

PLANNING COMMITTEE**Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 14th November 2018 at 6.00pm in The Telford Suite, Telford Whitehouse Hotel, Watling Street, Wellington, Telford**

Present: Councillors C F Smith (Chair), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, J Loveridge, N C Lowery, L A Murray and C R Turley (Vice Chair).

In Attendance: V. Hulme - Service Delivery Manager, K. Harris - Highways and Building Control Manager, S. Drury – Principal Planning Officer, M. Turner – Area Team Planning Manager, G. Onions - Tree & Woodland Officer, I. Ross – Solicitor, M. Farley – Democratic & Scrutiny Officer and T. Carruthers – Planning Assistant.

PC-038 Apologies for Absence

Councillor P. Scott

PC-039 Declarations of Interest

None.

PC-040 Minutes

Resolved – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 24th October 2018 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

PC-041 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC-042 Site Visits

Resolved – that site visits will take place on Wednesday 5th December 2018 as follows:

2.30pm – TWC/2018/0658 – Land rear of Charlton School, Off St Pauls Drive, Dothill, Telford, Shropshire (Site of the former Blessed Robert Johnson School)

3.30pm - TWC/2018/0744 - Land rear of Provosts House 44, Provost Mews 46 & The Old Stables, High Street, Edgmond, Newport, Shropshire

PC-043 Tree Preservation Order for determination

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Director: Governance, Procurement & Commissioning seeking confirmation of a provisional Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

On 15th June 2018 a provisional Tree Preservation Order was made in respect of one oak tree. On 22nd June 2018 an objection to the TPO was received from Mr Harris, the owner of the property in respect of the oak tree.

Mr Harris spoke against the Tree Preservation Order. Mr Harris shared that the tree provided a nice view for himself and his wife previously but they are now becoming increasingly concerned due to height and weight of tree. The tree is very close to their bungalow and could become a health and safety issue if the tree were to fall. If 30% of tree was cut back, the tree would still be within 8-10m of their property. If the Tree Preservation Order were to be refused, Mr Harris would be happy to plant another oak tree to replace this one at a further distance from their property.

Mr G. Onions - Tree & Woodland Officer, explained that an application was made for the removal of a tree in a Conservation Area, and as such any application must be either approved or refused, it cannot be approved subject to any conditions placed on it; therefore the Local Authority considered it appropriate to place a Preservation Order on the tree. There are no structure issues with the tree.

A site visit had taken place earlier, and following debate some members expressed that although they appreciated both sides, for and against the TPO, the oak tree has a high amenity value and should be protected.

The decision was then put to vote. All members voted in favour of the Tree Preservation Order.

RESOLVED That Tree Preservation Order (Oak Tree within the grounds of; Dunwich, Spring Village, Horsehay, Telford, Shropshire, TF4 2LX) be confirmed.

PC- 044 Planning applications for determination

- a) TWC/2018/0714 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc, Gresham Drive, Newdale, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 5ES

This application was for the installation of a 4 metre high pole and an Automatic Number Plate Recognition Camera (ANPR) camera at the entrance into existing Lawley Square Car Park. There was a second application which was currently pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority, relating to a signage application to advertise a maximum stay period and charging notices for the same Car Park.

Councillor J. Francis spoke against the application and felt that both of the applications should be considered together as they were connected. She raised concerns regarding lack of parking for other local businesses and staff due to the time limit, the impact on residents who would be forced to park on nearby paths and streets and impact on access for traffic and local buses.

Councillor J. Greenaway spoke against this application regarding the car park being integral to local businesses, the lack of alternative parking for shops, GP surgery and the School, surrounding roads could not accommodate additional parking, and she asked that both this application for the ANPR and the signage be considered together and that the application either be deferred or refused.

Councillor R. Mehta was unable to attend the meeting and submitted a statement against this application which was read on his behalf by Mr M. Turner. Cllr Mehta raised concerns that the community carpark was a focal point of Lawley, with the local amenities, care homes, shops, a supermarket and a nursery all built around it and was accessed without restriction, car parking charges may resort to mindless parking causing congestion and nuisance and the impact would starve the town of customers and may encourage businesses to leave.

Ms C Pilling, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application and informed Members about the calibre of the proposed operator Euro Carparks. And that the application was made to enable Morrisons to improve parking for their customers by limiting long stays. She asserted that a 3 hour maximum stay would provide ample time for shoppers and there would be no parking charge for this time. Workers and residents would be exempt from the maximum stay and would be provided with dedicated spaces.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns regarding the separation of the two applications; the consideration that Lawley as Sustainable Urban Extension was granted on the provision that this was a community car park for the area, without restriction; the change of restriction from an unrestricted car park would therefore have a detrimental impact on local residents and businesses, and its potential harm to highway safety and the economic viability of existing shops. Members asked for clarification on who would qualify for the parking exemptions, and how the proposal would work in practice. Members concluded that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the ANPR camera was the most appropriate solution, and that, because of the lack of alternative available parking within Lawley losing the unrestricted car park would worsen the current situation.

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

RESOLVED That in respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0714 this application be refused for the following reasons:

- a) **Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the use of ANPR cameras is the most appropriate solution**
- b) **The sustainability and implications on local residents and businesses, recognising this is a local centre car park**
- c) **A lack of alternative parking provisions in the area and its resultant impact on the local highway network.**

b) TWC/2017/0916 - Land adjacent to Bettisfield, Longford Road, Newport, Shropshire

This application was for the erection of a dwelling and ancillary workshop with associated access and landscaping works.

This application was considered at the previous planning committee meeting held on the 24th October 2018, when members agreed that the application would be deferred in order to allow the Ward Member to speak, a site visit to take place, and to allow a Section 106 agreement to be drawn up in regards to the occupancy of the proposed workshop. Since the previous committee report was written, a further objection had been received. A site visit took place earlier that day.

Councillor A. Eade spoke against this application and raised concerns that Longford was not a named settlement within the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan, non compliance with Policy HO10, the layout, density and design, visual appearance and the impact that the dwelling would have on the character of the area, the building was not exceptional nor innovative and was not in-keeping with the local area, the size of the buildings were out of proportion to the surrounding buildings, the development did not enhance the local environment or respect the landscape and the impact on the highway and additional traffic.

Mr Adam Turnell (Applicant's Agent) spoke in favour of the application which he asserted was proposed to be located on the edge of Longford and was within walking distance of a sustainable settlement. He considered the buildings were of exceptional design and had been developed with local planning and highways officers along with a national recognised review board. The position of the building retained existing natural woodland area and the scale of property was not much larger than the adjacent properties. There was no design pattern with existing properties and therefore the building design was in-keeping.

Officers explained that in 2012 the NPPF introduced an exception policy to where development would normally be resisted subject to it being of exception quality and innovative. The Local Planning Authority has consistently required such applications to be considered by MADE, an independent design review panel. This proposal had been presented to MADE, and latterly following the request for amendments, in which the Panel supported the application. Officers also explained the requirements for exceptional quality and innovative design were made up of a number of criteria, and not solely judged on design alone, including sustainable construction, and green energy.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns regarding the industrial design of the building featuring metal cladding and a metal roof within a rural area. The road from which the site is accessed is narrow and students regularly walked along it. Members also considered that the proposal was for two dwellings, not one as the workshop contained a two bedroom flat, in addition to the proposed five bedrooms proposed in the main dwelling. There were existing traffic problems in the area, as witnessed on the site visit and suggested amended vehicular access through the adjacent neighbouring property access. Internally, the proposal seemed to be a positive scheme although the exterior was not in-keeping with the area.

On the chair's casting vote it was:-

RESOLVED that In respect of Planning Application TWC/2017/0916 this application be deferred for the following reasons:

- a) **To amend the scale and design of the proposed dwelling, and reduce the scale of accommodation provided across the site.**
- b) **To revisit the access arrangements for the site.**

c) TWC/2018/0747- Willow Vale, Longdon On Tern, Telford, TF6 6LQ

This application sought permission for the erection of a two storey extension to the existing annexe on the site. The proposed extension would see a second bedroom and kitchen area created. This annexe had been subject to three planning applications since 2016.

Councillor D. Johnson spoke against this application. Attention was bought to the members that the property was currently listed for sale. The annex was to be extended for the occupant's son and daughter-in-law, it had undergone 4 applications, 3 of which had been refused. It was already an over developed site and this application had no substantial change to the previous one.

Councillor J. Seymour spoke against this application. Permission was granted in 2011 to convert the double garage as an annex and not a separate dwelling. Applications had been made for the annex to have a bedroom, bathroom and kitchen, this was denied as it could be regarded as a separate dwelling. She stated that the fact the property was for sale questioned the long term use for the family.

Mr Paul Sharples (applicant's representative) spoke in favour of the application. Support was obtained previously from a planning officer who then left the authority, the pre-approval advice was then not taken by the subsequent planning officer. He stated that the annex would not have a negative impact as the current family would live there and the property was put on the market following the previous refusal and was contracted for 13 weeks. During this period, the application had been resubmitted.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns that members and officers had been consistent previously in refusing this application and there were no new reasons to change this position. The site was over developed already and offered no innovative design.

Upon being put to the vote, the majority of members:-

RESOLVED - That in respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0747 delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full Planning Permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) along with a Section 106 Agreement, terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager, relating to the extended annexe not being transferred, let or sold as a separate unit and the annexe only being

occupied by a person who is related to the registered owner of the main dwellinghouse.

d) TWC/2018/0159 Land adjacent Golden Bear Products Ltd, Hortonwood 40, Hortonwood, Telford, Shropshire

The proposed development comprised erection of two substantial industrial buildings (Use Classes B1(c), B2 and B8), and associated car parking and service areas. Total proposed floor space amounts to 6,772.5 sq. metres. Proposed access for this site is to be taken off Hortonwood 40 to the west.

There were 4 linked applications in total for this development (TWC/2018/0159, TWC/2018/0162, TWC/2018/0163 and TWC/2018/0164) and therefore the chair requested for the applications to be heard together.

Mr Jon Brumwell spoke against application TWC/2018/0159 as a member of the public, regarding sustainability and transport issues including under provision for cycle storage and the generation of additional traffic movement.

Mr Jon Brumwell then spoke against applications TWC/2018/0162, TWC/2018/0163 and TWC/2018/0164 on behalf of the parish council. Concerns raised against the previous application were reiterated for the remaining 3 applications additionally, there was no complete highways assessment of the Hortonwood area, including recent approvals and proposals at Hadley park East and junctions were approaching capacity. Traffic in the area was already substantial.

Mr S. Drury – Planning Officer, explained that all of the sites were allocated as employment sites. All four applications had been supported by transport assessments and financial contributions would be made from the businesses towards Strategic Highway Network, footway/cycleway linkage and travel plan monitoring. . The plan fell short on cycle spaces with regards to the local plan although there would be a sufficient number of spaces available. The sites were designed not to impact residents with regards to noise and the public protection department had not raised any objections.

Mr K. Harris - Highways and Building Control Manager, explained that a transport model had been used to assess the impact on the highway network and a robust assessment was made. £272,000 would be generated for improvements. Highways were satisfied that the number of cycle spaces available reflected current usage.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns regarding current local plan cycle parking policy not being followed, inadequate access to local transport and the site should be in close proximity to sustainable travelling. There had been no attempts for exceptional design or to reduce emissions. The sites would cause extra traffic

Some members spoke in favour of providing new employment opportunities and the expansion of Hortonwood. One member suggested that major companies should provide their own bus service to their employees to reduce the amount of commuters and traffic.

Upon being put to vote, the majority of members:-

RESOLVED – That in respect of Planning Applications TWC/2018/0159 delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant Planning Permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager)

- e) TWC/2018/0162 Land West of Household Recycling Centre, Hortonwood 60, Hortonwood, Telford, Shropshire

As set out at (d) above this application was heard in conjunction with planning applications TWC/2018/0159, TWC/2018/0163 and TWC/2018/0164

Upon being put to vote, the majority of members:-

RESOLVED – That in respect of Planning Applications TWC/2018/0162 delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant Planning Permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager)

- f) TWC/2018/0163 Land opposite Wrap Film Systems Ltd, Hortonwood 40, Hortonwood, Telford, Shropshire

As set out at (d) above this application was heard in conjunction with planning applications TWC/2018/0159, TWC/2018/0162 and TWC/2018/0164

Upon being put to vote, the majority of members:-

RESOLVED – That in respect of Planning Applications TWC/2018/0163 delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant Planning Permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager)

- g) TWC/2018/0164 Land rear of Wrap Film Systems Ltd, Hortonwood 40, Hortonwood, Telford, Shropshire

As set out at (d) above this application was heard in conjunction with planning applications TWC/2018/0159, TWC/2018/0162 and TWC/2018/0163

Upon being put to vote, the majority of members:-

RESOLVED – That in respect of Planning Applications TWC/2018/0164 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant Planning Permission subject to the conditions and

informatives set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager)

h) TWC/2018/0749 Annexe, 7 Limekiln Lane, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9EY

This application proposed to remove a Planning Condition included within the Approval for the conversion of the outbuilding into an annexe. The Condition preventing the annexe being sold or let separately to the main dwelling and ensuring that the annexe was retained as an ancillary part of the primary dwelling. A site visit had taken place earlier that day.

Mr John Hockin (applicant) spoke in favour of the application. The application was to allow letting only, and not to allow the annex building to be sold separately to the main house. He expressed his objective was to ensure proper control and that he had no desire to have the property sold separately. The current situation dictated that only he or his wife could live there. It was a perfectly good dwelling left vacant and he argued that the annex should be considered for occupation and not be sold. It would generate revenue by means of council tax.

Councillor A. Eade spoke in favour of the application. He considered that it was a sustainable building, attractive and small in compliance with the sustainable setting and met a need in the local area; the dwelling was not disproportional and was in-keeping with the design of area. The application was for letting only and to not sell. Planning permission was granted 15 years ago. He concluded that it was a reasonable application.

During the debate, some members felt that the speakers were enlightening and the site visit was beneficial. It was noted that the annex could not be accessed by any other means than via the main house which mitigated concerns that it could be a stand-alone dwelling. Some members felt that letting the property should be enabled.

The legal adviser, explained that the application was to remove restrictions which would allow the sale and letting of the property. As it was possible to have long term leases for example up to 999 years or consecutive leases, there was no practical difference in planning terms between selling or letting because letting could be so long term.

In considering the recommendation, officers also asked members to consider the result of short term lets, for example holiday lets, and its provision of both parking and amenity; however Upon being put to vote, the majority of members:-

RESOLVED - That in respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0749 that this application be refused for the following reasons:

- a) **The annexe by reason of its proposed means of access via the existing garden associated with the primary dwelling is considered to be an inappropriate form of development to function as a separate dwelling**

which would cause a fragmentation of the existing curtilage and significant detrimental impacts upon the host dwelling through the unacceptable loss of residential amenity. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Local Plan BE1 Design Criteria and BE2 Residential Alterations.

- b) The proposed new residential unit fails to provide for on-plot car parking and would be likely to encourage on-street car parking on the highway to the detriment of highway safety contrary to Local Plan Policies C5 and SP4 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.**

The meeting ended at 8:38pm

Chairman:

Date: