheme, with the reintroduction of a more extensive landscape buffer. Distance wise, separation to the side elevation of Callow House (with no habitable windows present on the closest projecting section of the property) sitting in the adjacent Arleston Manor Mews development, a minimum of 21m applies relating to the rear of plot 89. The rear of the adjacent Haddon House features a number of habitable windows onto the development with a level change down towards the site, this faces the side elevation of plot 81, here two windows would be present comprising a ground floor cloakroom and utility with a separation distance of 16m applying and an improved landscape boundary. This does not raise concern as to the amenity relationship between the two.
- 6.27 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 previous outline proposals. The revised position of the allotments from the previous Reserved Matters scheme – set closer to the boundary of properties of Arleston Village - has been raised in dialogue with neighbours as to loss of soft landscaping.
- 6.28 The nature of the boundary relating to the approach proposed to the dwellings adjoining the listed Arleston Manor at the outset of the application was such that elements of garden areas and habitable windows would have entailed a particular loss of privacy. The applicant has taken on board the concerns raised, and duly provided a mix of additional fencing, 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.
- 6.29 In respect of Callow House (noting its relationship with the listed building and the need for sensitive boundary treatment), 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 adjacent landscape buffer to create a suitable soft boundary to provide sufficient privacy bearing in mind the proximity of the listed building and open space backdrop. Here it is noted that the resident has requested specific input to further detailing of this area - essentially through the discharge of conditions, and further setback of this

boundary treatment. This would however represent a stage where public consultation is not undertaken, setting back of the temporary fencing would eat into the landscape buffer beyond what has previously been approved.

- 6.30 In terms of Midfields, a stretch of 2m high brick wall is proposed along its western edge where adjacent to the internal service road, to address the concern raised by the resident. Provision of vertical hit and miss fencing has also been reinstated to the enclosure details for the site relating to the neighbouring property of The Woodlands, and indeed added to its southern edge.
- 6.31 A concern has been raised as to an increase in houses on the east west road approach from Arleston Village with an increase in headlight pollution into low lying property beyond, such that without a significant barrier this could have an intolerable impact on quality of life. Here plots 17-23, with plots 17-22 in the context of the approved plans; the increase is marginal with less parking at the eastern end than approved, which combined with the intervening allotments and planting, and separation distance of 34 metres to the dwelling is considered to afford sufficient protection in this respect.
- 6.32 Soft planting is also proposed around the edge of the site related to Midfields, the Serchem factory, Heatherset, 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. The application as it now stands more closely aligns with the approved application as a material consideration; the LPA are duly satisfied that these arrangements represent an appropriate approach related to privacy, overlooking and overshadowing.
- 6.33 Concern as to lighting of the Extra Care has been raised, appreciating this is a taller building within the site, its specific nature i.e. an institution sitting within a context of C3 residential development, the requirement for details of proposed lighting of the site would be controlled through condition – as per the outline scheme, with Environmental Health having requested a specific condition relating to any future floodlighting of the site.
- 6.34 The need to protect neighbouring residential amenity during the construction phase of the development is acknowledged bearing in mind local representation. As per the previous outline approval, a Site Environmental Management Plan would be conditioned, including hours of construction operations (with no Sunday, Bank Holiday or Public Holiday operations other than emergencies anticipated, and hours anticipated as not going beyond 08:00-18:00 Monday to Friday, and 08:00-13:00 on Saturdays further to Environmental Health commentary), and loading and unloading of plant and materials.
- 6.35 Bearing in mind proximity of the site to the M54 and Dawley Road, the application is accompanied by a Noise Assessment, as was the case for the previous scheme. Whilst the assessment identifies that predicted noise levels

indicate that the site is suitable for residential development, a number of mitigation measures are proposed including upgraded glazing and acoustic trickle vents to meet internal noise level targets, the exact location of which would be confirmed, together with a prospective noise barrier, once proposed ground heights are finalised with a recommendation that the noise model be rerun and a mitigation strategy finalised. Subject to conditioning on this basis, Environmental Health are supportive of the scheme in respect of noise.

- 6.36 The application is further accompanied by an Air Quality Impact Assessment in respect of residential amenity, its scope including the impact of the construction phase, emissions associated with the operation of the proposed development with a particular emphasis on road traffic movements on the local road network, and the presence of the Saint-Gobain PAM UK foundry to the east of the Wrekin Retail Park.
- 6.37 The assessment concludes that standard practice dust mitigation measures as the norm on all well managed construction sites, would be sufficient to control emissions to the extent that a significant effect will not occur. Further that the impact of the proposed development on future baseline conditions related to vehicle movements were imperceptible for long and short term concentrations of Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5), with impacts for long-term concentrations of NO2 ranging from imperceptible to very low. At locations in close proximity to the Watling Street / Dawley Road junction, where annual mean concentrations are in excess of the national air quality objective for that pollutant, the very low impacts are considered to have a moderate adverse effect. Elsewhere, such impacts would have a negligible effect on local air quality. The impact of the proposed development on future consented conditions was imperceptible for all pollutants and averaging periods considered.
- 6.38 It is concluded that overall, the construction and operation of the proposed development would not cause an effect considered to be significant and would not contravene local or national planning policy. If minded to approve the application, a condition would duly be imposed for the construction details of the development to be set out through a Site Environmental Management Plan. A further request in respect of air quality is made by Environmental Health related to the Extra Care facility and the proposed kitchen facility with details as to the extraction equipment and mechanical extraction to be submitted. On this basis, the scheme is supported by Environmental Health ensuring the amenity of local residences.

Highway Impacts

- 6.39 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.

- 6.40 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 1-75 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 76-92. Both accesses connect the site with Wellington and the wider area.
- 6.41 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 had been 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 had been required by of the outline permission - condition 33.) 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, with a link through to the back of the Wrekin Retail Park.
- 6.42 Through the previous application it was agreed that the development would secure improvement to the existing public rights of way that runs through the site, including a footway link to the proposed LEAP (likely the western edge of the LEAP), this is again to be secured through conditioning requested by the Local Highways Authority to tie into the final design of the play space to facilitate a more direct access for users of the LEAP when accessing from this end of Dawley Road. This is together with details of the crossing points of the rights of way across the residential roads, particularly to address concerns over the interaction between pedestrians using the existing paths and the commercial vehicles accessing the Serchem factory, a conflict with the existing neighbouring residences is also made within the representations.
- 6.43 The improvements are likely to include passing places and a widened footpath to mitigate as far as possible any conflict between commercial and residential traffic. A design led approach of the junction making it difficult for residential traffic to use the rights of way as a means of access to the dwellings within this development applies. 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.
- 6.44 Amendment to the scheme is also proposed through the current application with a footpath connection through to Kingsland via the open space adjacent to the Extra Care and open space with access to the local bus network and through to the local shops at Arleston local centre. This link was secured further to a request from the Local Highways Authority, with a S106 contribution sought for improvement works to three bus stops situated along Kingsland with a greater demand for provision arising from the development.

- 6.45 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 in accordance with policy CS9, and emerging policies SP4 and C1.
- 6.46 Parking comprises a mix of frontage, side and garage provision related to the 92No. dwellings amounting to two hundred and twenty one spaces (including the garages). Through the application, the size of the garages has been amended to provide suitable scaled provision (3m x 6m), as required by emerging policy C5. A total of 32 spaces is proposed to serve the Extra Care facility (7 staff spaces to the north, 8 visitor spaces fronting the building, with 17 resident and visitor spaces at the southern side an increase from the outset of the application (20 spaces) to bring it further in line with the approved scheme (34 spaces). Specific parking is provided to serve the allotments; four spaces are proposed adjacent to the road through to the gated allotments (2 spaces were allocated specifically for this purpose through the extant reserved matters scheme). A bollarded system is anticipated in this respect. Above and beyond this, users could use nearby visitor parking where necessary.
- 6.47 Whilst the level of parking for the dwellings represents a shortfall of four spaces to the parking standards of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan, this position is yet to be adopted and has not raised objection from the Local Highways Authority. As the final arrangements for the Extra Care are yet to be clarified in respect of exactly how many staff will be associated to the various establishments that will be located in the building (including hair salon, shop, etc.), it is considered that provision of a Travel Plan condition (as had been the case for the outline approval) in order to monitor the travel habits of the staff and visitors associated to the Extra Care Facility is sufficient mitigation and will be securing a contribution of £5,000 to undertake that monitoring exercise; and notably the level of provision is greater than that provided at other extra care facilities in the locality permitted by the Council.
- 6.48 In response to the current application, the Local Highways Authority (LHA) has not raised any objection. Subject to final arrangements being confirmed with regard to waste / recycling being picked up from the unadopted section of the development relating to plots 60-65 (to comprise an informative where approved), the proposal has demonstrated that the site can be suitably served in respect of refuse arrangements both to the dwellings and the Extra Care facility based upon the size of vehicle required by the LHA. The latter would be served from the north with a specific bin store now proposed. Officers note that whilst the layout to the north of the Extra Care has been amended subsequent to the latter refuse tracking plan for the overall site, the LHA has undertaken its own checks and confirmed sufficient manoeuvrability is available within this area. Access is afforded to the rear of each property for the purpose of refuse storage, including a central alleyway through to the rear of the terrace block (4 dwellings) of The Malvern. 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.

- 6.49 A number of parties have raised concern during the consultation process relating to motorised vehicles using the proposed walk through the central area of the site - as was the case through the consultation on the Reserved Matters scheme. Again it is reiterated that this shall not be adopted as public highway and shall be privately managed. Through the course of the previous application, options to limit access were 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, with a general need to avoid hindering access by those who are less mobile, in mobility buggies, or pushing prams for instance. The nature of the area entailed would duly be notably altered by the installation of fencing. A number of units are orientated towards the open space to create active frontages at either end to facilitate self-management.
- 6.50 The access points for the site were defined and approved through the previous outline permission, and are in line with extant Reserved Matters consent. 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, visitor and garages is deemed sufficient for the number and type of development proposed (noting a condition around the retention of garages for vehicular parking to be controlled through condition). Refuse arrangements are largely duly in place; and duly acceptable. As the ultimate end user of the Extra Care facility is yet to be determined, 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.

Heritage and archaeological issues

- 6.51 As per the extant approved scheme, 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 89-92, with plots 88-90 entailing a back to side / side to back relationship with the residences of Haddon House and Callow House (relating to enabling development of the Manor house), the scheme incorporates a landscape buffer between and sufficient separation distances. The remaining plots back directly on to the open space flanked by a proposed fence and areas of planting, the units are set away from the existing properties, and entail separation distances exceeding 27 metres. A minimum separation distance of 44 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.

- 6.52 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 have been duly revised related to 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 local representation, and 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.
- 6.53 Archaeological remains relating to the medieval settlement of Arleston may survive within the application site. An archaeological assessment accompanied the original outline scheme which concluded that the majority of the proposed development has low potential for below ground archaeological remains of all periods, but that the south-eastern part of the site had a moderate potential for remains of the medieval period, such that that archaeological remains relating to the medieval occupation of Arleston may survive within part of the proposed development site. A programme of archaeological work is duly requested with a watching brief on groundworks associated with the development by Archaeology to satisfactorily address the issue of known archaeological interest on the site.
- 6.54 The LPA are satisfied that the scheme pays due regard to the heritage and archaeological 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.

Flood risk and drainage

- 6.55 The Flood Risk Assessment accompanying the application confirms that the site lies fully within Flood Zone 1 (land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding), and goes onto set out the proposed drainage regime bearing in mind that there are no known public surface water or foul water sewers within the site. A conceptual drainage strategy has duly been developed based on site attenuation of flows – with three balancing ponds, and swale provision towards the centre of the site, to deliver a positive outfall. Foul drainage will be dealt with via the nearby Severn Trent Water foul sewer network, with a split proposed between Kingsland together with Arleston Village.
- 6.56 The principles of the approach are supported by Drainage, delivering an above ground attenuation arrangement providing water quality treatment as well as amenity and biodiversity value. Discussion with neighbours has reflected a concern as to the addition of swales to the scheme. It is confirmed that the developer is proposing to construct several swales (i.e. shallow sided ditches); these swales replace pipework in the previous proposals. Swales in this location will likely be more maintainable than a buried pipework and are also more sustainable, providing benefits to water quality and biodiversity, therefore representing a form of betterment to the scheme.

- 6.57 A concern as to the provision of a tank underneath the allotments backing onto Arleston Village has further been raised, Officers can confirm that this is no longer required to serve the development as presented through the amended Flood Risk Assessment prepared RPS (defined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy). Under the new proposals, the surface water produced by the southern and eastern portions of the development will still be discharged into the watercourse, however the developer has revised the design for how this will be achieved (i.e. the outcome is the same, however the method is now different). The revised proposals have split the drainage into two separate systems which, rather than having to cross the valley, now work with the natural topography of the site.
- 6.58 Further working up of the drainage strategy is set out to be controlled through condition, as recognised by the assessment, including a SUDS management plan to ensure the long term operation and maintenance of the drainage features. It is further noted that an exceedance flow routing plan is recommended through condition appreciating concerns from local residents as to excess water needing to escape somewhere. The rate of surface water discharge to the watercourse will be restricted to greenfield rates of 4.6 l/s for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 year event + climate change allowance, therefore the developer will be maintaining pre-development rates. The developer will be required to submit detailed designs and a full Microdrainage model of the drainage system prior to any development taking place.
- 6.59 Through the outline scheme it was also proposed that a financial bond be provided by the developer and held by the Council (amounting to £5k) for improvement works to the 'stream' running through Arleston Village to be drawn down by owners of the stream to undertake works to de-silt and do repairs. The provision of this and how it would soon be exhausted is raised in local representation. The outline Committee Report made clear the nature of the contribution as a community benefit rather than a form of mitigation. On this basis, the bond would not meet the tests in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, it is not a necessary obligation to make the development acceptable. The developer has nonetheless advised that they would be willing to provide the monies as an additional community benefit (managed separately to the S106) as an added community benefit of the proposal.
- 6.60 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.

Contamination and Geotechnical Issues

- 6.61 The site has a legacy of mining history with a potential risk posed to the development form from this context. This legacy issue has been investigated through previous applications on the site, together with the submission of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment for the current scheme further to objection from the Coal Authority as the site lies within the defined Development High Risk

Area. There is still potential of shallow mining issues however this can be mitigated through a condition with undertaking of intrusive site investigations. There is a historical well on site, which will need identifying and works undertaken to ensure no stability issues arise. There are two historical ponds on site which have been in filled and have potential for contamination and will require further testing to see if there needs to be further mitigation to protect human health. This issue can be resolved through conditions.

- 6.62 Officers consider that technical issues relating to ground conditions including land contamination have been sufficiently addressed for the purpose of complying with the principles of policy EH14, and emerging policies BE9 and BE10, together with guidance in NPPF, subject to conditions which can adequately control the issues raised.

Ecology and Trees

- 6.63 There have been a number of objections raised by residents to the development on the grounds of loss of trees and the impact this will have on wildlife and ecology.
- 6.64 The Arboricultural Officer has assessed the silver birch woodland and considers that these trees do not fit the criteria for protection and has no objection in principle to the loss of some of these trees, subject to a high level of mitigation planting and future management, which can be secured through conditions.
- 6.65 The application is accompanied by an updated ecological appraisal and protected species surveys, incorporating a detailed resurvey of habitats, reptile survey, bat activity survey and tree roosting potential assessment, and badger survey. Of particular note, the appraisal recommends retention of the central block of woodland and a block of woodland in the north of the site, together with trees and hedgerows where possible. The former is further recommended to be retained for potential bat roosts and for foraging activities. With the site overall used by an assemblage of bird species.
- 6.66 As per the approved scheme, the proposal retains the central and northern woodland areas, and the hedgerows are shown as retained around some of the boundaries of the site, whilst necessitating appropriate management details controlled through condition. On this basis, support subject to conditions is offered by Ecology. Conditions are duly requested, together with a woodland habitat management plan, relating to a series of artificial nesting / roosting boxes for respective bats / birds / hedgehogs, a landscaping design, lighting plan to minimise disturbance to bats, and a badger inspection. Provision of lighting along the footpath has been raised as a concern by neighbours, the lighting condition will also seek to address the issue.
- 6.67 Officers are duly 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.).

- 6.68 The site is subject to a Tree Preservation Order relating to two woodland areas and three individual trees in the central and eastern areas of the site. Pockets of trees are also dotted around the site, together with boundary planting. The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report (Rev. C) and associated Tree Constraint and Protection Plans, and a planting schedule. The report confirms that the impact from this detailed application is broadly the same as the existing approved scheme with no significant increase in the impacts, with removal of younger and low value vegetation that currently has limited impact on the locality, and retention of the key trees limits the impact of the tree loss as they help soften and screen the proposed development
- 6.69 The tree removal table (p.7-8) 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) – in line with access approved under the extant consent. 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.
- 6.70 The report identifies a number of additional trees to be lost to the approved scheme, the reasons cited include facilitating the access, road, attenuation pond, and the provision of units. Here a minor, low to moderate impact applies. It is particularly noted that a section of landscaping – TG25 is proposed to be felled at the northern side of No. 24 (Heatherset) in order to facilitate the neighbouring units. Here replacement is proposed with provision of close board fence around the rear gardens together with the placement of the garage serving plot 26 and new tree planting, the need for full removal is being queried with the applicant, with an update to be provided to Planning Committee. Further update is to be provided as to the outstanding objection from the Arboricultural Officer as to the TPO'd Oak T9 and its relationship with the neighbouring highway, with ongoing discussion with the applicant's Arboriculturist; it is anticipated that this issue is resolvable. The relationship between properties backing onto Arleston Manor Drive exists through the existing approval on the site and is not subject to amendment. In addition, the submitted landscaping scheme demonstrates that a high level of compensatory planting is possible due to the provision of retained open space.
- 6.71 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 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).

Open Space & Play facilities

- 6.72 The NPPF states that access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and wellbeing of communities. The proposed development will increase formal access to this land, including equipped play facilities and retain areas of the site with informal usage, as well as contributing to improvements of other sports and recreational facilities off site within the Arleston Ward through financial contribution (in line with the outline permission) further to comment as to triggering the need for provision of a NEAP (Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play), in combination with a LEAP (Local Equipped Area for Play) to address the demand created by the proposal.
- 6.73 A number of queries have been raised by Healthy Spaces, including design details of the LEAP (incorporating fencing arrangements), timing of its delivery, a request for an activity trail and management of the landscape areas as per the outline scheme. In this respect, proposals are in line with the approved permission, with relevant conditions to be rolled forward where Members are minded to approve the proposal. Whilst the outline contribution of £10k towards art work is no longer deemed to be necessary mitigation for the development relating to contribution regulations, the applicant has further agreed to provide an equivalent sum. Bearing in mind the comment of the Healthy Spaces Officer as to the lack of provision, it is considered that art work could be drawn into the design of LEAP, the detail of which would be addressed through condition. In respect of overlooking of the LEAP, there are three properties opposite directly fronting onto the area, with habitable side windows / parking areas of a further three properties facing the area, together with sitting adjacent to the internal service road serving the 23 properties along this section of the development. The timing of the sale of properties in the vicinity of the LEAP would be controlled through condition to ensure prospective purchasers are fully aware of the play provision in proximity to these properties at the time of purchase as requested. Amendments have also been made to the form of footpaths through the site, providing a continuous link and hard surfaced rather than a mown finish. It is further considered that a safe access route can be provided to the LEAP as addressed in the Highways section of this report.
- 6.74 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 on the site plan, the hedge is a

low value feature its removal is therefore reasonable, with a native buffer mix alternative in place to provide lower level screening and a soft backdrop to the space.

- 6.75 On balance, Officers therefore consider that the loss of land is replaced by better provision both on and off site and therefore conforms to emerging policy NE4, and guidance in the NPPF.

Planning obligations

- 6.76 In determining the required planning obligations on this specific application the following three tests as set out in the CIL Regulations (2010), in particular Regulation 122, have been applied to ensure that the application is treated on its own merits:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) directly related to the development;
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

- 6.77 In addition, account has to be taken of the changes to the CIL Regulations in April 2015 that now restrict the “pooling” of financial contributions to no more than five contributions to a single type of infrastructure. It is considered that the financial contributions set out below meet the relevant tests and should be included within a S106.

- 6.78 The S106 contributions are proposed as follows:

- Education - £248,663 towards primary educational facilities comprising the expansion of Wrekin View.
- Affordable provision – provision of 51No. self-contained flat Extra Care facility 100% affordable (notably triggers have been agreed as per the outline scheme TWC/2012/0240 acknowledging concern in local representations)
- Open Space - provision of open space (including the area for 10 allotments) and play facilities on site and off site play area contribution of £25,000 towards play area works at John Broad Avenue, with a maintenance contribution of £15,000
- Highways - £10,000 towards improvements works to three bus stops along Kingsland, £5,000 provision of support and monitoring of the required Travel Plan, £7,000 towards re-location of the 40mph speed limit along Dawley Road covering the costs associated to the necessary amendments of associated signing and lining and amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order.

- 6.79 The provision of affordable housing is necessary and consistent with Core Strategy Policies CS1 and CS7, Local Plan Policies H23 and H24 and the NPPF. The contributions towards highway improvements reflect the features of the site and its location relative to public transport. The negotiation of these contributions is also consistent with Local Plan Policy T22, and emerging policy C3 which now holds significant weight. The provision of a financial contribution and land transfer towards educational improvements is necessary

because of the link between the development and larger local school rolls. The need for open space and equipped play provision is a requirement under policy LR6, CS11 and TWLP policies NE4 and NE5.

- 6.80 As noted within the above drainage section of this report, the developer has provided an assurance as to providing the monies relating to the drainage works measure of the outline S106 agreement. Public Art contribution of £10k secured through the previous outline scheme is further no longer considered compliant with CIL regulations.

Other matters

- 6.81 Further to concern raised as to encroachment of the red line boundary of the site across the grounds of the Serchem factory and Heatherset, the edge of the site has been drawn back to exclude the land in question. Officers acknowledge that the application has been subject to a number of iterations, including revision from a Wellbeing Facility to an Extra Care facility, with provision of covering letters / amended Extra Care Statements encouraged in this respect, together with a direct discussion held between the applicant and local residents / Ward Member and the LPA in this respect.
- 6.82 All other objections raised in the consultation process have been considered, including existing water pressure issues at Arleston Manor Mews, a need to cater for street lighting at the top of Arleston Lane, 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 and reserved matters planning permission for residential development, constituting a 50no. self-contained flats extra care facility and 95No. residential dwellings. This is an extant consent and a material consideration for this application, whilst conversely the appeal decision referenced in neighbour representation which followed the outline application is not. The level of public open space remains in the region of 50% of the sit - this includes the agreed allotments with intensification of landscaping and controls as to future management of retained areas of green space, 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. Access arrangements remain as per the previous scheme with an additional footpath link secured as an enhancement to the scheme, and sufficient parking and servicing available subject to conditioning of a Travel Plan related to the Extra Care facility. The amount of development has slightly reduced related to the dwellings from 95 to 93, and an additional flat added to the Extra Care, and the scale of development is determined to be acceptable. Changes have been made to reintroduce measures to ensure the privacy of proposed and existing residents can be secured through the development.

- 7.2 The emphasis of the current application is led by the prospective purchase of the site by the developer Redrow with general modification to the layout, the introduction of their heritage range housetypes, together with the remodelling of the Extra Care facility seeking to cater for interest shown by a number of providers. Notably there has been a number of amendments to the form of the building in this latter respect over the course of the application, the latest being from Housing & Care 21 - an established older people housing specialist and Extra Care provider across England - whilst retention of a number of community facilities within the building has been secured. Fundamental reconfiguration of the site, including consideration as to repositioning of the LEAP, has not been pursued.
- 7.3 The determination of this application, is therefore focussed around the form of amendment to the extant Reserved Matters consent as a key material consideration. Here, it is accepted by the Local Planning Authority that the overall design provides less of a bespoke design solution to the site than the approved permission, with a national housebuilder on board. The proposal does however still afford a positive number of different housetypes across the site - 12 in total with further variation as to the material finish and window placement. There is a greater emphasis on semi-detached provision related to the pattern of development of Dawley Road and Kingsland, through to the detached provision and more traditional feature detailing to the east with greater proximity to the listed building and its neighbouring enabling development. The applicant has further taken on board the request for amendment to the elevational treatment of the Extra Care facility seeking to reduce its overall massing within the site. The position is such that the design does respond to the context overall and does not warrant refusal on this basis.
- 7.4 The planning balance further lies in enhancements and the maintenance of the benefits derived from the development, an uplift from 30 to 51 affordable units - comprising the full Extra Care facility would be derived from the development. The applicant has further agreed to provide monies (£5k as per the previous S106) to undertake de-silting and repair works to the stream running through Arleston Village; together with the equivalent of £10k towards public art within the site, as obligations that no longer satisfy tests of necessity.
- 7.5 On this basis, Officers resolve that the planning balance remains acceptable in respect of both the principle and detail of the development, 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:
- A.) The applicant/landowners entering into a Section 106 agreement with the

Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to:

- i. Education - £248,663 towards primary educational facilities comprising the expansion of Wrekin View, North Road
 - ii. Affordable provision – provision of 51 No. self-contained flat Extra Care facility 100% affordable (notably triggers have been agreed as per the outline scheme TWC/2012/0240 acknowledging concern in local representations)
 - iii. Open Space - provision of open space (including the area for 10 allotments) and play facilities on site and off site play area contribution of £25,000 towards play area works at John Broad Avenue, with a maintenance contribution of £15,000
 - iv. Highways - £10,000 towards improvements works to three bus stops along Kingsland, £5,000 provision of support and monitoring of the required Travel Plan, £7,000 towards re-location of the 40mph speed limit along Dawley Road covering the costs associated to the necessary amendments of associated signing and lining and amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order.
- B.) The following conditions (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):
1. A04: Time limit – Full
 2. B010: Details and samples of materials (notwithstanding details submitted)
 3. B011: Sample brick panel(s)
 4. B032: Road design
 5. B036: Off-site highways (details to be approved)
 6. B045: Travel Plan
 7. B049: Details of Public Rights of Way works
 8. B049: Crossing point details
 9. B050: Shallow Mining (Coal Authority)
 10. B052: Untreated Mineshafts
 11. B057: Land contamination
 12. B059: Coal Authority
 13. B061: Foul and surface water (including Microdrainage models in .mdx format)
 14. B076: SUDS Management Plan
 15. B079: Exceedance flow routing
 16. B084: Noise mitigation (notwithstanding proposed acoustic barrier on Dawley Road, re-running of noise model and mitigation strategy finalised)
 17. B086: Details of extraction (Extra Care facility restaurant kitchen)
 18. B110: Programme of archaeological work
 19. B121: Landscaping Design (notwithstanding details submitted)
 20. B126: Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan
 21. B131: Trees – services root protection
 22. B145: Lighting Plan
 23. B149: Woodland Management Plan
 24. B150: Site Environmental Management Plan (including on-site construction details)
 25. B155: Play space details (including art work)
 26. B159: Open Space details

- 27. Bcust: Well Investigation
- 28. Bcust: Foundation details
- 29. C13: Parking, loading, unloading and turning
- 30. C14: Visibility splays 2.4m x 65m
- 31. C071: Trees – soil levels
- 32. C072: Trees – material storage
- 33. C089: Trees – works in accordance Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report and Tree Protection Plans
- 34. C101: Erection of ecology boxes
- 35. C109: Badger inspection
- 36. C118: LEAP Occupancy
- 37. C38: Development in accordance with deposited plans (materials, soft and hard landscaping plans not agreed)
- 38. D03: Domestic garage restriction on residential use urban area
- 39. D06: Restriction on use of Extra Care facility

Informatives:

- I06: Section 106 Agreement
- I11: Highways – S278, S257, refuse arrangement for plots 60-65 relating to unadopted section of development
- I25a: Ecology – badgers and birds
- I32: Fire Service
- I40: Conditions
- I41: Reasons for approval
- RANPPF1: Approval - NPPF