

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2015 at 6.00pm at The Place, Limes Walk, Oakengates, Telford**

**PRESENT:** Councillors J C Minor (Chair), N A Dugmore, E J Greenaway, J Loveridge, N C Lowery, P J Scott, M J Smith and C R Turley.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillors A J Eade (for Planning Applications TWC/2014/0434 and TWC/2014/0532), J M Seymour and R T Kiernan (for Planning Application TWC/2014/0113) and K T Blundell and W L Tomlinson (for Planning Application TWC/2014/0746)

#### **PC-009      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None

#### **PC-010      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

#### **PC-011      DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist reported that an Inspector's decision on an appeal against the refusal of planning permission for a housing development at Tibberton (TWC/2014/0236) had just been received. The Appeal decision had accepted that the Council now had a five year housing land supply. Another application for a housing development in Tibberton (TWC/2014/1080) was due to be considered at this meeting. However, it would be prudent to consider this application in the light of the Appeal decision, and therefore it was recommended that application TWC/2014/1080 we deferred to allow for the implications of the Appeal decision to be understood in relation to this application.

**RESOLVED** – that consideration of planning application TWC/2014/1080 be deferred to a future meeting.

#### **PC-012      SITE VISITS**

None

#### **PC-013      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 each planning application.

(a) TWC/2014/0434 - Land adjacent The Croft, Church Road, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire

This was an outline application for the erection of 6 dwellings and 2 bungalows, with all other matters reserved for consideration at a later stage via a separate application. The application site was currently agricultural land situated on the eastern edge of Lilleshall off Church Road. The application was approved by the Committee on 4 February 2015, subject to the applicants entering into a Section 106 Agreement. The application was being brought back to Committee because the Section 106 Agreement had not yet been signed and, in the meantime, the Council had announced that it had a five year housing land supply. The consequences of having a five year housing land supply was a new material consideration that required Members to review applications that had previously received consent but had not yet been "signed off". The original report that had been presented to the 4 February 2015 meeting was attached for information.

Following the announcement regarding housing land supply, the Council had re-consulted all interested parties and statutory consultees. All new comments and representations were summarised in the report. These included an objection from the newly constituted Lilleshall Parish Council and comments from Arriva Buses. 76 letters of objection had been received from local residents, the majority of which repeated the comments submitted previously when the application was first considered. Additional representations, from the applicant, applicant's agent and from a planning consultant representing local residents, had been received and were attached to an update report, which was tabled at the meeting.

Councillor J Taylor, member of Lilleshall Parish Council, addressed the Committee. The Parish Council had strong objections to this application and the separate application for the adjoining site (TWC/2014/0532), which would effectively form one development and have a significant detrimental impact on the village of Lilleshall. There had been 600 objections to both applications and only two letters in support. The village school was already full without more families coming to live in Lilleshall on top of the new housing already approved or under construction. Reference was made to the unsuitability of the local road network to deal with the additional traffic that this development would generate, and the hazards that pedestrians, cyclists and motorists would face. Arriva Buses had now raised concerns about the impact the construction of the development would have on Church Road, which could result in the loss of the village's direct bus service during the construction period.

Councillor A J Eade, Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee, and stated that this was inappropriate development on a greenfield site that might facilitate further incursion into the countryside and broke a centuries-old boundary to the village. There was no demonstrable need for this housing, and the development would significantly harm the character of the village. The site was opposite a Grade I listed church and would detract from its setting. The application was contrary to a number of Local Plan policies, particularly as Lilleshall was not one of those rural settlements identified for development in policy CS7. Policy OL6 regarding Open Land was also now being given the weight it deserved, and the Committee could now rightly refuse this application.

Ms J Lefroy addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents. There was no justifiable need for these houses, which would put further pressure on the local school and the local road network. There were few other facilities in the village and a further significant increase in population was unsustainable. The application was contrary to policies in the Local Plan, and would have a detrimental impact on the appearance and visual amenity of the village, including the Church. The local road network was narrow in places with pinch-points and no proper walkways/pavements for pedestrians. In addition, people attending events at the Church often parked along the road opposite to the entrance to the proposed development, and this would constitute a further hazard.

Ms L Roberts, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and argued that this would be a sustainable development in accordance with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to affordable housing, sustainability and the vitality and viability of rural communities. In the original application approved by the Committee, there had been no objections from any statutory consultees. There was no robust case for saying that the proposed development did not comply with policy OL6, and some of the statements in the latest Officer's report completely contradicted the initial report and did not form any sound basis to support alleged harm to character and appearance of the area. The applicants were still offering 3 affordable houses even though this was no longer a policy requirement, and there was no realistic chance of affordable housing being delivered in Lilleshall if this application was refused.

The Planning Officer advised that one of the key arguments in favour of the application when it was considered by Committee in February was that policies CS1, CS3 and CS7 were not considered up-to-date because at that time the Council could not demonstrate a five year housing land supply. This meant that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development. With the Council now having demonstrated a five year housing land supply, this argument now fell and the application could be considered on its merits applied against the Core Strategy policies. While it was considered that some of the issues raised by objectors to the scheme could be addressed by appropriate conditions, the application was contrary to a number of adopted policies and as such would be unacceptable in terms of its impact on the character and amenity of the area. Lilleshall was not identified in policy CS7 as a key settlement for development, and therefore this scheme would also be contrary to that policy. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Members were concerned at the comments from Arriva Buses, and the potential loss of the bus service because of the disruption that would be caused on Church Road. A number of Members reiterated some of the issues/concerns raised by local residents and Councillors. The application was contrary to a number of policies in the Local Plan, and Members were satisfied that full weight could now be given to those policies due to the material change in circumstances regarding the 5 year housing land supply.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0434 permission be refused for the following reason:

**The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposal is unacceptable as it is outside the settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Furthermore the development would result in an encroachment of built development into the open countryside that, at the scale proposed, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to adopted Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS3 and CS7 and saved Policy OL6 of the Wrekin Local Plan**

(b) TWC/2014/0532 – Land adjacent The Croft, Church Road, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire

This was an outline application for the erection of 12 dwellings and 2 bungalows, with all other matters reserved for consideration at a later stage via a separate application. The application site was currently agricultural land situated on the eastern edge of Lilleshall off Church Road. The application was approved by the Committee on 4 February 2015, subject to the applicants entering into a Section 106 Agreement. The application was being brought back to Committee because the Section 106 Agreement had not yet been signed and, in the meantime, the Council had announced that it had a five year housing land supply. The consequences of having a five year housing land supply was a new material consideration that required Members to review applications that had previously received consent but had not yet been “signed off”. The original report that had been presented to the 4 February 2015 meeting was attached for information.

Following the announcement regarding housing land supply, the Council had re-consulted all interested parties and statutory consultees. All new comments and representations were summarised in the report. These included an objection from the newly constituted Lilleshall Parish Council and comments from Arriva Buses. 76 letters of objection had been received from local residents, the majority of which repeated the comments submitted previously when the application was first considered. Additional representations, from the applicant, applicant’s agent and from a planning consultant representing local residents, had been received and were attached to an update report, which was tabled at the meeting.

Councillor J Taylor, member of Lilleshall Parish Council, addressed the Committee. The Parish Council had strong objections to this application and the separate application for the adjoining site, and many of her comments made earlier in the meeting in respect of TWC/2014/0434 applied also to this proposal. In addition, it was felt that the revised entrance to the site was very poorly situated on the steepest and narrowest part of Church Road approaching the brow of a hill. The development would place strain on an already overburdened sewerage system, and there was concern at the loss of an existing stone wall which should be conserved. The development would be on prime agricultural land on a sensitive green-field site. This development was not sustainable, would be harmful to the character of the site and village, and should be refused.

Councillor A J Eade, Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee, and stated that this was inappropriate development on a greenfield site that might facilitate further incursion into the countryside. Many of his comments made earlier in the meeting in respect of TWC/2014/0434 applied also to this proposal. The application

was contrary to a number of Local Plan policies, particularly as Lilleshall was not one of those rural settlements identified for development in policy CS7. In relation to the comments from the applicants regarding the site being promoted for housing within the emerging 'Shaping Places' Local Plan, this Plan was not yet an adopted policy and therefore no weight should be attached to it when determining this application.

Ms S Jones addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents. There was a need to protect green spaces and wildlife in and around Lilleshall for the benefit of current and future residents. This application was contrary to Local Plan policies, and there were no exceptional circumstances that could justify its approval. There would be a detrimental impact on the appearance and visual amenity of the village, and the possible diversion of the bus route would greatly affect elderly residents who relied on the bus service.

Ms L Roberts, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and argued that this would be a sustainable development in accordance with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to affordable housing, sustainability and the vitality and viability of rural communities. In the original application approved by the Committee, there had been no objections from any statutory consultees. There was no robust case to support the conclusions in the Planning Officer's report that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The applicants were still offering 5 affordable houses and significant financial contributions amounting to over £50,000. There was no realistic chance of affordable housing being delivered in Lilleshall if this application was refused. The highways concerns/issues could be satisfactorily addressed through conditions to any planning consent.

The Planning Officer advised that one of the key arguments in favour of the application when it was considered by Committee in February was that policies CS1, CS3 and CS7 were not considered up-to-date because at that time the Council could not demonstrate a five year housing land supply. This meant that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development. With the Council now having demonstrated a five year housing land supply, this argument now fell and the application could be considered on its merits applied against the Core Strategy policies. While it was considered that some of the issues raised by objectors to the scheme could be addressed by appropriate conditions, the application was contrary to a number of adopted policies and as such would be unacceptable in terms of its impact on the character and amenity of the area. Lilleshall was not identified in policy CS7 as a key settlement for development, and therefore this scheme would also be contrary to that policy. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Members were concerned at the comments from Arriva Buses, and the potential loss of the bus service because of the disruption that would be caused on Church Road. A number of Members reiterated some of the issues/concerns raised by local residents and Councillors. The application was contrary to a number of policies in the Local Plan, and Members were satisfied that full weight could now be given to those policies due to the material change in circumstances regarding the 5 year housing land supply.

**RESOLVED** – That with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0532 permission be refused for the following reason:

**The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposal is unacceptable as it is outside the settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Furthermore the development would result in an encroachment of built development into the open countryside that, at the scale proposed, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to adopted Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS3 and CS7 and saved Policy OL6 of the Wrekin Local Plan.**

(c) TWC/2014/0113 – Former British Sugar site, Allscott, Telford

This was a proposal seeking outline planning consent for a mixed use development at the former Sugar Beet Plant, Allscott comprising up to 470 dwellings (Use Class C3), a primary school (Use Class D1), a commercial area (Use Class B1), clinic and health centres (Use Class D1), retail units (Use Class A1), financial and professional services (Use Class A2), restaurant and cafes and/or hot food takeaways (Use Classes A3 and A5) with associated allotments, sport and recreational facilities, open space, biodiversity enhancement and access. All other matters were reserved for future consideration.

The outline application was approved by the Committee on 23 July 2014, subject to the applicants entering into a Section 106 Agreement. The application was being brought back to Committee because the Section 106 Agreement had not yet been signed and, in the meantime, the Council had announced that it had a five year housing land supply. The consequences of having a five year housing land supply was a new material consideration that required Members to review applications that had previously received consent but had not yet been “signed off”. The original report that had been presented to the 23 July 2014 meeting was attached for information.

Following the announcement regarding housing land supply, the Council had re-consulted all interested parties and statutory consultees. All new comments and representations were summarised in the report, although many consultees had simply referred to the comments they had made when the application was first considered in July 2014. Since the publication of the agenda, additional representations had been received from Little Wenlock Parish Council, Wrockwardine Parish Council, Allscott Sports and Social Club and a further 14 local representations in support of the application. These additional representations were summarised in an update report, which was tabled at the meeting. The majority of the additional comments relating to the technical constraints of the site had been considered in the original report.

Mr M Goldstraw, representing Wrockwardine Parish Council, stated that the Council had now identified sufficient land to meet the housing needs of the Borough, and there was no need for this development. Sustainability had not been adequately demonstrated in relation to transport and school provision, and he questioned the viability of the proposed doctors’ surgery, pharmacy and village shop. He also commented upon the quality of life in the rural area and the apparent extension of

urban development into the countryside. There were still significant concerns that the local highway infrastructure would not support the level or direction of traffic flow arising from this development, and the impact of the increased volumes of traffic that would be going through Wrockwardine and other hamlets nearby would not be mitigated by the measures proposed in the Section 106 Agreement and conditions.

Cllr J M Seymour, Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee, and referred to the size and scale of the development and the impact this would have on the local infrastructure, particularly the highways network. This would be compounded by the increase in traffic volumes arising from other new housing developments in the area. It was considered that a scaled down development covering the brownfield site of the former Sugar Beet factory itself might be acceptable. The areas of green-field/agricultural land that had been identified for development should be removed from the scheme, and consideration should be given to removing the primary school from the scheme and using that land for housing instead. The current proposal was contrary to national planning policy which stated that green-field sites should only be developed in exceptional circumstances.

Cllr R T Kiernan, adjoining Borough Ward Member, also felt that this application was superfluous to requirements now that a 5 year housing land supply was available. There would be an unacceptable impact on the local road network, particularly in the direction of Wellington. Many of these roads were narrow lanes totally unsuited to the extra volumes of traffic. There was already an increase in heavy goods commercial and agricultural traffic as a result of the increased size of the nearby potato storage facility, and there would be further traffic generated by other new housing developments in the adjoining area.

Ms S Boardman spoke on behalf of local residents who opposed the application on the grounds of sustainability and accessibility. This was too dense a development and was not sustainable in terms of accessibility to local services, secondary schools and employment. There was a lack of public transport in this rural location, and the overall result would be large numbers of vehicle journeys to and from the site on unsuitable single track lanes. Less than half the development site was on brownfield land, and it was felt that the applicants had been misleading in claiming this was primarily a brownfield site.

Mr P Starling, Chairman of the Allscott Sports & Social Club, spoke in favour of the application which he considered would positively transform the site and meet the growing demand for sports and recreational facilities for all age groups in the surrounding area. The application was supported by Sport England, and would provide first class recreational facilities for the local community. He welcomed the proposed traffic calming measures and the new employment opportunities that would be created.

Mr De Pol, the Applicant's Agent, reminded Members that the application had been approved previously, and that all the financial contributions in the proposed Section 106 Agreement had been accepted by the applicants. The application met national planning policy requirements, and the declaration of a five year housing land supply did not mean it should be refused. A lot of work and consultation had taken place to get an acceptable scheme, and there was no change in circumstances since the

application was previously accepted. The scheme would provide for the redevelopment of a large brownfield site that had been derelict and unused for 7 years. Only 3 acres of greenfield land would be used for housing, with the remainder constituting open space or community/sports facilities.

The Planning Officer advised Members on the principle of development on this site, and referred to the comments about the British Sugar site made by the Inspectorate when examining the Core Strategy. This suggested that the future of the site would have to be decided through the application of national planning policy. Even though the Council now had a 5 year land supply, the direction to consider this site against national policy still stood. The proposals would redevelop a brownfield site, would deliver improvements to the local transport infrastructure, a market for the business hub had been ascertained with the associated broadband element benefiting the whole site, it would provide employment opportunities and support the construction industry, provide financial revenue through Council Tax and Business Revenues, and provide a health care and a primary education facility. There would be improvements to the local highways network, and public transport links to Wellington. It was considered that the Masterplan was acceptable, including design codes and housing density, and that the overall scheme met the principles of a sustainable development. Therefore, it was considered that the application was in accordance with the presumption in the National Planning Policy Framework for sustainable development, and was recommended for approval.

During the course of the ensuing debate, views were expressed that this was a strategic site on largely brownfield land, which could not be compared to proposed housing developments in other parts of the Borough. The scheme would improve a currently ugly piece of derelict land, and would bring a considerable number of benefits to the local and wider community. There was no objection in principle from Wellington Town Council, and there had only been 22 letters of objection received during the most recent consultation. Other Members expressed concerns about the long term funding of facilities following the expiry of the Section 106 Agreement and the cost of transporting children to secondary schools in Wellington, the lack of a travel plan, the apparent lack of improvements to the immediate local road network to support a development of this size, and the proximity of the proposed school to the railway line. In response, the Planning Officer confirmed that the Section 106 Agreement included provision for a contribution of £3.9m for a new primary school and the transfer of the land to the Council. The Council was not being asked to contribute to the cost. There would be improvements to public transport to provide an hourly bus service to Wellington, and that the conditions of any planning consent would include improvements to the immediate highway network and traffic management schemes in the village of Wrockwardine and for Station Road, Admaston.

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

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0113, authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission subject to:**

**a) The applicants entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Council (terms to be agreed by the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management) that includes the provision of:**

- i. £3,900,000 towards onsite provisions of primary education facilities in addition to the transfer of land to the Council of no less than 1ha.**
- ii. £500,000 towards Public transport improvements, including secondary education transportation**
- iii. £137,100 towards a traffic signal junction improvement scheme at the B5061 Roman Road/Holyhead Road Junction.**
- iv. £99,920 towards a roundabout junction improvement scheme at A442/A5223/B5063 Shawbirch Roundabout.**
- v. £25,000 towards Public Rights of Way Improvements in the vicinity of the site.**
- vi. £10,000 for improved signage at Allscott Level Crossing**
- vii. £5,000 towards Travel Plan monitoring and support**
- viii. £5,000 towards Air Quality monitoring**
- ix. £20,000 towards planning and financial monitoring of planning conditions and section 106 (this is a maximum figure and may be changed if, in the opinion of the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management, such change is required)**
- x. 10% on site affordable housing**
- xi. Onsite NEAP facilities (with terms to cover the possibility of transfer to and adoption by the Council if required)**
- xii. Public open space / SuDS / Ecology park (with terms to cover the possibility of transfer to and adoption by the Council if required) where identified by applicant in accordance with the Councils Schedule of Rates**
- xiii. The ecology park**
- xiv. The Sports facilities and pitches including a community use agreement**
- xv. The allotments (with terms to cover the possibility of transfer to and adoption by the Council if required)**
- xvi. High speed broadband**
- xvii. A healthcare facility**

**b) the conditions as set out in the original report.**

(d) TWC/2014/0746 – Maxell Europe Ltd, Hortonwood, Telford

This was an outline application for the erection of a mixed use development comprising of up to 540no dwellings (Use Class C3), a local centre (Use Class A1), and public open space with associated access and landscaping following the demolition of the factory. All other matters were reserved at this stage. The site amounted to 24.57ha within the settlement of Apley Castle adjoining the junction of the A442 Queensway and Whitchurch Drive. Part of the site contained the large factory premises of Maxell who, having reduced the scale of their operations, had surrendered their lease and were re-locating. The current applicants had purchased the site with the intention of building a meat processing and abattoir facility, but following local opposition had sought an alternative location. The remainder of the site was in agricultural use, part of which was in the Green Network.

The outline application was approved by the Committee on 25 February 2015, subject to the applicants entering into a Section 106 Agreement. The application was being brought back to Committee because the Section 106 Agreement had not yet been signed and, in the meantime, the Council had announced that it had a five year housing land supply. The consequences of having a five year housing land supply was a new material consideration that required Members to review applications that had previously received consent but had not yet been issued. The original report that had been presented to the 25 February 2015 meeting was attached for information.

Following the announcement regarding housing land supply, the Council had re-consulted all interested parties and statutory consultees. All new comments and representations were summarised in the report. Since the publication of the agenda, the School Organisation team had looked at the application again in the light of the comments and queries raised by local Members and residents in relation to the capacity of local schools to accommodate this development. Their statement was produced in full on an update report that was circulated at the meeting.

Councillor K T Blundell, Borough Ward member, addressed the Committee. She felt it was wrong to describe this site as brownfield land, because much of it was within the Green Network. The proposed measures to mitigate against the impact of the development were not sufficient, and there was not the infrastructure in place to cope with a development of this size. Although the Schools Organisation Service were still insisting that there were sufficient school places in the immediate area, it was hard to see how the additional children from this and other developments in the school catchment areas could be accommodated. The local road network was already at capacity, and the extra vehicles arising from this development would have a serious adverse impact on access to the nearby Princess Royal Hospital. This was not a sustainable development, and should be refused in the light of the Council now having at least five years of housing land supply.

Councillor W L Tomlinson, adjoining Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee, and also highlighted the concern about the impact this development would have on the local roads network. The existing infrastructure was already struggling to cope, and improvements to the road capacity and network needed to be in place before this kind of development was considered. The possible future dualling of Whitchurch Drive to alleviate congestion might be compromised by

housing on this development being built too close to the road. He further questioned the assertion that there were sufficient school places in the area, taking into account other housing developments that would come forward. It was also felt that there should be a presumption against building on the Green Network.

Mr S Warner addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents and the Friends of Apley Woods. It was accepted that some development of the site was inevitable, but it needed to be sympathetic in order to minimise the impact on Apley Woods. It was considered that the density of housing proposed was too great, and there should be an extension to the buffer zone between the development and the Woods. The concerns about the local infrastructure being able to cope with this development were repeated, and there was no hard evidence that this scheme was sustainable. The situation had now changed with the housing land supply for up to 8 years being identified, and there was no demonstrable need for development of this scale on this site.

Ms K Else, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and stated that the viability of the scheme was not reliant upon the housing land supply situation. It was a suitable and sustainable location for housing on a site that had been identified as suitable for development in the emerging Local Plan. It was a sustainable development within the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework, and would deliver many significant improvements to the local community and the roads network.

The Planning Officer advised that while the Council had now identified a five year housing land supply, the application still had to be considered against paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This made it clear that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The original report attached to the agenda had examined the economic, social and environmental issues and concluded that the proposed mixed use of the site represented clear sustainable development. Technical issues such as Highways could be resolved through planning conditions and a Section 106 Agreement to ensure that contributions for necessary infrastructure and landscape and environmental enhancements, together with leisure facilities etc, were provided to the satisfaction of the Council. About one third of the site was in the designated Green Network, but this land was not accessible to the public and it was considered that the benefits of the proposal in terms of enhancing leisure and amenity provision and providing improved access to open space compensated for the loss of Green Network. In addition, the development would not have a detrimental impact in terms of Local Plan policies OL3 and OL4. Therefore, the proposal as a whole created a sustainable form of development consistent with local and national planning policy guidance, and was recommended for approval.

During the ensuing discussion, Members raised concerns regarding the impact of the development on the adjoining Apley Woods, the size of the development, amount of Green Network land that was being lost, and the impact the development would have on local infrastructure such as roads and schools. In relation to further questions about the capacity of the local road network, the Service Delivery Manager: Transport & Highway Development explained the transport model that had been applied based on current traffic flows and future predictions for known or potential

growth. The model had shown that the biggest impact would be on the Shawbirch Roundabout, and this could be improved as a result of the proposed development. It was recognised that the improvements to the local highway network could not be funded solely from planning contributions, and public funding was being sought via the Marches Local Enterprise Partnership for improvements to the wider network as part of an overall highways improvement strategy. The strategy included the A5223 corridor, and the proposed development on the Maxell site was being phased which would allow for time for the funding package to be secured.

Members acknowledged that the site was appropriate for some housing development, but were concerned about the scale of the proposal and its impact on the local infrastructure and the adjoining Apley Woods. There was concern at the loss of Green Network land, but acknowledgement of the potential of the area of the site that had been previously developed. The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist advised Members of the options open to them in reaching a decision, and the risks to the Council of any appeal by the applicants to a decision to refuse the application. If the Committee still had concerns about the scale of the development, it could ask Officers to go back to the developer for a view about a revised scheme to address some of the concerns that had been raised.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0746, determination be deferred to allow for further discussions with the applicant on the scale of the proposed development, and whether an alternative scheme, that would address the concerns of Members and local residents in relation to the extent of the loss of Green Network in order to reduce impacts on Apley Wood and Apley Pool, could be achieved.

**PC-014      URGENCY RESOLUTION – SECTION 100B(4), LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**

The Chair made the following statement:

“I am of the opinion that the following item of business should be dealt with as a matter of urgency at this meeting in order to avoid any unnecessary delay”.

**PC-015      PLANNING APPLICATION TWC/2015/0373 – TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST (VODAFONE), BROOKSIDE AVENUE, BROOKSIDE, TELFORD**

This was an application submitted under the terms of Part 16 (Communications) of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, whereby the principle of development was established and the application was to assess the siting and appearance of the development only. The application was for the erection of a 17.5m high monopole telecommunications mast and an additional equipment cabinet. The mast would replace an existing 12m high monopole mast and would be located approximately 3m to the east of the existing mast. The site was situated on a grass verge on the northern side of Brookside Avenue in a residential area.

Cllr A R H England had requested that the application be considered by the Committee, and a further five letters of objection had been received from local residents.

The Planning Officer reported that the operator considered it was necessary to increase the height of the monopole mast in order to retain and significantly improve the continued need for coverage and capacity (including 4G network). Concerns had been raised about the height of the proposed mast and the visual impact, but it was considered that the additional height would not cause any significant additional harm upon the character and appearance of the area or upon the visual amenities of nearby residents. The proposed cabinet would be narrower than the existing and of the same height. The application included a certificate to demonstrate that it complied with the necessary public health guidelines agreed by Central Government. The application was therefore recommended for prior approval and consent.

**RESOLVED – That with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0373, prior approval and consent be given subject to the conditions set out in the report.**

The meeting ended at 8.55pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....