

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 26 September at 6.00pm in Meeting Rooms G3/G4, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford TF3 4NT

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

PC-026 Apologies for Absence

Councillor J Loveridge and N C Lowery

PC-027 Declarations of Interest

Cllr S J Reynolds declared an interest in planning application TWC/2018/0584 as he was a Member of Oakengates Town Council but had not taken part in any discussions or decisions in this regard.

PC-028 Minutes

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 5 September 2018 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

PC-029 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC-030 Site Visits

RESOLVED – that a site visit takes place at 4.00pm on Wednesday 24 October 2018 – TWC/2018/0658 - former Blessed Robert Johnson School.

PC-031 Planning Applications for Determination

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning application TWC/2017/0253.

(a) TWC/2017/0253 – Rushmoor Paddock, Rushmoor Lane, Bratton, Telford, Shropshire

This was a part retrospective application seeking a change of use from agricultural land to equestrian with the erection of replacement stable block and associated storage facilities, formation of a new vehicular access, formation of pond and the installation of a septic tank.

This application had been called in by Councillor J Seymour and a site visit had taken place on the afternoon prior to the meeting.

The Planning Officer informed the Members that there would need to be an additional condition to be added to the recommendation in relation to the easement on the public sewer on Rushmoor Lane.

Councillor N Evans spoke against the application on behalf of Wrockwardine Parish Council who, although they normally welcomed new business, raised concerns regarding the location, wet and boggy conditions, lack of grazing, drainage and surfaces and the viability of the business. The Parish Council raised further concerns regarding the national speed limit on the adjacent road.

Councillor J Seymour, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by Planning Committee. Although she would normally support an equestrian business she felt on this occasion she could not support the application due to the unsuitability of the site, the lack of grazing, the low lying land a boggy conditions, the validity of the business case and she asked that the buildings be removed.

Mr J Elgin, member of the public, spoke against the application due to the works being undertaken without planning permission and a Stop Notice being served. He considered the lease plan to be incorrect and confirmed that the water supply was from Lawn Farm but that it had never been intended to supply water to a business. Access was also granted from Lawn farm. He also raised concerns regarding the viability of the business and the ground conditions.

Mr A Sheldon, Applicant's Agent, spoke in support of the application and informed Members that this site had a well-established use as a stable. The work taking place was replacement of the existing stables and storage facilities to a high quality and had limited visual impact due to screening by the existing hedge. The proposal assisted the local economy and was compliant with policies. Issues regarding drainage and access could be conditioned and there were no technical reasons to refuse the application.

Some Members had visited the site and felt that this was an appropriate site for a rural business. The new access would be of benefit to the site and that the development created 2 local jobs. It was encouraging to see the significant drainage works which it was hoped would alleviate any future problems. Other Members reported that they had been unable to see all of the documents on the planning portal and didn't feel they were fully informed on the application and raised concerns regarding the water supply, the lack of grazing space and the business case.

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

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2017/0253 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the conditions in the update report and the additional condition in relation to the easement on the public sewer on Rushmoor Lane (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

(b) TWC/2018/0584 – Bush House, Mossey Green, Ketley Bank, Telford, Shropshire TF2 0DL

This was a part retrospective application for the siting of two steel container units to be clad with timber and a tile effect roof, erection of a gazebo and erection of a 2.4m high fence.

This application had been called in by Oakengates Town Council.

Councillor J Lavery spoke against the application on behalf of the Town Council. He raised concerns regarding the position of the container, the noise upon closing the containers and any work being undertaken in them, the disregard for the neighbours and the part retrospective application. He also felt that the containers lent themselves more to an industrial activity rather than residential.

Ms L Cooke, a member of the public, spoke against the application which had been placed in the garden at Bush House which impeded the view from the kitchen window of Rosevale. The containers were 40ft long and could be seen over the fences and blocked out the light. She also raised concerns regarding the fence, the noise from the containers and pest control which may become an issue with rodents using the container as a nesting place.

Mr C Beamond, Applicant, had taken on the suggestions from the previous speakers. He informed Members that a previous application in 2014 had been granted for a 2 storey house which would have been twice the height of the containers. There would be no noise from the containers as they were solely for the purpose of storing vehicles which were only likely to be used at weekends and no business use. The ground had been cleared for the installation of the containers which had made a positive impact on the local community.

During the ensuing debate some Members felt that the containers, although large and unsightly, would only be used to store classic cars, but also had sympathy with the neighbouring property and the impact that the container had. It was suggested that this may improve with the cladding in place and that this may also reduce the impact of the noise. It was noted that the gazebo had been moved and this was welcomed. Some Members made a suggestion that the container was moved back approximately half its width in order that the view of the neighbour at Rosevale was more acceptable and that this would also negate the need for the fence. Other Members felt it was important that as this was a retrospective consent that the conditions were strictly adhered to and enforced. A further suggestion was made that the application be granted permission on the grounds that the container be moved by half of its width further back from the view of the kitchen window at Rosevale and the cladding be undertaken and if the applicant did not agree to relocate the containers that the planning permission be refused.

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

RESOLVED – In respect of Planning Application TWC/2018/0584 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager:

a) subject to the applicant submitting amended plans showing the steel structures relocated to a position where they did not unduly impede the view from the kitchen window in the side elevation of Rosevale, to grant planning permission with reference to those amended plans and 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); or

b) if the applicant is unwilling to submit satisfactory amended plans for approval in accordance with “a)” above, to refuse planning permission due to impingement on the amenities of the neighbouring property Rosevale

The meeting ended at 6.56pm

Chair:

Date: