

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> December at 6.00pm in The Telford Suite, Telford Whitehouse Hotel, Watling Street, Wellington, Telford**

**Present:** Councillors C F Smith (Chair), E A Clare (as substitute for J Loveridge), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, V A Fletcher (as substitute for N C Lowery), L A Murray, S J Reynolds, P Scott 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, K Craddock – Principal Planning Officer, I Ross – Legal Advisor, J Clarke – Democratic & Scrutiny Officer, K Wilde – Planning Assistant and T Carruthers – Planning Assistant.

#### **PC-045 Apologies for Absence**

Councillor J Loveridge and N C Lowery

#### **PC-046 Declarations of Interest**

None

#### **PC-047 Minutes**

**Resolved** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 14 November 2018 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

#### **PC-048 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications**

None

#### **PC-049 Site Visits**

None

#### **PC- 050 Planning applications for determination**

- a) TWC/2018/0568 – Land south of A518/West of A41, Newport, Shropshire

This was a hybrid application for Part A – outline planning application for the construction of an employment park comprising up to 34,890 sq.m of business, general industrial, warehouse and distribution floorspace (Use Classes B1(b), B1(c), B2 and B8) with all matters reserved except for the means of access to the site (Phases 2 & 3). Part B – Full application for the construction of 24no. business, general industrial and warehouse and distribution units (Use Classes B1(b), B1(c),

B2 and B8 along with associated 2no. accesses and internal spine road, parking provision and landscaping (Phase 1).

An update report was tabled at the meeting containing comments from the Arboricultural Officer and comments of support for the development.

Councillor A Eade spoke in favour of the application which he felt was a vital development for local sustainability and for jobs, skills and opportunities and he welcomed high tech industries and businesses to the Town which would add to the collective offer of Newport. He raised concerns regarding the landscaping, ecology, highways and the impact of the two roundabouts and the protection of the public right of way. As the site was within the rural area it was important that conditions were put in place to ensure that the design complimented the surrounding area and did not impact on the visual amenity.

During the debate some Members felt that this was a good news story and would put Newport on the map. It was asked that Members and the Parish/Town Councils were kept fully informed of the programme of roadworks in advance and that the pedestrian routes across the roads were looked at. Other Members fully supported the application but raised concerns regarding the two roundabouts on a busy stretch of road during peak times, ecology and requested conditions be put in place for a buffer and for the development to naturally enhance the area.

The Highways Officer confirmed to Members that the roundabout was the most appropriate solution for this development and highway improvements would be undertaken. There would be a joint access with the development on the A514 together with a new dual purpose roundabout. The public and Parish/Town Councils would be kept fully informed through consultation.

The Planning Officer confirmed that an ecology buffer could be conditioned on the outline application for Phases 2 and 3 but could not be conditioned on the full planning application for Phase 1 as an enhanced ecology buffer on the eastern boundary could only be achieved by amending the site layout.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by those Members in the room, unanimously:-

**RESOLVED that in respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0568 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline and full planning permission subject to:**

- a) **The applicant/landowner entering into a Section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority, (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to:**
  - i) **Strategic Highway Contribution - £338,003.25 (Phase 1 -**
  - ii) **£34,320.33; Phase 2 - £303,682.92)**
  - ii) **PROW Enhancement - £5,000**
  - iii) **Travel Plan Monitoring - £5,000**
  - iv) **Public Transport Contribution - £120,000**

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

b) TWC/2018/0601- Lawley Phases 5 & 9, Lawley, Telford, Shropshire

This was a reserved matters application for the erection of 362no. dwellings with access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to outline application TWC/2010/0828.

This application had been called in at the request of Lawley and Overdale Parish Council and an update report had been tabled at the meeting containing comments from the Arboricultural Officer.

The Planning Officer drew Member's attention to the key issues which were the Public Rights of Way, removal of trees and the affordable housing.

Councillor J Greenaway spoke against the application on behalf of Lawley & Overdale Parish Council who raised concerns regarding the impact on the primary school, public rights of way and the safer routes to school, buffer zones, wildlife corridors, ecology, visual amenity, protection of trees, retaining wall, unsuitable extension into the surrounding boundaries and it was felt that the original masterplan should be adhered to. It was asked that this application be deferred for further consideration.

Councillor J Francis, Ward Councillor, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the removal of the trees at Teawell Close affecting the windbreak, impact on nature conservation, loss of the rights of way, impact on the safer routes to school and the loss of trees which the developers had already begun to fell.

Mr R Doran, member of the public, spoke against the application and suggested that a small adjustment on the layout of the development would enable all the trees in the copse to be saved. The trees were a significant amenity along the green corridor which housed wildlife habitats, fauna and flora and provided a windbreak to the houses within The Rock. He also raised concerns regarding the impact on the soakaway and the levels of the land and the retaining wall.

Mr D Norris, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application and confirmed to Members that the development had been approved in 2008, it was on a brownfield site on a formerly mined area and the site was in a good position within the New Town. The development was currently mid-way with 1,500 units already built. The retaining wall was necessary due to difference in levels and although trees would be lost a proposed 2,000 new, well planned, trees would be planted which would be more of a contribution in the long-term. There were no objections on ecology grounds and with regards to Rights of Way the developers would work with residents. The HCA were keen to deliver the land supply and there was a great demand for affordable housing.

During the ensuing debate, some Members raised concerns regarding the level of affordable housing, the loss of trees on the green network and the viability of the gardens, especially those with such small gardens. Other Members raised concerns regarding the Public Rights of Way, safer routes to school, removal of the trees and the levelling of the green network barrier, the effect on the established trees routes, the lack of mitigation measures for the retaining wall, loss of amenity, design, drainage, changes in level and the attenuation pond. Some Members also raised further concerns regarding the lack of affordable housing which went against Council policy, the retaining wall being higher than most of the other buildings within the development and it was felt that there were too many loose ends which needed finalising. A suggested came forward that the application be deferred for further consideration.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for all of the issues raised to be further considered and for there to be an opportunity for members to undertake a site visit.

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

**RESOLVED that In respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0601 that this application be deferred for further consideration of the following:**

- **Retention of trees on site, and lack of information**
- **Impact of retaining wall on drainage, septic tanks and run-off for properties on Rock Rd**
- **Design and construction of retaining wall and its maintenance**
- **Amenity, design and layout**
- **Safer Routes to School and Public Rights of Way**
- **Affordable housing and Viability**
- **Maintenance responsibility for attenuation ponds and landscaping**

c) TWC/2018/0658 – Land rear of Charlton School, Off St Pauls Drive, Dothill, Telford, Shropshire

This application was for the erection of 54 no. dwellings and associated landscaping on land at the rear of Charlton School, off St Pauls Drive, Dothill, Telford, Shropshire.

This application had been referred to Planning Committee as it was a major application in which the Council had a financial interest. A site visit had taken place on the afternoon prior to the meeting.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the principle of development had already been established on the site and that the key issues were the access and egress of the development.

Councillor L Jinks spoke against the application on behalf of Wellington Town Council, who raised concerns regarding the drainage and the impact on the environment and wildlife. She informed Members that the Town Council were not against the application itself but had major concerns regarding the access to the site which would cause additional traffic with roads becoming impassable at peak times

and further impact the already busy Whitchurch Road and North Road. The Town Council felt that the access to the development should be provided where the construction access was to be sited, onto Whitchurch Drive. This would divert traffic towards the Princess Royal Hospital.

Councillor K Tomlinson, Ward Councillor, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the proposed access which would be unviable as the streets were already congested with kerb side parking from the current residents. The parking provision was below the average and the access would become a pinch point. In order to avoid this it was suggested that the construction access was used as the permanent access to the site as this was an equal distance to the Charlton School Access as was the proposed access point. It was also suggested that the speed limit be reduced to 20mph.

Ms A Westbrook, a member of the public, spoke against the application with regards to the access and egress which would increase the traffic by 100%. The road was currently 5.5m which was below the current safety width. She raised concerns regarding further congestion, traffic flow, bottle neck during school opening/closing times and with the two primary schools along North Road and highway safety. She was also concerned about the access to the estate of emergency vehicles and refuse lorries.

During the ensuing debate, some Members were of the opinion that the development itself was welcomed as it proposed specialist units but raised concerns regarding the increased traffic and highway safety and suggested that an island be put in place on North Road/Whitchurch Road. Other Members raised further concerns regarding the narrow roads and the lack of affordable housing and asked where the play provision would be located. Some Members raised further queries regarding the split of the unit types and what the specialist units would be for and raised further concerns regarding emergency and specialist vehicles accessing the development and the extra traffic created by visiting carers and medical staff. It was suggested that this application be deferred to further consider the access.

The Highways Officer explained to Members that the assessment of the highway access had been looked at carefully within the national guidance policy and within the Manual for Streets Guidance. The advice was that where appropriate new access should be built in order to prevent congestion and safety and eliminate risk ie an access on the A5223. The suggested access width specified in the Manual for Streets for residential developments was 5.5m which the proposed developments met. The impact on traffic on the development site was estimated to be 22 cars per hour during peak traffic. A s106 contribution towards a roundabout at North Road/Whitchurch Road had been proposed would also be provided from contributions of the former Charlton School. The construction access was being used to minimise the impact for local residents during the construction phase and this would be a managed access for a short term and would revert to pedestrian access only once the build was complete.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the specialist units were a range of housing to support residents in retaining their independence and facilities would change depending on need ie wheelchair friendly and adaptations and provisions as

required. There would be 35 general need houses. The specialist units did come at a cost and although they supported policy HO7, it meant that only two affordable houses could be provided on the development. A viability assessment had been undertaken and officers were satisfied with this.

During a further debate, some Members raised further concerns regarding that delivery vans, free hospital transport and emergency services may struggle to access the estate roads and may have to mount pavements in order to negotiate a clear way through to the development. Having a main access onto Whitchurch Drive would make the development self-contained and it was noted that further down the Whitchurch Drive there was an access to Apley and the Severn Hospice. It was further suggested that this application be deferred for further consideration of the access.

The Planning Officer was unable to clarify the distance to the play park which would be on Severn Drive, but he could confirm that they would need to cross a highway.

The Highways and Building Control Manager re-iterated that the possibility of an access directly from Whitchurch Drive had already been explored but for a number of technical reasons was not considered desirable, or necessary given that the proposed access complies with Manual for Streets Guidance. A deferral was unlikely to change this position.

The Planning Service Delivery Manager also reminded Members of the need to balance concerns against the benefits in terms of new housing and specialist accommodation provision.

Upon being put to vote it was, unanimously:-

**RESOLVED - that in respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0658 that this application be deferred for further consideration to the residential access and egress of the proposed site from Whitchurch Drive.**

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

This application was for the erection of 3no. detached dwellings with associated garages and access on land to the rear of Provosts House 44, Provost Mews 46 & The Old Stables, High Street, Edgmond, Newport.

This application had been called in by Edgmond Parish Council and a site visit had taken place on the afternoon prior to the Committee. A response from Historic England was tabled at the meeting.

The Planning Officer raised some key issues with that had been raised at the site visit being access along Birchmore Lane and the resulting loss of a section of the sandstone walls, and the visibility splay. It was confirmed that sections of the Sandstone wall would be rebuilt and in some places they were in very poor condition.

Councillor R Higginson spoke against the application on behalf of Edgmond Parish Council and raised concerns regarding the reference to the site being “infil”, being contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan which had now been adopted and there being no exceptional circumstances to build in the countryside. He felt the application was against Policy RES1, RES2, RES4, RES5, NPPF12 and BHO11. Members were asked to refuse the application.

Councillor S Burrell spoke against the application and raised concerns under Article 12 of the NPPF and it failed the Heritage Asset test as there was no public benefit to the public on this site. The resurfacing work, footpaths, drainage and the planting of 40 Scotts Pines would only benefit the new development. He further felt that this application went against policy BE5 regarding design and appearance and raised concerns regarding the loss of amenity, design and construction material and asked that this application be refused.

Mr E Pugh, a member of the public, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the development being in the conservation area, contrary to policy, misrepresentation of Historic England’s consultation response, no public benefit, the loss of trees, the development was not infil, the noise and odour within this rural location and he asked that this application be deferred or rejected.

Mrs C Lord and Mr J Doherty, members of the public spoke in favour of the application and expressed that this application did not go against policy, it was an infil plot not on agricultural land, it was three high quality well-designed houses that would support and sustain local services, there would be protection for the sandstone wall and it would prevent future larger development.

Mrs J Bleach, Applicant’s Agent spoke in favour of the application. She explained that a presentation had been made at the local Parish Council Meeting and members of the PEHE Group had not attended. The application was for three dwellings which would preclude any further development on this site. The sandstone wall would be returned to a good state of repair although on further examination the wall near to the access under the vegetation was currently rubble and this would be of great community benefit. The development would be screened by hedges and the houses would be designed to suite the local vernacular. This was an infil site and the public footpath would be subject to enhancement.

During the ensuing debate some Members felt that this application was within the rural area and as it was an extension to the village it was contrary to Policy HO10 and BE5, there were no exceptional circumstances as the houses were not affordable but detached houses on the edge of the village. Concerns were raised regarding the access and the narrow lanes which would be exacerbated by the additional traffic and lack of visibility. Further concerns were raised regarding the sandstone wall, the rights of way and the response from Historic England and that this was not an infil site. Other Members felt that HO10 was open to interpretation and this development was for only three detached houses and that these were within the village setting and essential to support the local shops and amenities, the access was acceptable and noise and odour was to be expected in the rural area. Other Members felt that this was an infil plot and as the development was approximately the same distance to each end of the road that there were no concerns and that the Secretary of State may

intervene with the decision in any event. Some Members asked if there could be either a passing bay or light up signage that could be put in place.

The Planning Officer explained to Members that a break in the wall was needed for the access and clarification of this had been undertaken on the site visit. Improvement works to the width would be undertaken with an increase from 3.4m to 4.5m which would be sufficient to allow cars to pass. The application would benefit local shops, pubs and businesses and there would be enhancements to the landscape and public rights of way.

The Highways Officer confirmed that light up signs, such as cattle crossing, were usually only housed on high speed roads and that there was unlikely to be any power for the signs in this area.

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

**RESOLVED – that in respect of Planning Applications TWC/2018/0744 that, subject to receiving confirmation from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government that the Secretary of State does not wish to determine the application, delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the conditions in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager) .**

The meeting ended at 8:44 pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....