

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> January 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 C. Turley), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, J Loveridge, N C Lowery, L A Murray, K Sahota (as substitute for S Reynolds) and P. Scott

**In Attendance:** V Hulme : Development Management Service Delivery Manager, A. Gittins – Area Team Planning Manager, M Turner – Area Team Planning Manager, S Drury - Principal Development Planning Officer, M Rowley - Principal Highways Engineer, T. Goffe - Highways Engineer, I Ross – Legal Advisor, M Farley – Democratic & Scrutiny Officer, K Wilde – Business Support Officer

#### **PC-057      Apologies for Absence**

Councillors C Turley and S Reynolds

#### **PC-058      Declarations of Interest**

In respect of planning application TWC/2018/0775  
Cllr N A Dugmore is member of the Parish Council.

#### **PC-059      Minutes**

**Resolved** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman

#### **PC-060      Deferred/Withdrawn Applications**

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager informed the Committee that, at request of Officers that consideration of planning application TWC/2018/1050 Site of Screenprint Centre, Dawley Road, Lawley Village, Telford, Shropshire be deferred.

**RESOLVED** – that determination of planning application TWC/2018/1050 be deferred for further consideration.

#### **PC-061      Site Visits**

**Resolved** – that a site visit will take place at 2:30pm on 20th February in respect of TWC/2018/0601 - Lawley Phases 5 & 9, Lawley, Telford, Shropshire

**PC- 062      Planning applications for determination**

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

This application sought permission for the erection of 1No. dwelling and 1No. ancillary workshop with associated access and landscaping works on land which has been historically used as private garden land for the property known as 'Bettisfield.'

This application has been considered previously at Planning Committee on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2018 and 14<sup>th</sup> November 2018 where it was deferred subject to amendments.

Cllr A Eade – Ward Councillor, spoke against this application. He raised concerns regarding the scale and design of the proposed application. He raised that the proposed application was not within the Newport boundary and was in fact in open countryside and therefore not in keeping with the setting.

Mrs Smith – applicant, spoke in favour of the application. She stated the main house proposed was a 5 bed house. The workshop would have an additional 2 bedrooms above solely to enable her disabled son to live there while still being close to his family. She felt the design would be sensitive to the environment and eco-friendly.

The Planning Manager advised members that the applicant had lodged an appeal against non-determination and that there had been no changes to previous proposals since heard. It was therefore recommended that members confirm how they would have determined the application had an appeal against non-determination not been lodged.

During the debate, some members raised concerns regarding the road and substandard access, the scale and appearance would be detrimental to the area, the narrow road was used by school children and may be unsafe and work vehicles may not have sufficient clearance.

Conversely, other members were in support of the application, took into account the independent report completed by MADE, felt there was no set type of house along the road in question, that the proposed location of the application would not stick out and that it was secluded from the road.

The Principal Highways Engineer explained that the access on Longford Road was narrow and the development was large in scale but traffic would not significantly increase. The access was 5m wide which is deemed acceptable.

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager explained that the exceptional quality or innovative design exception in policy HO10 was a subjective policy and, because of the potential for different views, was referred to MADE for assessment. MADE's report was based on quality and sustainability, not just appearance.

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

**RESOLVED: That in respect of Planning Application TWC/2017/0916 that 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 and update report along with the applicant/landowner entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement with the Council, terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager, relating to the occupancy of the living accommodation located within the proposed workshop being limited to the applicant's immediate family and that it shall not be let or sold as a separate unit of accommodation.**

**b) TWC/2018/0886 Former Shukers Garage, Holyhead Road, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 5DS**

This application sought permission for the change of use from a garage/car dealership to a Place of Worship and Community Hall (Use Class D1 'non-residential' institutions).

This application was called in by Ketley Parish Council.

Cllr S Thomas – Parish Council Representative, spoke against this application on behalf of the Parish Council. He raised concerns regarding access on the busy main road, volume of traffic, hours of use and the lack of formal agreement to use the car park opposite which may cause on road parking.

Cllr J Francis – Ward Councillor, also spoke against this application. She echoed the same concerns as Cllr S Thomas with the addition of noise and disturbance concerns within the residential area as a result of a lack of sound proofing. Leasing of the building for community functions may also exacerbate the parking, traffic and noise concerns.

Mr Rick Kaul – Applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He shared that the application was part of the All Nations group to encourage Christian worship. An independent noise survey was completed, with the outcome being in favour of the application. The imposed S106 agreement will be adhered to if permission were to be granted. There had not been any objections received from local businesses or residents. Local businesses had agreed to include their parking facilities within the application. The primary use of the building would be as a church, along with children's and youth work for the community.

The Principal Highways Engineer explained that 53 parking spaces would be provided which was in line with the standards in the Local Plan. There have been no objections regarding parking from Highways. Funding would be secured towards a traffic regulation order if required in the future.

During the debate, members spoke in favour of the application. It was raised that a new place of worship and community hall would be welcomed in the area and youth work was needed. It would be a positive if the space was utilised in this way. Conversely, if parking became an issue, there would be potential for on road parking

In response to a question about imposing double yellow lines from the outset, the Principal Highways Engineer explained that planning tests would need to be conducted to indicate a demonstrable problem before double yellow lines could be implemented.

Upon being put to vote, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED That in respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0886 that 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 and update report and subject to the applicant/landowner entering into a Section 106 legal agreement with the Council terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager relating to the imposition of an ongoing in perpetuity obligation to pay a £3,000 (together with indexation applicable to the contribution from the date of this committee resolution to the date of payment) in the event of on road parking restrictions becoming necessary in the future.**

**c) TWC/2018/0775 Annexe, 70 Wellington Road, Muxton, Telford, Shropshire**

This application sought retrospective permission for the building to become a separate dwelling and planning unit. Whilst permission was granted for the extension of the existing garage to a double garage with a room above, over time the applicant had made changes to the building to make the building a self-contained annexe, and now sublet as a separate dwelling. Planning permission had now been sought for this building as a separate planning unit, noting that the self-contained dwelling was currently unauthorised.

Cllr A Lawrence – Ward Councillor spoke in favour of this application. He stated that the dwelling was to enable students to stay and encourage an independent lifestyle. Previously, it was used for family use. The building and structure wouldn't be changed. The dwelling was subject to separate council tax. There would be no long term intention to sell or separate the annexe.

Mrs Swindley – Applicant spoke in favour of this application. She stated that the breeze block would be rendered. The annexe was subject to building regulations in 2017. Mrs Swindley believed the application did not constitute over development. Her intention was to use the annexe for the Shared Lives scheme in the future. This could not be achieved if permission for the annexe to be used as a separate dwelling was not granted.

The Planning Officer advised that no comments had been raised from neighbouring properties. Donnington Parish Council objected to this application as outlined within the report. There had been no highways objections. It was proposed by the applicant, to become a separate planning unit.

During the debate, some members shared views that the only change was a kitchen unit. The building already existed, if refused, the building would still remain. There was enough parking and sufficient amenity.

Other members felt that rules and regulations should be adhered to. There was no separate parking or garden and therefore the development would be unsuitable as a separate dwelling.

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

**RESOLVED:** That in respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0961 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to refuse full planning permission for the following reason:

**The proposal by reason of its inappropriate and prominent siting within the curtilage of an existing residential dwelling alongside the absence of any private amenity space, would be considered to cause fragmentation of the existing curtilage, resulting in an unfavourable and inappropriate intensification and subdivision of the site which would be out of keeping with the existing street pattern, contrary to Telford & Wrekin Local Plan Policies BE1 and SP4.**

**d) TWC/2018/0757 Land rear of Hadley Park House Hotel, Hadley Park East, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire**

This application sought permission for the erection of six industrial buildings (B1a, B1b or B1c uses class), together with associated access, landscaping and infrastructure. The buildings would either be occupied as 6 larger units, or subdivided into a maximum of 26 smaller units. The proposal provided a total of 5,828 sq metres (62,741 sq feet) of floor space.

16 objections had been received from the public, along with a Parish Council objection.

Mr J Brumwell – Parish Council representative spoke against this application on behalf of the Parish Council. He expressed concerns regarding the detrimental impact to the proposed setting. The development should be innovative and in keeping with the setting and natural heritage. Employment opportunities were welcome and the site would be supported if the design and layout was more imaginative and would enhance the landmark.

The Principal Development Planning Officer explained that there had been extensive consideration of the proposed plans. The application was supported by the transport assessment. A highways contribution would be secured. Highways had no objections. The units had been repositioned. Historic England were consulted and they were happy for the council Conservation Officer to give a recommendation.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns regarding the detrimental impact on the local listed buildings, although they appreciated the reduction of buildings within the plan. Past failures to control in previous years impacted on the area. More innovation and landscape was needed. To open up a view of Hadley Castle, trees would have to be removed.

Conversely, other members spoke favourably of the application and acknowledged the financial highways contribution.

Members debated whether a deferral would be beneficial in order to redesign the layout. The Principal Development Planning Officer explained that amendment attempts had already been made and the site has already been reduced; if it were any smaller it would not be viable. It was difficult to get a layout that would adhere to everything; as this was an allocated employment site, having considered many other factors on balance the scheme was acceptable. The current layout provided landscaping, and whilst additional landscaping could be considered a redesign could not.

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

**RESOLVED: That in respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0757 that 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 and update report along with the applicant/landowner entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement with the Council securing a financial highways contribution of £141,548.96 (together with indexation from the date of this committee resolution to the date of payment) terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager.**

**e) TWC/2018/0775 Land adjacent Building B8, MOD Donnington,  
Hortonwood 37, Hortonwood, Telford, Shropshire**

This application sought Full Planning Permission for the refurbishment of an existing portal framed building and erection of a new building to provide a new production facility, warehouse and distribution centre together with the

provision of associated storage and service yards, car and HGV parking, vehicular access and landscaping. The total development would comprise 31,075 sq. metres GFA.

An objection was received from the Parish Council. Previous permission was granted but had since expired. The application could be accommodated in line with highways regarding shift patterns and operating hours. A financial contribution would go towards highways improvement. The trees that were removed were not of high quality or Tree Preservation Order worthy.

There were no speakers for this application.

During the debate, some members stated they would welcome the application, although were disappointed that trees were removed prior to gaining permission. A member was conscious that the proposed application should not impact on the drainage work previously completed by Seven Trent Water. Some members felt the proposed financial contribution to highways would be helpful.

Upon being put to vote, it was unanimously:

**RESOLVED: That in respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0775 that 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 and update report and the landowner(s) entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Council and/or a Memorandum of Understanding (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to :**

- **Payment of a highways contribution of £64,455.33 (together with indexation from the date of this committee resolution to the date of payment)**
- **Payment of a monitoring contribution of £5,000 (together with indexation from the date of this committee resolution to the date of payment)**
- **An appropriately worded obligation restricting the numbers of vehicles permitted to enter and leave the site over a 24 hour period including specific restrictions during peak periods as required.**

The meeting ended at 7:56pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....