PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 11 July at 6.00pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds, M J Smith and C R Turley

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors A. Lawrence (for planning application TWC/2012/0408) and J.M. Seymour (for planning applications TWC/2012/0261 and TWC/2012/0362).

PB-013 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on 20 June 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

PB-014 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

PB-015 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

TWC/2012/0031 and TWC/2012/0143 - Councillor I.T.W. Fletcher stated that in "green carding" these applications, his concerns had been recorded as formal objections in the report. He therefore indicated that he would leave the room during determination of these applications, but would first speak as Ward Member on behalf of local residents.

TWC/2012/0261 – Councillor C.R. Turley declared a personal interest as the Council's appointed representative to the Shropshire Hills AONB Steering Group.

TWC/2012/0408 – Councillor N.A. Dugmore declared a personal interest as a ward member and parish councillor, but had not taken part in any prior discussion on this application.

TWC/2012/0420 – Councillor S.A.W. Reynolds declared a personal interest as a ward member and parish councillor, but had not taken part in any prior discussion on this application.

TWC/2012/0145 – Councillor G.C.W. Reynolds declared a personal interest as a ward member and parish councillor, but had not taken part in any prior discussion on this application.

PB-016 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None

PB-017 SITE VISITS

RESOLVED –

(a) that site visits take place on 1st August 2012, relating to applications at Maynards Croft, Newport and for Residential Development at Wellington Road, Newport that are due to be considered by the Board at the next meeting.

(b) that the following applications be deferred for Site Visits to take place on 1 August 2012 (times to be advised by Planning Officers):

(i) TWC/2012/0031 – Land adjacent to The Shires, Shifnal Road, Priorslee, Telford
(ii) TWC/2012/0143 – Land at junction of Moss Road/Rookery Road, Wrockwardine Wood, Telford
(iii) TWC/2012/0362 – 4 Little Meadow Close, Admaston, Telford

PB-018 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Board and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning applications TWC/2012/0145, TWC/2012/0261, TWC/2012/0473, TWC/2012/0362 and TWC/2012/0391.

(a) TWC/2012/0031 - Land adjacent to, The Shires, Shifnal Road, Telford, Shropshire, 2 9NN

This was an application for the erection of six detached houses fronting Shifnal Road and a four storey care home to the rear of the site with new access and associated works.

Councillor I T W Fletcher, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

Councillor Fletcher (speaking as Ward Member) stated that local residents were satisfied with the housing element of the scheme, but considered the proposed four storey care home to be significant over-development of the site. There was concern that the application would exacerbate existing problems with poor drainage and sewerage in the area, and that there was no mains sewerage connection to the application site. He requested that Members undertake a site visit before determining the application.

It was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2012/0031 be deferred to allow the Board Members to make a site visit.

(b) TWC/2012/0034 - Stockton House Barns, Stockton, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9BA

This was an application for conversion of barns and former workshop to form one holiday let and five units for use within Class B1 (Business).

Councillor G Reynolds considered that the scheme was sympathetic and will assist keeping the building in a good state of repair.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0034 planning permission be granted, subject to the applicant entering into a s106 agreement for £7,000 towards highway improvements and subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(c) TWC/2012/0075 - Land off, Concorde, Dawley Bank, Telford, Shropshire, TF4 2QB

This application sought consent for change of use from scrubland to garden allotments. The proposals included creation of 200 raised bed allotments, erection of a secure boundary fence and gate, improved access with dropped kerb, disabled parking and a dry eco toilet container unit.

This application had been deferred at the meeting of the Board on 20 June 2012 to enable Members to undertake a site visit.

Mr D Harber, on behalf of the local Residents Association, spoke against the application on the grounds that there had been no detailed plans submitted for the layout of the allotments; that the "greenness" of the proposal was undermined by the replacement of top soil on a regular basis and the likely increased car usage as the vast majority of users did not live in Dawley Bank. Furthermore the Residents Association had alternative plans for the site that would benefit the wider local community as opposed to the small group of people who would be able to use the allotments.

The Planning Officer advised that while there was a separate general consultation on the wider use of land in the area, this application was specifically for a change of use to allotments. Only a small segment adjacent to the highway verge was designated as Green Network, and local policy gave a presumption in favour of community facilities which could be located on Green Network, therefore the principle of development was therefore considered acceptable. Consideration was also made by the officer in that the majority of the site was white land and as such not protected from other forms of development such as residential. Great Dawley Parish Council had not raised any objections, although there were some neighbour objections and 2 petitions against the application, as detailed in the report.

Councillor N.A. Dugmore expressed concern at some of the technical issues regarding the application, including the height of the compost bins, the proposed parking provision, removal of trees, and the security of the site; concerns were also raised with regard to the contamination of the site. In response, the Planning Officer advised that these details would be controlled by the proposed conditions to granting planning permission. The Board also reflect on a recent allotment application in Lilleshall which also had limited parking. Other Members welcomed the application

as an opportunity to tidy-up a scrubland site, and as providing a community facility that would encourage social interaction and sustainability, promoting Civic Pride.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0075 planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(d) TWC/2012/0143 - Land at junction of Moss Road/Rookery Road, Wrockwardine Wood, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 7BL

This was an application for the demolition of two dwellings (The Nyth and Erindale) and the erection of an 'L' shaped 2-3 storey block of 13 apartments with associated car parking and amenity area. An extant planning permission (W2010/0060) adjacent to the proposed apartment block which would share the proposed access.

Councillor I T W Fletcher, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

Councillor Fletcher (speaking as Ward member) stated that residents had raised a number of concerns about this application, including over-development of the site, the increase in the amount of traffic onto Moss Road (close to a bend) when combined with another adjacent development for more houses, and potential damage to a monkey puzzle tree on the site.

(Councillor Fletcher then withdrew from the meeting)

The Planning Officer advised that the scheme had been amended to take account of the monkey puzzle tree, and that any permission would be conditioned to ensure the tree was not adversely affected. In terms of highway safety, the Highways Engineer had not raised any objections in relation to increased traffic movements. The principle of residential development on this site was acceptable, and would provide a beneficial effect upon the appearance of a currently unmanaged site. The current building on the site was not listed, and therefore had no statutory or non-statutory protection.

Councillor S.A.W. Reynolds referred to the objections submitted by Wrockwardine Wood and Trench Parish Council, and also to the potential loss of the existing building on the site, which was one of the few historical properties in that area. Although the site was now run-down, it would be preferable to see a sympathetic reuse of the existing building for residential use rather than demolition.

It was then moved, seconded and

RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2012/0143 be deferred to allow the Board Members to make a site visit

(e) TWC/2012/0145 - Maddocks Sports & Social Club, Church Street, Oakengates, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 6BP

This was an application for the demolition of existing clubhouse and outbuildings and erection of a new clubhouse facility and bowling green with parking areas and 30 dwellings comprising 18 two- and three- bed houses and 12 two-bed apartments with new retaining walls, screen fencing and alterations to vehicular entrance to provide a new access road.

This application had been deferred at the meeting of the Board on 30 May 2012 to enable Members to undertake a site visit. An update report was tabled which referred to receipt of a 142 signature petition from members of the club and local residents in support of the re-development of the site. A further letter of objection (signed by 22 local residents) had been received, and was appended to the update report. There was also further Officer comment in response to the issues raised.

Mr D Tooth (representing local residents) spoke against the application, which he felt would have a detrimental impact on the neighbourhood. The sloping nature of the site and the proposed levels/gradients outlined for the development would cause significant overlooking and loss of privacy/light to existing properties in Station Fields and Church Street in addition to concerns over ground stability. These properties would also potentially be at risk of flooding from increased surface water run-off. The proposed scheme would result in increased traffic and congestion in the adjacent area, and there was concern that the number of car parking spaces associated with the new clubhouse would be insufficient.

Mr J Bradbury and Mr A Williams (on behalf of the applicants) spoke in favour of the application. The current club premises were outdated and not very secure; furthermore limited modernisation could occur within the exiting premises, and this proposal offered an opportunity for a new-build replacement with many facilities that would benefit the local community, along with improved landscaping and parking. A wide range of potential community uses of a new clubhouse building were listed. It was emphasised that the Club was not seeking to profit from this scheme, and had undertaken extensive consultation with the local community etc.

The Planning Officer reminded Members that this was an outline application to decide the principle of the redevelopment of the site, and that all matters in respect of siting, layout, design, appearance, boundary treatment and landscaping would be addressed at the reserved matters stage. However, a condition could be added to cover the use of audio equipment in the new clubhouse, as well as a condition to state that the layout plan was indicative only.

Councillor G Reynolds considered that the proposals brought forward improvements, however raised concerns over the indicative layout. Councillor Dugmore recognised that the principle of development had previously been established on the site, but considered the reserved matters application needed to take account of those properties along Station Fields, taking account of planting and possibility of bungalows in this location,

Members generally welcomed the proposals, but that the concerns and issues raised by local residents regarding the proposed layout and levels, drainage, access arrangements, slope stability etc. should be explored with the applicants during negotiations on the reserved matters. It was also suggested that the reserved matters application should be determined by the Board, and that delegated power be given to Officers to review the existing conditions in the light of the concerns raised.

RESOLVED –

(a) that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0145 outline planning permission be granted, subject to the developer entering into a Section 106 Agreement to provide 38% affordable housing of a mix and tenure to be confirmed by the Council's Strategic Housing Officer, financial contributions of £18,000 for recreational facilities in the local area, £69,828 towards education facilities in the vicinity and £10,000 towards highway improvements, and subject to the conditions as set out in the report and additional conditions to cover the use of audio equipment and to state that the layout plan is indicative only;

(b) that authority be delegated to the Development Manager to review the conditions attached to the report in the light of the issues raised.

(c) that the reserved matters planning applications for the site be determined by the Board.

(f) TWC/2012/0261 - Land off, Wrekin Course, Wellington Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This application had been deferred at the meeting of the Board on 20 June 2012 to enable Members to undertake a site visit. The application sought planning permission to construct a 40 space car parking area and hardstanding to site a mobile catering van, with provision of a footpath link leading to the track up to The Wrekin. The application further proposed to provide additional off-road parking and a pedestrian link to The Wrekin in order to avoid the dangers of pedestrians walking along the highway.

An update report was tabled which referred to two further letters of support from a local resident and from Wellington 21 Group. Wellington Civic Society had also reiterated their objections to the application. There was also further Officer comment in response to the issues raised.

Councillor J.M. Seymour (speaking as Ward Member) stated that the Wrekin was a significant visitor destination, and that many people wanted to park as close as possible to the hill and local trails. This application would address the current situation of haphazard parking along local lanes, and would also be a first step in potentially unlocking future funding for developing the Wrekin Forest project.

Councillor S Hutchison, representing Little Wenlock Parish Council, spoke against the application on the grounds that it would involve the loss of a green-field site, which would set a precedent for the local area. There were a number of concerns

relating to the operation of the proposed catering van, the management and security of the site, the enforcement of parking restrictions on the highway, and that the funding for this scheme had not yet been secured. It was felt that there was little local community support for the proposal, and that there had not been any meaningful consultation.

Mrs M Pietroni, Vice-Chair of the Local Access Forum spoke to support the application which she considered to be crucial to the strategic development of parking and rights of way between the Wrekin and the Telford Town Park. Priority needed to be given to developing opportunities for those with disabilities and limited mobility to access the countryside. This scheme would do that, and the car park would be properly landscaped. She did not agree that the local community was not behind this application, and stated a number of communities, schools, golf club and church which supported the scheme.

The Applicant, Mr P Holt, and his agent, Mr A Francis-Jones spoke to support the application. Mr Holt stated that the car park would give direct access to the Wrekin without the need for having to cross the road. It was felt that the Wrekin was one of Shropshire's most iconic landmarks, but that it was currently the poor relation in terms of facilities and parking. Mr Francis-Jones added that only a small area of the site would be tarmaced. This was a local voluntary-led project, and that the funding application to the Huntingdon Lane Mining community fund would be sought once planning permission was granted.

The Planning Officer referred to the photographs attached to the report, which showed examples of parking in the area on a recent Saturday and Sunday. At the site visit, Members had looked at the access points to the site, and discussed the issues of on-road parking. It was suggested that delegated powers be given to Officers to negotiate with the applicant and Highways regarding measures to prevent parking along the highway.

Members expressed the view that the application should be supported in terms of providing a safer environment for families and children visiting The Wrekin. The issue of controlling the hours of operation etc of the proposed catering van was raised, to which the Planning Officer stated that this was covered in the management plan for the site. Councillor S.A.W. Reynolds suggested that alternatives to yellow lines should be considered to deter parking on the adjacent highway, and the Chair suggested that the provision of wildlife noticeboards at the site could be negotiated with the applicant.

RESOLVED –

(a) that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0261 planning permission be granted, subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to provide contributions towards a Traffic Regulation Order, and subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(b) that authority be delegated to the Development Management Manager to negotiate with the applicant and highways officers regarding alternative

measures for the parking restrictions on the existing highway and the provision of noticeboards.

(g) TWC/2012/0362 - 4 Little Meadow Close, Admaston, Telford, Shropshire, TF5 0DN

This was an application for the erection of a two-storey, detached hipped roof dwelling with a two storey side extension, conversion and alterations of garage to as study and extension to porch. The extension would provide the dwelling with a bedroom and ensuite on both the ground and first floors. The Planning Officer referred to an update report that had been tabled. This set out some additional neighbour comments, along with clarification on permitted development rights and the distances between the proposed extension and neighbouring boundaries. The Council's Enforcement Officer had confirmed that the property was not being used for business purposes, and the Planning Officer confirmed that the application was specifically a household extension with no business aspects.

Councillor J.M. Seymour (Ward Councillor) spoke on behalf of local residents against the application. The proposed two storey side extension would have a significant impact in terms of overlooking and loss of light to the neighbouring property. Many local residents believed that a business was operating from the property contrary to the covenant on the property, and that there were three different households currently living there. She requested that Members undertake a site visit before determining the application.

It was then moved, seconded and

RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2012/0362 be deferred to allow the Board Members to make a site visit

(h) TWC/2012/0391 - Unit 6, Telford Bridge Retail Park, Old Park, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 4PB

This proposal sought planning permission for the erection of a mezzanine floor to replace an existing mezzanine, thereby increasing floor space by 312sqm. The final proposed floor area would be 1,104 sqm.

The Planning Officer referred to an update report which had been tabled. This expanded further on the policy considerations in relation to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Central Telford Area Action Plan. It was considered that the extension of this unit would complement rather than compete with the retail offer in the town centre shopping area. The application was a small increase in the floor space above the permitted development allowance and would not impact on the viability and vitality of the town centre. The policies within CTAAP requested contributions towards transport improvements within Central Telford, and as such the applicant had agreed to provide the requested contribution.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0391 authority be delegated to the Manager of Development Management to grant planning permission, subject to the applicants entering into a Section 106

Agreement relating to financial contributions towards strategic highway infrastructure, and subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(i) TWC/2012/0408 - Land off Meadow Road, Marshbrook Way, Muxton, Telford, Shropshire

This was a reserved matters application for the erection of twelve dwellings on site, with matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for consideration.

Councillor A Lawrence, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

Councillor Lawrence (speaking as Ward Member on behalf of the residents of Meadow Road) raised concerns regarding the proposed access point off Meadow Road. This was a small cul-de-sac with difficult access, and it was felt that the only access point should be from Marshbrook Way, which was a more substantial road. However, the access point off Marshbrook Way should be moved to a better location. It was also considered that 12 dwellings were too many for this site.

Mr I Cox, from Bromford Housing Group (the applicant), and Mr J Chipeta, the Applicant's Agent, spoke to support the application. It was contended that the scheme would be a positive development for the area, and provide much needed affordable housing. The proposed access arrangements to the site were considered to be adequate, with the new turning head for Meadow Road providing benefit to existing residents and improving the current road network. The concerns of local residents had been taken on board, and any disruption from the development would be minimised.

During consideration of the application, Councillor N.A. Dugmore expressed concern at the access point to the proposed development from Marshbrook Way, which was located at a point where queues built up at busy times from the nearby junction with Donnington Wood Way. A proposal to defer the application for a site visit was moved and seconded, and upon being put to the vote was lost.

The Planning Officer reported that the Highways Officer had not raised any concerns in principle to the proposed access arrangements. The scheme would improve pedestrian linkages within the area; it was not a high density development; and there would be screening between the development and Meadow Road.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0408 planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(j) TWC/2012/0420 - 80 Wombridge Road, Wrockwardine Wood, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 6QG

This retrospective application sought change of use from garage to dog grooming business.

Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council had requested that the application be determined by the Plans Board.

A local resident, Mrs A Griffiths, spoke in support of the application. She stated that it was a well run business, and not overly visible or noticeable from neighbouring properties. Customers parked directly outside the property, and there were no problems with driveways being blocked etc. It was noted that all the objections to the application had been submitted anonymously.

The Planning Officer reported that neither Enforcement Officers nor Environmental Health Officers had received any complaints about the operation of the dog grooming business from the premises. The proposed use of the garage was a relatively low-key development, and the hours of operation etc would be conditioned.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0420 planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(k) TWC/2012/0471 - Telford Town Park, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 4AQ

This proposal was for a landscaping scheme incorporating lighting and play equipment in association with the new visitor centre in Telford Town Park.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0471 planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(l) W2008/0473 - Former Dale End Garage, Dale Road, Coalbrookdale, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for the erection of ten dwellings comprising 6 two-bedroom apartments and 4 dwellings with associated works and access.

This application had been deferred at the meetings of the Board on 11 June 2008 and 2 July 2008 to resolve the issues with regard to flooding and the Environment Agency. The application was subsequently presented to the Board on 20 June 2012 and deferred to enable Members to undertake a site visit.

Mr J Parnell, a neighbouring resident, spoke to oppose the application. His main concern was the proposed three storey block of apartments that was to be built on a raised plinth. This would make the building equivalent to four storeys, which would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties and be out of keeping with the character of the local area. Photographs illustrating the potential impact had been circulated in an update report. It was also considered that there was insufficient parking provision for the development, which would lead to more on-street parking and add to the existing highways/traffic problems on Dale Road. It was further suggested that any development should be conditional on the workshop on the site also being developed.

The Planning Officer advised that this was an important “gateway” site at the entrance to the Gorge. It was currently derelict, and in need of some form of development. The applicant had reduced the number of proposed dwellings from twelve to ten, and at the site visit Members had been able to see the site levels and heights of adjacent existing buildings viewed at different vantage points. A number of flood mitigation measures had been carried out, one of which had been the necessity to raise the level of the proposed buildings. In respect of highways issues, it was felt on balance that one parking space per unit was sufficient, given the proximity of nearby car-parks and bus routes.

Councillor Dugmore recognised that due to the historic nature of Ironbridge the area was less car friendly, which is accepted by any potential resident; considering that the proposal was therefore in keeping with this environment He also considered the need for protection against the culvert, and projecting the residential amenities of existing residents in particular to the rear of the site.

Councillor G Reynolds stated the site as existing detracted from the area, and the proposed development reflected the adjacent development.

Members felt from viewing the site that the scheme had taken care to reflect the architecture of the adjacent site and did not harm other amenities. The re-development of this site was badly needed, and it was recognised that a lot of work had taken place with the applicant and the Environment Agency to address the concerns about flooding. It was suggested, however, that the culvert at the rear of the site should be properly fenced off.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application W/2008/0473 authority be granted to the Development Management Manager to grant planning permission, subject to further information relating to retaining structures on site, any further drainage conditions and a Section 106 contribution of £600 per 2 bed unit or above towards the provision of off-site leisure and recreation facilities, and subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 8.45 pm

Chairman: .....

Date: .....

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

PLANS BOARD

1st August 2012

Schedule 1 - Planning applications for determination by Board

TWC/2011/0821 Land At, Wellington Road, Newport, Shropshire
Outline application for proposed new housing, open space/playing field and associated works.....3

TWC/2011/0959 Isombridge Farm, Isombridge, Shropshire, TF6 6NF
Conversion of 2no. redundant agricultural buildings to a combined live/work unit 69

TWC/2012/0031 Land adjacent to, The Shires, Shifnal Road, Telford, Shropshire, 2 9NN
Erection of six detached houses fronting Shifnal Road and a four storey care home to the rear of the site, with new access and associated works 78

TWC/2012/0053 North Lynn Manor, Lynn, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9BB Erection of a 20kw wind turbine on a 20m high tower *****ADDITIONAL NOISE ASSESSMENT RECIEVED*** 93**

TWC/2012/0143 Land at junction of Moss Road/Rookery Road, Wrockwardine Wood, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 7BL
Demolition of 2no. dwellings (The Nyth and Erindale) and erection of a block of 13 apartments with associated car parking and amenity area 111

TWC/2012/0211 Land To The Rear Of, Maynards Croft, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 7SZ
Residential development comprising the demolition of a detached house (No.25) and erection of 34no. dwellings and garages, served off a new estate road with associated parking, drainage, sewage pumping facility, landscaping and associated accommodation works *****AMENDED PLANS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RECEIVED***.....121**

TWC/2012/0240 Land at, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire
Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 103no. new dwellings (Use class C3) and 50no. extra care housing units (Use class C2), Provision of 2no. new access roads and associated drainage, open space and landscaping ***Amended Parameter Plans* 157**

TWC/2012/0355 W Davies & Sons, Mill Lane, Kynnersley, Newport, Shropshire, TF6 6DY
Demolition of existing factory and redevelopment of 3no. detached houses with detached double garages *****Amended plans received***.....201**

TWC/2012/0358 Land between 44 & 45 Sandbrook, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire
Erection of 2no. bungalows.....210
TWC/2012/0395 The Acorns, Donnerville Gardens, Admaston, Telford, Shropshire, TF5 0DE
Erection of 7 no. new houses with garages and construction of a new access off Sweet Chariot Way following the demolition of The Acorns 217
TWC/2012/0420 80 Wombridge Road, Wrockwardine Wood, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 6QG
Change of use from garage to dog grooming business (retrospective) 224
TWC/2012/0423 9 Bayswater Close, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9GY Proposed two storey front extension and the conversion of the loft in to habitable space 230
TWC/2012/0472 Southwater Square, Southwater Way, Telford Town Centre, Telford, Shropshire
Erection of a mixed use building incoporating First Point (A2), Library (D1), restaurants and cafes (A3) and flexible office space (A2 & B1) for a range of community, voluntary or public sector uses and associated public realm (Reserved Matters Application).....235
TWC/2012/0362 4 Little Meadow Close, Admaston, Telford, Shropshire, TF5 0DN
Erection of a 2no. storey side extension and garage conversion 249

TWC/2011/0821 Land At, Wellington Road, Newport, Shropshire
Outline application for proposed new housing, open space/playing field and associated works

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
HDD Newport Ltd	30/09/2011

PARISH	**WARD**
Church Aston, Newport	Church Aston and Lilleshall, Newport West

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES:

Housing need and supply in Newport, affordable housing provision, the principle of development in this location, highway and traffic issues, surface and foul water drainage, infrastructure issues, open space provision, ecology and noise.

THE PROPOSAL:

This is an outline application with all matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) being "reserved matters" for consideration at a later stage, via a separate application(s). However, as required with such applications some key parameters for the proposed development are provided in relation to land use, access and movement, density and scale which are shown on 4 parameter plans included in the Design and Access Statement.

The application is applying for permission for approximately 285 houses, open space provision (including an informal kick about area and associated works) on land between Wellington Road and Moorfield Lane on the southern edge of Newport. The application area excludes land around an existing residence called Aston Grove that also lies between these two roads. The access to Aston Grove splits the application site into two parcels of land, with the northern part being substantially larger than the southern half.

The residential element of the proposal is approximately 8 hectares of the 10.36 hectare site. Overall the density of the residential element would be around 35 dwellings per hectare. Within the site, the southern parcel and the northern and western fringes of the northern parcel, a lower density of 25-35 dwellings per hectare would be built; whereas in the central and eastern part of the northern parcel the density would be higher at 35-45 dwellings per hectare. Dwellings would range in size from 2 to 2.5 storeys in height with the latter being located in the north eastern and central part of the northern parcel.

The applicant has stated an aim to meet TWC's Core Strategy policy requirement for 35% of the total homes being affordable units. This would be a mixture of 2, 3 and 4 bed houses that would be 'pepper-potted' throughout

the development. Across the affordable housing provision the applicant has indicated a proposed split of 75% rented and 25% shared ownership.

The applicant has stated that, subject to permissions being granted, the first dwellings could be delivered by mid 2013 with annual build rates of approximately 30 units per annum subject to market conditions. On the basis of this timeline the development could be completed by around 2022.

The proposals include a total of approximately 2.2 hectares of open space provided throughout the development (excluding swales and basins), the majority of which would be an area of approximately 1.9 hectares in the north-eastern corner of the site within which the applicant proposes to provide an informal kickabout area, public open space, Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP) and Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) for use by the proposed and existing community. The applicant had originally indicated that the informal kickabout area could be developed as a sports pitch for use by the adjacent Moorfield Primary and Newport High Girls Schools, but the schools have since indicated to the applicant that they do not consider that it would be practical for the schools to use a facility shared with the community. The open space area would also contain swales and balancing ponds as part of a wider Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS). A small parking area of 10 - 15 spaces is illustrated for use of the open space area. Smaller areas of open space and landscaping would be provided through other parts of the development incorporating existing landscape features (hedges and trees).

Vehicular access would be from two new accesses off Wellington Road; one serving the larger northern parcel above the existing Aston Grove access and one serving the southern parcel. Additional pedestrian/cycle access into the site would be provided to both Moorfield Lane and Wellington Road, with the existing public right of way in the north eastern corner of the site following a slightly altered alignment due to a SUDS attenuation feature. It would also be hard-surfaced.

The application has been submitted with the following documents in support of the proposals:

- Planning Statement;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Various plans and drawings including an Indicative Site Masterplan;
- Transport Assessment and General Arrangement plans of the proposed

Accesses;

- Travel Plan;
- Phase I Land Contamination / Geo-technical study;
- Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy;
- An extended Phase I Habitat survey;
- Habitats Regulations Assessment screening opinion;
- Ecological surveys of bats, badgers and great crested newts (amended);

- Landscape and Tree Constraints report;
- Landscape Masterplan;
- BS5827 Tree Survey;
- Statement of Community Involvement;
- Utilities Supply Summary note;
- Environmental Noise Assessment;
- Sustainability Statement; and
- Heads of terms of a legal agreement;

Prior to submission, the applicant engaged in pre-application discussions with Council Officers through a Strategic Application Workshop meeting. There has been engagement with the local community on the proposals with the outcome of this exercise being highlighted in the Statement of Community Involvement included as part of the application.

Whilst this report concerns the application at Wellington Road, the attention of Plans Board is drawn to the fact that this application is one of four applications submitted to the Council which are seeking consent for residential development in and around Newport. In addition to the Wellington Road site, these are as follows:

- Outline application for up to 215 dwellings north of Audley Avenue (TWC/2011/0821);
- Outline application for up to 350 dwellings north and south of Station Road (TWC/2011/0871) as part of a mixed use development; and
- Full application for 34 houses at land to rear of Maynards Croft (TWC/2012/0211).

The location of all four applications is shown on a plan at the end of this report.

In analysing the housing need and supply situation in the Newport area this report will consider the wider implications of all the residential applications and the cumulative effects of the proposed developments in relation to provision of physical and social community infrastructure. In responding to these applications both Highways and Education consultations have likewise considered the cumulative effect of the number of dwellings proposed should permission be granted.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site is located within the boundary of Newport Town Council. Church Aston Parish borders the site to the west, south and part of the east, with the village of Church Aston also being in this direction. Newport town centre lies approximately 1km to the north.

The application site extends to 10.36 hectares of agricultural land between Wellington Road and Moorfield Lane (excluding land around an existing residence called Aston Grove). The access to Aston Grove splits the

application into two parcels, with the northern parcel being substantially larger than the southern half.

The boundaries of the site are well defined and contained by existing development and roads. An existing hedgerow defines the site's northern boundary beyond which is a modern residential development of detached or link-detached houses served
off cul-de-sac. Moorfield Brook on the north eastern boundary separates the site from the grounds of Moorfield Primary School and Newport High Girls School beyond. A public footpath running parallel to the brook links Wellington Road with a footpath to the rear of The Larches (a residential cull de sac).

The site's eastern boundary is formed by Wellington Road, beyond which are residential streets of varied character, age and style. Wellington Road is the primary road leading in and out of Newport to the south in the direction of Telford, along which the 481 bus service (Telford to Stafford) runs.

The site's western boundary is formed by the narrow Moorfield Lane and by the existing buildings and land at Aston Grove. Aston Grove is served by an access from Wellington Road which runs east-west through the application site. To the west of Moorfield Lane lies open countryside.

The topography of the site is such that the land slopes generally down from the south to the north-east where the boundary meets the Moorfield Brook.

PLANNING HISTORY:

The site has no recent planning history relevant to current local or national planning policy. Part of the site was subject of an outline planning application (W89/0400) in 1989 for residential development that was refused.

The application site was included in the Telford and Wrekin Land Allocations Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report of September 2005 as a Housing Allocations site with a potential capacity of 330 dwellings to be delivered during 2011-2016, although this included land at Aston Grove which does not form part of this application. However, the Land Allocations DPD has not progressed beyond the Preferred Options stage.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
National Planning Policy Framework

Saved Wrekin Local Plan policies
Policy NR6 – Waste Disposal and Recycling facilities
Policy UD2 – Design Criteria
Policy UD5 – Public Art
Policy H10 – Scale of new development
Policy H22 - Community Facilities
Policy H23 – Affordable Housing
Policy T22 – Planning Obligations

Policy OL12 – Open Land and Landscape – contributions from new development
Policy OL13 – Maintenance of Open Space
Policy LR4 - Outdoor recreational Open Space
Policy LR6 – Developer contributions to outdoor recreation open space provision within new residential developments

LDF Core Strategy policies
Policy CS1 – Homes
Policy CS6 – Newport
Policy CS7 – Rural Area
Policy CS9 – Accessibility and Social Inclusion
Policy CS10 – Community Facilities
Policy CS12 – Natural Environment
Policy CS13 – Environmental Resources
Policy CS14 – Cultural, Historic and Built Environment
Policy CS15 – Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

For all consultation responses received by the Development Management Team the following text below represents a summary of the salient points made in relation to the application. Full versions of all consultation responses can be viewed by Members of the Plans Board via the Council's eplanning system.

<u>Internal consultations from within Telford and Wrekin Council</u>

TWC Highways Engineers
In acknowledgement of the number of major planning applications currently being considered by the LPA in and around Newport, the Council's Highways Engineers are concerned that the cumulative impact on the local highway network, should these developments all receive planning consent, will be such as to cause capacity and safety issues on parts of the strategic highway network.

In light of this the Highway Authority (the body with responsibility for the strategic highway network) has carried out an assessment of the cumulative impact, based on the background counts carried out in support of the developments and on the distribution of development trips put forward by each highway consultant for their respective developments.

Plans have been produced that indicate the scale of works necessary to accommodate all the developments and this involves junction capacity improvements along certain points on the A518 and A41 bypass and the widening/dualling of the A518 carriageway between Station Road and the A41. The works have been costed and the cost to each development has been apportioned based on the level of impact derived from the trip distributions.

These monies would be secured through a suitably worded Section 106 agreement with the works delivered at appropriate trigger points based on phasing of development. In terms of this application the proportional impact will require a contribution of £228,953.

Physical works that have been identified for access are not included and will need to
be delivered by the relevant development under Section 278 Agreement.

The developer has considered the proximity of public transport provision but has not
offered any particular enhancements. At this time the frequent 481 service (Telford to Stafford) bypasses the site and the nearest stops are at least 500m from the centre of the site. The existing local service only runs four times a day through the middle of the day on a one way loop.

In conjunction with other developments it is felt that the level of local service provision could and should be enhanced along with the associated infrastructure.
This would encourage sustainable travel around the town and would provide linkages between residential, retail and employment areas.

The total level of development proposed will take a number of years to completely
build out. To ensure the enhanced services are still running at that time it is proposed to pool all the bus subsidies.

The development will need to provide a subsidy of £120,000. Infrastructure such as
bus shelters and bus boarder kerbs will be additional to this with £20,000 on the basis of four stops on or in the vicinity to Wellington Road/Greenvale/Dark Lane. The Passenger Transport Team would procure the service and would agree the timetable.

The supporting documentation references the footway and cycleway linkages between the site and the rest of Newport (and particularly the key facilities such as
shops, schools etc). The proposal impacts on the existing public right of way that
cross the north east corner of the site. It is proposed to accommodate this within an
area of public open space. Beyond this point the PROW provides linkages into the
estates and facilities to the north. This particular route requires some improvement if
it is to be utilised as envisaged by the Applicant and a contribution of £27,000 will be
required to upgrade the off-site sections.

As the application is in outline, conditions should include:

- Details of site layout in connection with roads, footpaths, cycleway, parking, street lighting and furniture and drainage etc and their construction;
- Provision of the new site access priority junctions and widening of the site frontage footway to Wellington Road;
- Requirement for a new traffic management gateway feature on Wellington Road, in the vicinity of Moorfield Lane and Greenvale and to include the extension of the 30mph zone prior to occupation of houses; and
- Details of a Travel Plan for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing.

TWC Drainage Engineers
Support subject to conditions. As previously highlighted by TWC and the Environment Agency, there are known flooding and capacity issues associated with the Moorfield Brook. For this reason either betterment in runoff rates or improvements to the channel to provide increased attenuation should be included within the development proposals.

The Flood Risk Assessment has identified possible increased risk of flooding from the Severn Trent Water foul sewer network as a result of the additional flows produced by the development. Although there is the potential for future improvements to the STW network, there is no guarantee that these works will be carried out. Details are therefore required on how these affects will be mitigated until such time that the works are carried out.

Relevant conditions should be attached to ensure issues are addressed plus a condition relating to the details of the pedestrian bridge over the brook between site and Moorfield Primary School.

TWC Geotechnical Engineers
Support subject to conditions. The site is affected by high ground water levels. This must be considered when designing the foundations and BRE Protocol 1 must be followed especially in relation to high ground water.

TWC Parks and Open Spaces (P & OS) Officer
The development proposes a number of properties which will contribute to the need of recreational facilities for the area.

The Council's records indicate there are sufficient formal sports pitches (i.e. club use pitch) in the area (with requirements occasionally necessary on existing facilities to change allocations of use from senior to junior and vice versa to meet current demand) to serve the local community now and in the future. P & OS have not requested a formal sports pitch but an informal kick about area which could be utilised by the school should they wish. In regards to the applicants agents subsequent letter of the 2nd February I can confirm that P & OS agree to the amendment of the sports pitch becoming an informal area to better meet the needs of the community.

Consider this development proposal meets the need for play and recreation arising from the development in accordance with WLP Policies LR4 (Outdoor recreational open space) and LR6 (Developer contributions to outdoor recreation open space provision within new residential developments).

The detail of the design of these open spaces / play provision will need to be agreed particularly as it is proposed by the developer that the council adopt these open space areas and in relation of the safety of children using play facilities next to attenuation basins / swales. There are a number of issues arising out of the current proposed design in which P & OS would wish to clarify; not least whether sufficient commuted sum monies for maintenance have been set aside by the developer for the adoption by the Council given the high spec design and proposed management regime. P & OS also have concerns relating to the adoption of swales and attenuation basins which have proved difficult to adopt in the past (primarily due to the cost of maintenance).

As such the following is required:

- Condition relating to the approval of open space / landscape detail by TWC (P & OS) prior to starting development to ensure appropriate landscape design.
- Condition relating to confirmation of the timing of implementation of the Public Open Space - POS (completion in 1st phase before start of 2nd phase). This is important to agree as we would normally request a condition relating to no overlooking housing being sold prior to the POS being built which would not be necessary if timing is as proposed.
- Condition relating to the requirement of a Landscape Management Plan (identifying the proposed ownership / management and maintenance responsibilities for after implementation to ensure continued use of the public open space and provided in association with the landscape detail.
- A Section 106 relating to the future adoption by the council of the open space is agreed prior to the start of development (and not prior to submission of the detailed application / reserved matters). The reason for this is that accurate commuted sum costs for maintenance cannot be accurately provided based on illustrative drawings.

TWC Housing Policy & Enabling Officer
Has supplied a joint Affordable housing needs in Newport report in light of the three large planning applications in Newport. The need for 35% affordable housing in Newport is supported by information from the following sources:

- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)
- Telford & Wrekin's Choice Based Lettings scheme
- 2005 housing needs summary
- A profile of the existing affordable housing stock
- A profile of the current housing market
- A profile of the population of Newport

This information supports the need for a high level of affordable housing

provision in Newport, and shows that this need has increased over the last decade. The rise in property prices, together with consistently low incomes and difficulty in obtaining mortgages even when house prices have fallen, has led to the current situation where local people, particularly young couples and families have left the town to find accommodation elsewhere or remain in overcrowded and unsuitable accommodation. There are also many older people who need alternative accommodation.

In particular the SHMA, updated in 2009, showed that 124 dwellings are required each year over a twenty year period to meet the needs of Newport residents. This is considerably higher than the need shown in the 2005 housing needs summary and takes into account the lack of suitable existing provision and the backlog need.

Data from the Choice Based Lettings scheme shows a high level of bids for properties in Newport from local residents as well as applicants from a wider area. An analysis of bids over the last five years shows that the greatest need for local people is for three-bedroom houses and two-bedroom bungalows for rent, with lesser degree of need for two and four-bedroom houses for rent. In terms of tenure, the evidence points to a need for mostly rented accommodation with very little evidence of local demand for shared ownership.

Data regarding the existing social housing stock shows that there are very few two and four-bedroom houses, and only one of each has become available in the last twelve months. Although there is a higher number of three-bedroom houses, the waiting time for these is seventeen months with only three having become available in the last twelve months.

Local Estate Agents have confirmed that the “lower end” of the housing market in Newport is not moving. There are several properties which, despite a reduced asking price, are not selling, largely due to the difficulties in obtaining mortgages and the level of deposit required. Estate Agents do however receive a high level of demand for rented accommodation particularly from young families who wish to remain in Newport.

Data regarding the population of Newport (see Appendix 6) shows that approximately 30% of households fall into categories which are highly likely to have incomes of less than £30,000 per annum and would therefore be unable to afford to buy.

It is also worth noting that it has been very difficult to achieve increased affordable provision in Newport as most of the sites which have come forward over the implementation period of the plan have been below the 15 unit threshold for affordable provision. Any provision which has been achieved has mostly been on small infill sites, and there have been an average of only seven affordable completions per annum over the last seven years. Opportunities such as these large schemes are therefore critical to meeting the long term affordable needs of the town and its rural hinterland.

In conclusion, it was clear through the Core Strategy process that 35% affordable housing provision would only address a proportion of the affordable housing need in Newport. In reality, in order to meet the backlog of affordable need in the town as well as newly arising need, a greater percentage would have been required.

It is also clear from the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment that since the Core Strategy evidence base was produced, the need has increased and the affordable housing shortfall has worsened. It would therefore be essential to achieve 35% on each of the three Newport proposals in order to help meet identified needs and enable local households to remain in the area.

As outlined above, the 35% required by policy is supported by evidence of need from a range of sources, therefore these three schemes in Newport would be required to provide no less than 35% affordable housing.

The greatest need is for three-bedroom social rented houses, with a smaller number of two and four-bedroom houses. There is also an identified need for two-bedroom bungalows and for a small amount of wheelchair standard provision for all household types and sizes.

The suggested proportion of shared ownership is 20%, as recommended in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. There are no indications from the evidence available that there is a market for a greater number of shared ownership for existing residents of Newport, given the ongoing issues with mortgage availability.

Within the required 35% provision, the following proportions of house types, sizes and tenures would best meet identified affordable housing needs in Newport:

<u>Social rented</u>
2 bedroom 4 person houses – 20%
3 bedroom 5 person houses – 30%
4 bedroom 7 person houses – 7%

2 bedroom bungalows for older people – 20%
Full wheelchair standard properties – 3%
(For older and/or disabled people of any age. These could be 2, 3 or 4 bed sizes and could consist of houses with a lift, or bungalows - ideally a mix of both)

*Social rented = **80%** of total affordable provision*

<u>Shared ownership (depending on market)</u>
2 bedroom 4 person houses – 15%
3 bedroom 5 person houses – 5%

*Shared ownership = **20%** of total affordable provision*

TWC Education
In acknowledgement of the number of large residential planning applications currently being considered by the LPA, TWC Education has prepared a "Position Statement" as updated in July 2012. In summary, the following represents their position:

The Newport area at secondary level is served by:

- Burton Borough secondary school (LA maintained)
- Adams Grammar School (Academy)
- Newport Girls High School (Academy)

As at July 2012, there is an oversubscription of pupils of over 3% in the Newport area at secondary level. This is set to continue for the foreseeable future.

The following table details our 6 year projections for the maintained secondary school and includes housing currently under construction, strategic sites, and the following developments: Wellington Road, Audley Avenue, Station Road and Maynard's Croft.

Total Newport Area	**2012**	371	363	374	373	385	216	196	2278	**2260**	**-1**
	2013	335	373	371	370	371	220	206	2245	**2260**	**1**
	2014	355	337	381	368	369	212	211	2233	**2260**	**1**
	2015	355	359	347	380	369	208	203	2221	**2260**	**2**
	2016	376	359	369	346	380	219	198	2248	**2260**	**1**
	2017	382	379	368	367	345	219	210	2270	**2260**	**-0**

As there are two grammar schools situated in Newport who take children from a very wide area, Burton Borough, as the only comprehensive school, takes the vast majority of secondary aged children living in Newport. Although the school will benefit from Building Schools for the Future funding, this is not providing additional accommodation, rather it is modernising and refurbishing current provision.

The Newport area at primary level is served by:

Church Aston Infant
Edgmond St Peters CE Primary
Moorfield Primary
Newport Infant
Newport Junior
SS Peter & Pauls Catholic Primary
Muxton Primary
Lilleshall Primary

As at July 2012, there is a surplus of primary places of above 5%, however projected within the next 5 years is a reduction in this surplus to under 5%.

In line with the Audit Commission's review on the supply of school places, "Trading Places: The Supply and Allocation of School Places" (published December 1996, reviewed 2002), a school should be considered to be at full capacity when at 5% surplus capacity or less.

TOTALS	Census Yr	Rec	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Yr 6	Total	Net Capacity	% Surplus
	2012	224	244	258	242	244	265	272	**1749**	1906	8
	2013	255	236	257	263	249	254	270	**1783**	1906	6
	2014	261	267	248	266	273	259	258	**1831**	1906	4
	2015	229	271	279	258	273	281	262	**1853**	1906	3
	2016	200	238	283	279	266	281	284	**1832**	1906	4
	2017	234	208	249	290	288	274	284	**1827**	1906	4

Not all proposed housing for the area is included in this 5 year projection. This includes all sites under construction, strategic sites and all know housing as at July 2012 (including Wellington Rd, Audley Avenue, Station Rd and Maynard's Croft). Much of the planned housing is set to be provided beyond this 5 year period, therefore the percentage surplus is likely to decrease still further.

The projections provided were completed June 2012. Data is updated annually therefore it is expected that projected numbers for both primary and secondary school will be updated between March and May 2013 for the whole Borough.

The Primary schools included which are located in the rural area outside the Newport town boundary tend to attract applicants from the Newport urban area. These pupils tend to be the nearest children outside the rural schools' defined attendance areas, and as such get priority over other children living further away.

Parents are able to express a preference for any mainstream school, and if there are places available the school are obliged to offer them a place. If a school is going to be full, the admissions authority have to then apply the published admissions criteria to decide which pupils will get places. When schools are full parents have the right to appeal to an Independent Appeals Committee who can decide to place a child over the admission number.

Some schools, for instance Moorfield Primary, are oversubscribed with pupils who are from outside their own attendance area, but are still living within Newport. If development is located in close proximity to such a school, then the pupils generated by the new housing will displace those living further away but who are still within the Newport boundary. These pupils will then have to seek places either at their own local Newport school or schools outside of the area. In these cases, it may in fact be necessary to provide additional accommodation at schools which have no new housing development within their own geographical attendance area in order to ensure that there are sufficient places.

An Education contribution calculation has been provided using current numbers and based upon an average 3.35 beds per dwelling for the following sites:

- Wellington Road - @ 285 houses (TWC/2011/0821);
- Audley Avenue - @ 215 houses (TWC/2011/0827);
- Station Road - @ 350 houses (TWC/2011/0871);
- Maynards Croft - @ 33 houses (TWC/2012/0211).

The total contributions being required allowing for surplus provision is £1,216,036 in respect of Primary School provision and £960,160 for Secondary School provision with a combined contribution of £2,176,195. The combined cost per dwelling for all of the four developments is £2,464.55p. The Council would not be seeking an education contribution for the Wellington Road application if this is the only development that proceeds.

Ideally, the Local Authority would want to provide accommodation before need arises, particularly as Newport is somewhat isolated geographically and it is undesirable for very young children to have to travel to access reception class provision.

In the current financial climate it is no longer possible for Local Authorities to 'bank roll' schemes pending receipt of Section 106 contributions on the completion of sites. Education would seek to negotiate when the release of funds would best suit the Council and the developer. Considering the limited options for Newport residents in accessing out of area places, we would require 50% upon commencement of development, 25% on 25% occupancy, and the remaining 25% at 50% occupancy.

As with other education contributions, we would expect the agreed sums to be subject to indexation to ensure future value is not eroded by inflation.

TWC Aboricultural Officer
Support subject to the conditions covering the following:

- Landscape management & maintenance (including implementation);
- Tree and root protection;
- Tree replacements;
- Hedge protection and maintenance.

TWC Sustainability Officer
There are some very positive sustainability aspects of the development, for example the affordable housing will be built to Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 standard. Taking this into account it is recommended that for the affordable housing development Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 standard is 'conditioned' and that proof of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 certification is provided upon design and build. This is to ensure that the affordable housing development is built to Code for Sustainable Homes standard as stated. However, if the affordable housing development is to be constructed after April 2013 then Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 should be stipulated.

With regards to the open market housing – it is disappointing to note that the developer has decided not to build to Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 standard, but will meet the requirements of Part L of Building Regulations 2010 instead. The revised Sustainability Statement details how these measures relate to the Code for Sustainable Homes standards. However, the issue is how would the Authority measure these 'measures' and know that they have been undertaken. This issue needs to be resolved to the satisfaction of the Council. Additionally it is important to note that the 'measures' outlined in the Sustainability Statement do not all measure up to the Level 3 Standard, but in some cases fall short to Level 2 or Level 1. Due to these issues it is important the developer build the open market housing to Level 3 standard and that proof of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 certification is provided upon design and build.

TWC Planning Ecologist
Supports subject to conditions. The site consists of improved grassland with a number of hedgerows, of varying age and quality, bounding and bisecting the site. None of the hedgerows are important under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 but they do provide habitats for nesting birds and foraging and commuting bats. The hedgerows should be retained wherever possible, particularly the boundary hedgerows, and replacement planting should take place to replace any that are removed. Retained hedgerows should be enhanced with additional planting.

There are a number of mature trees on the site, mostly as standing trees in the southern hedgerows. In particular, there is a very large beech and a very large sycamore in the eastern hedgerow on Wellington Road, and a large ash in the south west corner bordering Moorfield Lane. All these trees should be retained in the landscape scheme, as they are valuable for a range of wildlife, including nesting birds, roosting bats and invertebrates.

In respect of species, no evidence of badgers was found on the site. Common bird species were recorded during the site visit. The Phase I Habitat survey report considers the site to be sub-optimal for reptiles. The great crested newt (GCN) surveys did not find any GCNs, but smooth newts and frogs were present.

With regard to bats, three mature trees of note were assessed as having potential to support roosting bats. The sycamore (T9) and ash (T13) trees are to be retained as part of the development, but the arboricultural assessment targeted the mature beech tree (T10) for 'removal within 5 years as the condition of the tree has deteriorated beyond recovery'. This tree is in the hedgerow bounding Wellington Road, and thus poses a health and safety risk to people travelling along Wellington Road.

The ivy covering this tree was removed in March 2012 in order to carry out an arboricultural and a bat survey. The bat survey found no evidence of bats and concluded that the tree has negligible potential for bat roosting.

A common pipistrelle was observed emerging from the main house at Aston Grove. Currently the boundary of Aston Grove is unaffected by the development. If this changes then further surveys may be required in this area.

Bat enhancements include the erection of bat boxes on retained mature trees and new buildings, including bat-friendly plants in the planting scheme, i.e. those that are particularly attractive to invertebrates, and ensuring that the lighting strategy is sensitive to bats. Lighting should not illuminate the mature trees, hedgerows, additional planting or bat box locations.

The landscape plan should include the following ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancements:

- retention of the mature trees and hedgerows
- planting of additional hedgerow, tree and shrub species
- inclusion of native species of local provenance, berry-producing shrubs, fragrant plants and nectar-rich flowers in the planting scheme
- grassland and wildflower creation
- creation of swales
- erection of bat, bird and invertebrate boxes/bricks on mature trees and new buildings
- creation of refuges for reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates

The following conditions should also be included:

- a lighting strategy to identify the appropriate levels of illumination for the proposed end uses, and include times of darkness during peak bat activity times and no direct illumination on hedgerows, mature trees or bat box locations; and
- If more than 2 years elapses between the previous ecological survey and the due commencement date of works, an updated ecological survey to be carried out.

A number of ecology related Informatives were also requested to be attached to any permission granted.

TWC Landscape Architect

Support subject to conditions. The consideration of landscape issues is a marked improvement to that in the pre-application documents. Landscape now plays a role in the formulation of the Master Plan for the site. However, these concepts MUST be taken forward into the finished design and the concepts developed further from the broad landscape planning scale down to small scale details, materials, furniture, plant species and future management.

The southern area would benefit from open space being creating within the development to provide a much needed feel of openness and providing views and focal points. The spine road could also be a little more open with more planting so not feel so confined. As well as setting housing back from boundary to minimise impact and maintain rural feel.
Landscape conditions need to be applied.

TWC Conservation Officer

The site lies outside the Conservation Area but on a principle approach road to the Conservation Area and is an important route into Newport and that the character of this road at this point is one of discreet housing and landscape screening. It is only when the road goes beyond the junction with Dark Lane to the east and Newport Girls High School to the west that the character becomes more urbanised.

It is important therefore that this character is retained as far as possible by adequate screening (planting and landscape) along the road front, preferably with a good gap between the road and the building line to ensure the development is set back a little if possible.

TWC Environmental Health (Noise)
Support subject to conditions. It is noted that the parts of the proposed Scheme are within NEC Categories B and C (situations where noise mitigation measures may make development acceptable).

If the council are minded to grant the application the site will need to be protected from the effects of noise. It is recommended that the applicant prepare a scheme, in writing, for approval by the LPA, which details suitable and sufficient noise attenuation measures for the site, before any development commences. The scheme should include (but is not limited to):

- Location, and orientation of dwellings;
- Location and specification of Acoustic barriers;
- Provision of acoustic glazing systems (as required);
- Provision of mechanical ventilation systems (as required).

Any scheme submitted should clearly state the standards with which it will comply. The scheme shall be fully implemented before occupation of the dwellings and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

It is considered that the Standard Conditions relating to Construction Noise be incorporated within any permission granted.

Subject to the above being included within any permission granted, we do not offer any objection to the proposed development.

TWC Environmental Health (Contaminated Land)
Support. In accordance with Environmental Health policy due to the scale of development a standard land contamination condition should be attached any permission granted.
Principal Planning Officer (Minerals and Waste)
The site is in a Mineral Safeguarding Area in relation to underlying deposits of sand and gravel. It is noted that it is adjacent to road infrastructure, substantial housing development and Newport High School. Given the need for standoffs from theoretical extraction limits and graded batters on a theoretical quarry face from existing road infrastructure and built development it is considered that any mineral which may be present within the site is already effectively sterilised. In addition, there would be major environmental concerns about working any mineral present so close to major

residential development and Newport High School. As a fall back position, it is always possible to work a small amount of any valuable minerals present during prior to construction of the other designated developments and avoid some sterilisation of minerals in the process. In conclusion, there is no objection to the Wellington Road site being developed on minerals sterilisation grounds.

External consultations

Severn Trent Water
In acknowledgement of the number of planning applications currently being considered by the LPA, Severn Trent Water has prepared a “Position Statement”. In summary, the following represents STW’s position:

Under the Water Industry Act, developers have the right to connect foul and surface water flows to public sewers and STW have a duty to provide additional capacity. Where there is insufficient capacity, STW cannot refuse connection but can ask the LPA to delay development pending upgrading. STW have to fund any capacity improvements, but also have a duty to minimise the impact on customers' bills - they also don't want to delay new development but need to avoid abortive expenditure associated with speculative development. STW also has a duty to comply with discharge consents issued by the Environment Agency (EA).

In terms of the ***sewerage network***, Newport is split into two sewerage sub-catchments – one to the north-west and the other to the south-east. There are known capacity issues within the SE catchment with records of sewer flooding affecting properties and gardens etc. Mitigation to properties has been successful but risk to external areas - gardens and highways - remain. Preliminary investigations suggest that additional flows from proposed development in the western catchment are likely to exacerbate existing problems. Investigatory work to look at solutions and options will be completed late summer 2012. Possible solutions include the developers reducing the amount of surface water (rain water) that enters the foul sewers, which will free up capacity for additional foul flows, and/or replacing parts of the sewerage system with larger sewers. The costs and benefits of each of the options will be assessed and the most suitable solution will be selected. STW may invite the LPA to delay commencement or occupation of any development until sufficient capacity is provided. STW recommend that the Council uses appropriate conditions on planning applications to ensure that developers provide details of foul drainage that the Council would then approve.

In terms of ***sewage treatment***, STW confirm that the sewerage network problems are not linked to the capacity of the existing sewage treatment works in Newport. Spare capacity exists for an additional 670 new dwellings within the existing discharge consent for the treatment works. The current treatment process is anticipated to have sufficient capacity for later development phases. Any additional capacity requirements would be provided on site at the existing treatment works. The impacts on air quality will be

negligible.

With regards to ***surface water management***, this should be managed on site rather than being discharged to the sewerage system or where necessary, restricted to “greenfield rates”. Such sustainability measures will reduce the demand on the existing sewerage network capacity.

In terms of ***water mains system***, a study is underway for Telford as a whole, which will report in late summer 2012. It is anticipated that STW along with TWC will manage the impact of new development. Water consumption is now being managed through the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 requirements. It is finally recommended that a Water Cycle Study be prepared by TWC for development across the Borough.

Environment Agency
An initial letter of objection was received from the Agency, but having received the Position Statement from Severn Trent Water regarding their infrastructure and the current development proposals in Newport it addresses the following areas of concern to the Agency:

1) Sewage Treatment and the capability of Newport STW to cater for the proposed developments.
The current Discharge consent has been assessed as having spare "headroom" to accommodate the early phases of development (670 dwellings). A revised discharge consent would be required to accommodate all the new development. Further detailed process design analysis would be carried out by Severn Trent to confirm the actual treatment capacity required to accommodate the later phases of development with additional capacity being provided as required.

2) The sewerage network
A more detailed feasibility study is currently being undertaken by Severn Trent to investigate solutions and options for providing capacity re additional flows from the proposed developments - particularly re the Grove Farm (Wellington Road) and Station Road sites. STW Ltd expects to conclude this report by early summer 2012. They confirm that at the present time the sewerage network, on which the Grove Farm development is located, has known sewerage capacity issues and that a detailed study is underway to investigate options for providing increased capacity. Severn Trent will look to provide the additional capacity; however, there is a potential timing issue.

The concern is that the necessary infrastructure capacity is provided prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings. To ensure that there is no polluting impact or adverse consequences to the environment, we would expect you either to seek a legal agreement to ensure this, or, to provide negative conditions on any permission which you may be minded to grant, to prevent occupation of dwellings until the additional capacity is available.

3) Flood Risk
The Severn Trent position statement acknowledges that there have been

sewer capacity issues causing flooding and incremental development could exacerbate flood risk in identified risk areas. Our objection as previously submitted was based on the statement in the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) that the discharge of foul sewage from this site will increase flooding for 3rd parties during a 30 yr return period. As the Severn Trent statement appears to address this issue, we would not wish to maintain our objection. However, occupation of the development should be delayed until the additional capacity is available within the sewerage system.

It is acknowledged that the proposed attenuation of the surface water runoff is in line with green-field rates and this should be taken forward in accordance with the FRA. The Council's Drainage Engineers should also advise on the surface water drainage issues.

The Agency confirms that they wish to remove their previous objection, subject to appropriate conditions to ensure adequate infrastructure capacity, as described above. Recommendations were provided regarding the detailed design of the scheme to help improve gains for biodiversity.

Groundwater
The Geoenvironmental Desk Study and Conceptual Model produced by WSP dated May 2011 are noted. The Agency agree with the recommendations as stated in para 6.2.1 of that report and support the proposals for Investigations in the area of the 2 identified wells/abstractions as they would be useful in maintaining the quality of groundwater in these areas.

Natural England
Designated Sites (European Sites (Natura 2000 Network) - The application site is within 5 km of Aqualate Mere Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). This SSSI forms part of the West Midlands Meres and Mosses (Phase 1 and Phase 2) Ramsar Sites. PPS9 makes clear that Ramsar designated sites are to be considered of equivalent status to European Sites (SPA/SAC).

Natural England has no objection to the development proposal in relation to designated sites (International Sites and UK Sites of Special Scientific Interest).

It is there view that, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, the proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect on the important interest features of the West Midlands Meres and Mosses (Phase 1 and Phase 2) Ramsar Sites or any of the special scientific interest features of the Aqualate Mere Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The detailed reasoning behind this view was provided in the response from Natural England.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) - Newport Canal SSSI is located close to the existing Severn Trent Water Ltd waste water treatment works. Based on the information discussed at our recent meeting with your council, the Environment Agency and Seven Trent Water Ltd regarding public water supply and foul drainage provision Natural England has no objection to this

development in relation to these issues. This is because our discussions confirmed that there were no significant environmental impacts from water supply or waste water treatment on Aqualate Mere (part of the Midlands Mosses and Meres Ramsar site Phase 2) or Newport Canal SSSI.

Shropshire Council Archaeologist
The proposed development site impacts on an area of possible medieval ridge and furrow ploughing. In view of this and in accordance with PPS5, it is recommended that an archaeological inspection be made a condition of any planning permission that may be granted for the proposed development.

National Grid (gas infrastructure)
The proposed areas of development have been checked and currently we do not predict any major problems to the network, other than for one development for the North and South of Station road. Should this site be fully built then major reinforcement works will be required in the area. We will deal with requests to connect to our network on an individual basis as they come in from developers.

Western Power Distribution (electricity infrastructure)
As requested they have checked the 3 locations for proposed developments in Newport at Wellington Road, Audley Avenue and Station Road. There is spare capacity at their Newport primary substation located at Longford Road (next to Vauxhall Farm) and both 11kV feeders called ''Longford Rd Tees'' and ''Ford Road/Vauxhall ABI''. It would only be necessary to overlay part of the 11kV cables which would feed new developments and which are mainly located in the footpaths in the adjacent area. They would deal with requests to connect to their network as they come in from developers and do not predict any particular problems with this development area from their point of view.

Regarding planning permissions which have already been granted for developments at Bromfield Road – TWC/2011/0179, Audley Road – TWC/2011/0334 and Continuing Care Retirement Community – W2008/0934 they would deal with these in the same way as the 3 new applications which are being considered.

Telford and Wrekin Primary Care Trust
The Primary Care Trust (PCT) has estimated that if all the major applications currently before the Council (and those where a resolution to grant permission has recently been given) then there would around 2,800 new patients between 2012 and 2024.

Assuming this is halved between both Newport GP Surgeries -

Wellington Road Surgery
Current Patient list - 13450
Actual rooms currently available - 13 consult 3 treatment
Current requirement for above - 10 consult 3 treatment
Increased patient list size - 14850 (current + 1/2 possible increase)
Future requirement based on above list size - 11 consult 3 treatment

Linden Hall Surgery
Current Patient list – 12,395
Actual rooms currently available - 8 Consult 2 treatment
Current requirement for above - 9 consult 2 treatment
Increased patient list size – 13,795 (current + 1/2 possible increase)
Future requirement based on above list size - 10 consult 3 treatment

NB: Linden Hall patient list size also includes Harper Adams students who are seen at the Harper Adams branch surgery (1 consulting room & 1 treatment room).
The practice also has a branch surgery at Muxton (1 consulting room & 1 treatment room).

Therefore Linden Hall Surgery provides a total of 10 consulting rooms & 4 treatment rooms from 3 locations, therefore this combined total is suitable for the anticipated additional patients.

At Circa 18,500 patients a Surgery would require 13 consult/treatment rooms so anything above this then additional consult and treatment rooms would be required if at only 1 location.

The overall impact of 2,800 patients to the actual premises themselves for both surgeries will be acceptable. However, the PCT cannot comment on the actual services provided from these or the types of healthcare provision. For example extra care home facilities obviously will require a different level and type of healthcare requirement for those needed by patients occupying starter homes for example e.g. young families etc.

Whilst the position of both practices above are currently suitable, healthcare standards and regulations however need to be met and premises kept up to date and with the forth coming CQC registration (April 2013) both practice premises will require some improvements and minor modifications in the future to ensure no non-compliances are encountered with CQC registration. With this in mind the PCT wonder if they could please take forward conversations with regards the Community Infrastructure Levy and perhaps look at providing some additional funding to support the Newport practices and ensure they can accommodate the future increases to the population.

With regard to dental provision, as the PCT does not have an up-to-date Oral Health Needs Assessment Document, capacity for dental provision is measured against performance against contracted activity.

There are currently 4 Dental Practices/Contracts in place in the Newport Area. Two of these contracts persistently underperform which indicates that there is additional capacity for patients in the area. The Local Authority and the Primary Care Team at the PCT – soon to be the Local Office of the National Commissioning Board - should work together to monitor current provision/capacity and put in place expanded capacity as and when the need

arises. Unlike GP surgeries dental practices do not have boundaries and so patients can be seen at other practices within Telford and Wrekin.

National Casework Planning Unit
Whilst the Council does not need to refer this application under the Consultation Direction to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for consideration, the Council has received correspondence from this body (who act on behalf of the Secretary of State). This correspondence states that should Plans Board be minded to approve this application (or the applications at Audley Avenue and Station Road) the National Casework Planning Unit has requested copies of the relevant documents be passed to them to allow an assessment to be made, before any notification is issued to the applicant. This is to allow consideration of whether there are any issues of a significant enough nature to warrant intervention from the Secretary of State, that is, to "Call In" the application.

Local consultation and representations

Newport Town Council
Strongly object on the following grounds:

- The scale of development with other proposals in Newport far exceeds the 60 per year in the LDF;
- Wellington Road is already congested and the development would make this worse;
- The development would affect the character of the Town of Newport, by merging it with the village of Church Aston, to the detriment of both;
- Whilst the 35% affordable element is welcomed it is noted that the smallest unit is 2 bed and so there need needs to be single occupancy dwellings e.g. 1 bedroom, which are poorly provided in Newport;
- The sustainability of the proposals is challenged on the basis there is no rainwater capture, nor micro power generation, nor even enhanced housing insulation. There are no corresponding jobs locally and so residents will have to commute by car. Conclude that the development does depend on fossil fuels, and so is not sustainable.

Church Aston Parish Council
Objects to the application as it is not in accordance with the Local Development Framework as this development, together with the other developments in the system exceeds the stated acceptable housing growth figures. Other factors which make the appication unacceptable are:

- Building on greenfield sites is less sustainable than building first on brownfield sites. There are alternative sites available elsewhere in Newport;
- Development would remove green space that separates Church Aston from Newport. It is very important to our parishioners to retain a separate identity;
- The traffic generated by the additional residents will add to the congestion which currently occurs at peak times in Newport, northern access is not in accordance with good practice;
- Local healthcare services are already over-stretched and there is no

consideration to increase this provision;

- The existing services such as the mains potable water, sewers, and utility services will be overloaded and unable to cope with the scale of the additional demand. There are areas of Church Aston which are currently suffering from low mains gas pressure;
- Development will cause flooding, flooding already at Silverdale near to site.

Newport and District Civic Society
Object to the entire application on the basis that it is both in the wrong location in Newport and is wrong in its size and density. The main reasons for this objection are as follows:

- There is no need for housing given the level of completions since 2006 together with other proposals coming forward therefore this application is not needed to reach the 600 dwellings figure by 2016;
- The Council has failed to carry out what should have been in place for the draft Core Strategy and in the 4 years since it was adopted i.e. an assessment to identify the specific housing needs of Newport and its rural hinterland. Any change from the 600 dwellings number in the Core Strategy should only be accepted by the Plans Board when and if supported by a housing market assessment for Newport and its rural hinterland;
- If granted the development would produce a near monopoly of housing provision in Newport for the developer and house builder over the next 5 years or so;
- The site is in the wrong location. Traffic congestion and safety issues associated with two schools nearby;
- The infrastructure in Newport for the supply of water, removal of storm and foul water, sewage treatment, drainage of the land in general, services for the provision of power (particularly electricity) is old and struggles to cope at times of increased (i.e. not high) demand. What Newport is facing as regards applications already approved, submitted but yet approved and shortly to be submitted, is an unprecedented and, as against usual timescales, immediate huge increase in density of residential, retail and business demands, the consequences of which will not fall to the developers under Section106 contributions but on the residents of Newport and Telford by way of increased utility bills;
- Request that the Plans Board reject the application in its totality and instruct T&W Planning Dept. to produce:-

a) A housing needs assessment specific to Newport and its rural hinterland, and
b) A report with levels of contributions than can be required from developers against levels of housing need for Newport and its rural hinterland.

Newport Regeneration Partnership
Comment that consideration of a number of applications before the Council is a piecemeal approach lacks the benefit of an overview and shows a substantive weakness in the Council's approach to master-planning in Newport.

Recently approved planning applications and those currently under

consideration exceed the LDF Core Strategy target up to 2016 with most sites being Greenfield. The Council has not yet formally assessed, proven and demonstrated housing need for Newport beyond 2016.

Request that a decision on the application be deferred and considered alongside other emerging development proposals being determined by the Council but if considered separately they wish to object to the proposals on the following grounds;

- Proposed development will remove green space that separates and gives identity to Newport and to Church Aston;
- Scale of development when considered alongside recently permitted applications and those emerging substantially exceeds Core Strategy housing targets for Newport;
- No indication that the housing market can sustain the scale of development proposed in the Core Strategy plan period and therefore the proposed scale of development is excessive and unnecessary at this point in time;
- Site is greenfield land and not sustainable as a number of alternative brownfield sites in Newport;
- Telford has the infrastructure capacity to accommodate housing and large scale development whereas development on the scale proposed for Newport will require extensive and unnecessary additional public and private investment at a time when neither sector can afford it;
- Question whether the applicant will provide 35% affordable housing given recent failures over last 10 years by the Council to achieve such figures;
- The recently approved care village (209 units) should count against the housing target for Newport because (i) each unit of accommodation occupied in the care village will most likely release a family home for re-letting or sale, (ii) the Homes & Communities Agency do count provision of extra-care housing against their affordable housing targets, and (iii) all other 'specialist' provision housing counts against affordable housing targets even where such provision has been specifically designed for the needs of individual households / prospective occupants;
- Development will increase surface water run and cause flooding;
- This and other applications currently with the Council do not properly take account of the cumulative impact of additional traffic, for drainage including rainwater run-off and sewage treatment, or for the capacity of utility services;
- Works to increase capacity of utility services will lead to extended disruption in and around Newport, especially when aggregated to other major development proposals;
- The main access layout does not meet the borough council's own design standards, will add to increased traffic congestion and lead to more vehicular conflict. It will also increase traffic passing nearby local schools adding to parking problems and increasing the accident risk;
- Additional pressures / demands on local healthcare services will place a greater strain on them especially in light of an increased population.

NRP supports sustainable development on brownfield sites within the built area of Newport, and we believe that the borough council has not done enough in the past to assemble these sites to ensure that the sustainable development needs of the town are met.

Newport History Society
Object to this planning application on two fronts:
Firstly, there is surviving medieval ridge and furrow on this site (see 1983 vertical aerial photograph of Cartographical Services Ltd ref 8822), and they feel that any archaeological watching brief should be set up before and during any development. This is an ancient medieval agricultural site, and was mapped as early as 1681. Then called 'The Gamble' and 'The Birches' Part of the Grove Farm fields are now a Heritage Environment Record (28280-MSA31038), recorded with the Sites and Monuments Record at Shrewsbury C.C. Offices. This record should be treated as a 'Heritage Asset' (see Planning Policy Statement 5 - Planning for the Historic Environment 2010)

Secondly, suggest that the weight of the 285 houses will surely compress the sponge and the water underground will to be squeezed out somewhere. Properties near the brook at Boughey Road or Brookside Avenue may suffer flooding. Can we be sure that cellars in the old houses of Longford Road, Vauxhall, and Salters Lane will not suffer flooding as a result? Who will pick up the bill? With modern techniques we assume that the proposed housing development at Grove Farm (Wellington Road) will build flood proof houses, but at what cost?

Newport Liberal Democrats
Provide a joint letter of objection in relation to all current major applications in Newport. In relation to this application the following comments are relevant:

- No need for more houses, leading to loss of green spaces and people coming into the town to live but working elsewhere;
- Inadequate infrastructure and services to accommodate proposed development. Lack of capacity at schools, medical services, sewerage and other utilities and increase in traffic congestion.
- Insufficient employment around Newport meaning new residents would work and shop elsewhere leading to greater congestion and would reduce community cohesion.
- Loss of green space and natural habitat. Plenty of brownfield sites within 20 mile radius including some within Newport.

Upper Bar Residents Association
Object as the development would remove the green fields that separate and give identity to Church Aston and the ancient market town of Newport. Area is already enjoyed by local community. Development would cause traffic congestion, road safety issues, noise and air pollution with commuters having to travel to Telford, Wolverhampton and Stafford for employment as there is no major employer in Newport. There are other brownfield sites available in Newport which is far more suitable for lower density housing development.

Local residents
The Council has received 483 representations from local residents objecting to the application. The responses received and the issues/concerns raised in relation to the application are summarised below:

- No need for more housing in Newport, already many houses for sale and new care village in town will release more houses to market. No housing market needs assessment for Newport has been produced. Local housing targets have already been exceeded. Telford has greater capacity and infrastructure to accommodate new housing for the area. Houses would be bought by student landlords not locals.
- New houses in Newport should be built on brownfield sites and sufficient brownfield sites exist within the town.
- Questions whether affordable houses would be affordable or go to locals, plenty of affordable houses in nearby Telford.
- House types and scale are out of character for area and the density of development too high. Homes would not be high quality, be unsustainable and energy inefficient.
- Highway concerns relating to increased congestion on Wellington Road and surrounding streets with increase in rat running towards bypass. Further worsening of congestion around two schools and doctors surgery. Two access points into site are insufficient. Highway safety – speeding motorists already on Wellington Road, increase in vehicles from the site would increase danger to cyclists, pedestrians and school children. Limited public transport serving the site. Increase in air pollution from cars owned by residents of proposed development.
- Development would have a negative impact on the identity and character of Newport and its role as a market town.
- Not enough jobs in Newport for existing residents let alone new ones. Already residents commute out of town for jobs and town is steadily becoming a dormitory settlement and this would be reinforced by proposals and increased commuting would result.
- Insufficient capacity of infrastructure in the immediate area and town to accommodate the scale of proposals and new residents. Concerns regarding the connection of water, gas and electric supplies. Doctor and dentists already at capacity. Insufficient town centre car parking, Police and social services to deal with new residents. Schools in the town already at capacity and new residents would limit choice of schools for other residents in town. Telford has better infrastructure to accommodate new homes.
- Part of the site floods from the nearby Moorfield Brook which forms the north eastern boundary of the site. Development would decrease infiltration and increase run off causing further flooding on and off site. Foul water system downstream of the site is inadequate and there has been foul water flooding around Boughey Road/Wrekin Avenue area. Flooding from rising groundwater is also a concern.
- The site provides an important open space between Newport and Church Aston providing clear demarcation between the two. The development would reinforce the amalgamation of the two settlements

and the loss of identify of Church Aston and have a negative effect on the character of the village.

- The development would lead to further coalescence between Newport and Telford.
- The proposals are on valuable 'greenfield' agricultural land. Location is a valuable green space used by locals to walk dogs and there is a lack of recreational land in Newport.
- Negative visual impact by urbanising the southern approach into Newport and having a detrimental impact on a key gateway into the town.
- Increase in noise pollution as result of open space and play area, increase in anti social behaviour.
- Impact on wildlife across the site. Bats and great crested newts have been seen on site and adjacent areas.
- Disruption from the construction phase of the development and concern over the length of time it might take to complete the proposals.
- Concerns regarding the lack of forward planning by the Council for Newport and the cumulative impact with other developments currently being proposed in Newport.
- Council will gain financially from the development.

In addition the Council has received a petition of objection signed by 305 individuals. Each page included room for bespoke comments to be added by each person(s) signing it. Between them those who added comments to their name(s) raise the same issues and concerns identified above by other local residents.

A noise report was received on behalf of the residents of Newport and Church Aston.
The conclusion of the report's author is that the proposed houses fronting onto Wellington Road fall into Noise Exposure Category C and as such planning permission should not normally be granted. It also makes the following claims:

- That the development proposals have been shown to not satisfy the aims of the National Noise Policy Statement for England;
- The measured noise levels and existing and proposed site conditions have been used to assess the development proposals in line with the anticipated future planning policy guidance contained in the Draft National Planning Policy Framework (July 2011) [NPPF] document. The proposals currently detail a development that would not satisfy the guidance in the NPPF in exposing occupants to a noise level at which *significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life* would likely occur. The proposals currently detail a development that reduces the tranquillity of an area prized for recreational and amenity value and, therefore, would also not satisfy the guidance in the Draft National Planning Policy Framework;
- Construction noise has been considered, and it has been shown that levels would be significantly above existing ambient noise levels. The degree to which this impact would be significant increases when put in

the context that the site is proposed to be under construction for 10 years;

- Houses would have to be set back from Wellington Road by more than 40 metres to ensure noise exposure is below the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level, above which adverse health effects are observed. Typical mitigation measures have been examined, whereby it has been show that whilst acoustic screens may reduce noise exposure at ground level, little benefit would be provided at first floor level bedroom windows or across the proposed open space.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

Housing need and supply in the Newport area

Background to housing policy for Newport in the adopted Core Strategy
With regard to housing provision, Core Strategy Policy CS1 (Homes) states that '*Newport's local housing requirements will be met by approximately 60 new dwellings per annum'.* Policy CS6 (Newport) states that '*Development will be limited to that required to meet local needs, including those of its rural hinterland, and to support the town's regeneration. New housing development will be expected to deliver affordable housing to the level of 35% of all such development'.*

The Core Strategy for Telford and Wrekin covers a 10 year period from 2006 to 2016. In this respect the total number of houses envisaged to be provided over that period to meet Newport's needs is 600 (60 per annum x 10 years).

By way of background to the 60 new dwellings per annum figure in the Core Strategy the following commentary is relevant. When the Core Strategy was submitted for Examination in Public it pinpointed that the delivery of affordable housing was the critical determinant of the housing strategy proposed for Newport. The evidence to support such an approach was derived from documents such as the Housing Needs in Telford and Wrekin (2004) and its Summary Update (2005).

The housing needs analysis identified that 22 new affordable households per annum would be required in order to meet identified local needs. As such, an overall level of development of approximately 60 new dwellings per annum would be required, with an affordable housing contribution of 35% from new residential development to meet the identified need. It should be noted that this level of affordable housing would not address the existing backlog of affordable housing need in Newport, due in part to the fact that no new affordable homes had been provided in the period 2001 to 2005, beyond the provision of 14 closed care dwellings in 2005.

The preferred development option for Newport prepared by the Council for the Core Strategy Examination proposed a balanced provision of new dwellings. Delivery whilst marginally above the rate of new household formation, was deemed to be both, realistic and have the potential to make a significant

contribution towards meeting the identified need for affordable homes. The need for affordable housing in Newport was identified as the second highest in the Borough.

The Inspector's report following the Examination in Public endorsed the Council's approach regarding the quantum of housing to be delivered in Newport over the Core Strategy period (60/pa). The Inspector enhanced the policy wording with specific reference to the proportion of affordable housing required of new housing development at 35% in accordance with Policy CS6 (Newport) such was the importance of this aspect.

In relation to the current applications under consideration in Newport, the Housing Policy & Enabling Officer comments that since the Core Strategy was adopted in December 2007 an update of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has been prepared by the Council in 2009. Along with other more recent evidence (collated from the Telford & Wrekin's Choice Based Lettings scheme together with profiles of the existing affordable housing stock, the current housing market and the population of Newport) the SHMA supports the continued need for a high level of affordable housing provision in Newport and shows that this need has in fact increased over the last decade. The rise in property prices, together with consistently low incomes and difficulty in obtaining mortgages even when house prices have fallen has led to the current situation where local people, particularly young couples and families, have left the town to find accommodation elsewhere or remain in overcrowded and unsuitable accommodation. There are also many older people who need alternative accommodation.

In particular the SHMA, updated in 2009, now shows that 124 affordable dwellings are required each year over a twenty year period to meet the needs of Newport residents. This is considerably higher than the 22 affordable dwelling need shown in the 2005 housing needs summary and takes into account the lack of suitable existing provision and the backlog of need.

It was clear through the Core Strategy process that 35% affordable housing provision would only address a proportion of the affordable housing need in Newport. In reality, in order to meet the backlog of affordable need in Newport as well as newly arising need, a greater percentage would have been required. It is also clear from the 2009 SHMA that since the Core Strategy evidence base was produced, the need has increased and the affordable housing shortfall has worsened. It is therefore essential to achieve 35% on each of the Newport proposals in order to help meet identified needs and enable local households to remain in the area.

<u>Expectation of greenfield development in Newport</u>
Objections to this application raise the availability of brownfield provision within Newport and the associated desirability of building on such sites in preference to a large greenfield site. The general preference in favour of brownfield development over previous years is acknowledged and is still encouraged in the Core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework. Indeed the delivery of housing during recent years has largely

been on brownfield sites in Newport.

The Inspector presiding over the Examination of the Core Strategy considered a range of housing delivery options for Newport including concentrating development on previously developed land within the current built up area which equated to approximately 25 dwellings per annum. Whilst this option provided a number of advantages including the use of brownfield and under utilised sites, a number of disadvantages were identified. These being that it "*would not achieve the necessary levels of affordable housing, since urban sites would commonly fall below the threshold size for affordable provision"* (para 3.47). As will be highlighted in this report, monitoring over the first 5 years of the Core Strategy has indicated that this has appeared to be the case.

It was also noted by the Inspector that: *"Moreover, if focussed on the town centre, pressure for housing could displace other uses and thus diminish rather than support the role of Newport as a market town."* (para 3.47). Furthermore, remediation costs associated with the redevelopment of brownfield sites are often cited by developers in justifying a lower level of affordable housing on the basis of the effect a higher level has on viability.

The Inspector acknowledged the option of 60 dwellings per annum would ultimately entail extensive use of greenfield sites in Newport and this was quantified as being "*the most likely to achieve the required level of affordable housing."* (para 3.47). Furthermore, the Inspector highlighted that because Newport is not as well-provided with brownfield opportunities as Telford that "*a higher proportion of greenfield development may be unavoidable if the proposed dwelling numbers are to be achieved in Newport."* (para 3.49).

It is therefore concluded from the above paragraphs, as well as further evidence regarding the delivery of affordable houses over the last 5 years (as to be described below), that there are sound planning reasons why greenfield sites need to be used for residential development in and around Newport.

<u>Delivery of housing and affordable housing in Newport to date</u>
In considering the determination of the large scale planning applications currently awaiting determination in Newport, including this one, it is necessary to establish what residential development has already taken place and is committed, as this will assist in gauging housing need in Newport.

Data recorded as part of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) prepared by the Council represents the key source of information as to the number of dwellings built, as well as what is likely to be built through permissions granted or in the process of being granted. Application of the Core Strategy policy of 60 additional dwellings per annum commenced in 2006, setting a target of 360 additional new dwellings to 31st March 2012. Headline figures from the AMR work for the years between 1st April 2006 and 31st March 2012 (6 years) are set out below. It should be noted that the figures for included for the 2011-12 year are internal calculations and have not been formally published yet by the Council as the AMR for this reporting year is not due to

be finalised until December 2012.

- A total of 252 dwellings have been completed against the aggregated target of 360.
- Houses under construction during the 2010-12 monitoring period totalled 12 dwellings.
- The number of dwellings where permission had been granted but work had not been started was 58.
- Dwellings granted permission between 1st April 2012 and 30th June 2012 was 30.
- Planning applications where the Council has made a resolution to grant permission would provide a further 61 dwellings upon the grant of consent.

The figures described above are incorporated into the table below and shown against the aggregated requirement of 600 houses for Newport for the period covering the Core Strategy (2006 - 2016).

Table 1 - Monitoring of housing completions and commitments in relation to Telford and Wrekin core Strategy Policy CS1 (Homes) in relation to Newport.

Monitoring of housing in Newport area	**Dwellings**	**Brown field**	**Green field**	**Outstanding requirement 2006-2016 CS1 *Homes* – 600 dws (60 dws per annum for Newport)**	**Affordable provision**		
					Total provision	**Brown field**	**Greenfield**
a) Completions 2006-2012	252	94%	6%	**108 (360–252)1108**	35 (14%)	35	0
b) Under construction 2011-12	12	83%	17%		0 (0%)	0	0
c) Dwellings with permission not started	58	90%	10%		0 (0%)	0	0
Sub-total	**322**	**93%**	**7%**	**278 (600 -**	**35 (10.5%)**	**35**	**0**

				322)			
d) dwellings receiving planning permission 1st April – 30th June 2012.	30	0%	100%		15 (50%)	0	15
Sub-total	**352**	**87%**	**13%**	**248 (600 – 352)**	**50 (14%)**	**35**	**15**
e) where there is currently a resolution to grant consent	61	100%	0%		9 (15%)	9	0
Built and committed Total	**413**	**89%**	**11%**	**187 (600 – 413)**	**59 (14%)**	**44**	**15**

This table highlights that for the 2006 - 2012 monitoring years there is a shortfall of 108 completed dwellings (252 minus 360) against the aggregated target of 360 (60pa X 6 years). Rolling forward the aggregated target of 600 dwellings for the 10 year period of the Core Strategy (2006 - 2016) and taking into account dwellings under construction, dwellings permitted and where there is a resolution to granted consent; there is an outstanding requirement for a further 187 dwellings.

Table 1 also highlights how the majority of housing completed or to be built are brownfield sites with 89% of dwellings being on this type of land.

With regard to the delivery of affordable housing since 2006, the right hand side of the above table shows how many affordable houses have been or are likely to be secured as a result of dwellings built or to be built through Section 106 obligations. This shows that the delivery of affordable housing (14%) is significantly below the Core Strategy target of 35% in policy CS6 (Newport). This indicates a correlation between a low level of affordable housing and the high level of development on brownfield sites (89%). This bears out the thoughts of the Inspector for the Core Strategy as referred to above regarding the disadvantage of relying on the use of brownfield sites, as well as, the view that extensive greenfield developments were the most likely to achieve the required level of affordable housing required.

<u>Housing delivery and trajectory</u>
As highlighted above, monitoring data shows a shortfall of completed dwellings against the aggregated target to 2012 and even with dwellings under construction and those permitted or resolved to be permitted there is a need for a further 187 dwellings to be consented to cover the period of the

Core Strategy up to 2016. In short there has been a serious under delivery of housing in Newport between 2006 – 2012 both in terms of number of dwellings completed and permitted but, even more importantly, in relation to the delivery of affordable dwellings.

In relation to the 187 dwellings that require consent in order to meet the aggregated figure of 600 houses to 2016, this figure could be met in quantitative terms by granting just only one of the major applications pending consideration by the Council. However, just granting one consent would be unlikely to delivery all of those houses prior to 2016. In the case of Wellington Road, the applicant estimates that following any outline permission being granted, the build out of the site to completion would take approximately 9 years taking delivery beyond the end of the Core Strategy period (2016). This is based on the applicants estimation that the first dwellings could be delivered on site by mid 2013 (having successfully secured Reserved Matters consent and site preparation) with annual build rates of approximately 30 units per annum, subject to market conditions. A trajectory showing the delivery of the Wellington Road site (in addition to sites under construction and permitted) in relation to the current shortfall and a continuation of the 60 dwellings per annum figure is shown as Table 2 to this report (see end of report).

Table 2 shows that granting consent for Wellington Road alone is not sufficient in making up the shortfall in provision to date as well as ensuring the delivery of the housing figures to 2016 by that date.

Similarly to the Wellington Road application the build out rates provided by the applicants for the Audley Avenue and Station Road proposals go beyond 2016. In the case of Audley Avenue this is envisaged as being completed by 2019 and in respect of the Station Road application the corresponding date is 2025.

In accepting that more than one of the major applications pending consideration by the Council needs to be granted consent to make up the shortfall in provision to date as well as ensuring the delivery of the housing figures to 2016, necessary to consider the cumulative effect on delivery of all the applications under consideration by the Council.

This is shown in the attached housing trajectory (Table 3 at end of report) which shows over a number of years the delivery of sites already permitted or resolved to be permitted together with the anticipated build out rates of applications currently with the Council for determination. This is set against the annual 60 dwellings per annum requirement set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1(Homes).

This shows how a number of sites coming forward at one time have the benefit of jointly making up the shortfall in provision to date as well as ensuring the delivery of the housing figures to 2016 by that date. Whilst this significantly increases building rates in Newport than seen in recent years, there is clear justification to allow this to ensure the provision and acceleration

of housing delivery in line with the Core Strategy. A number of sites would increase choice for consumers and competition between house builders and minimise risks associated with a single site being mothballed or landbanked by a builder.

Allowing a number of separate sites would result in a higher intensity of house building over a number of years, particularly during the years between 2013 and 2019. The trajectory estimates that this will peak at 151 units per year during 2015 -2016 and this is considerably higher than recent years where under delivery has occurred. However, past monitoring rates that the Council has recorded indicates that between 1992 and 1997 a total of 534 houses were built at an average of 89 per annum with one particular year (1994) seeing 141 completed dwellings in Newport and so such an increase in the building rate quantum has been experienced in the past and therefore feasible.

Housing trajectory beyond the end of the Core Strategy period (2016)
Another consequence of permitting a number of separate sites, as currently with the Council for determination, is that the total number of houses involved is greater than needed to meet the current shortfall in delivery and to the end of the current Core Strategy period. It is therefore necessary to consider the post 2016 housing situation in relation to the applications under consideration, when the Core Strategy period comes to an end.

Work is underway within the Council to put a new Local Plan in place over the next 2 years and the Council is referring to this plan as “Shaping Places”. It is proposed this plan will set out the spatial development vision, objectives and strategy for the T&W Council area, with borough-wide policies for different forms of development and key site proposals.

In setting out where new homes, jobs and green spaces are to be located and how areas across the Borough should develop to meet the needs of residents, employees and visitors up to 2030, the Shaping Places plan will need to take account of any significant planning permissions in place.

Preparation of a new Local Plan is not normally a reason to delay consideration of planning applications. Whilst "prematurity" can be a material planning consideration, government guidelines and case law indicate that this should not be viewed as such, unless relevant plans are very close to completion, in particular where they are submitted for examination. This is the case with the Shaping Places plan as it is at the earliest stage of development.

With regard to the Core Strategy, the overriding reason identified by the Inspector for reducing the plan period of the Core Strategy from 2021 to 2016 related to the capacity of the Strategy to provide adequately, and with the necessary flexibility, for new housing development. The principal issues behind this step relate to Telford centric issues – in the form of the ability of the Strategy to provide ‘flexibility’ for the highest growth levels proposed in the then emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (a Telford led issue); and also the

requirement for a review of green space with specific reference to the Green Network (again a Telford led issue). There was however, an element of reasoning cited by the Inspector towards Newport:

"*The recommended reduction in the timespan of the Core Strategy to 2016 would enable the basis of the housing strategy in Newport and the rural areas to be reviewed in line with its success in the early years, and to be strengthened, or otherwise amended, if necessary. But the change [explicit requirement 35% affordable housing in Newport] is necessary from the outset."* Also that *"The recommended reduction in the timespan of the Core Strategy to 2016 would allow an early review to include relevant policy on the basis of the forthcoming Strategic Housing Market Assessment together with the results of monitoring of housing development in the early part of the plan period."*

Taking forward the Inspector's line in reviewing the position for affordable housing, it is clear from Table 1 above that delivery in the early years has not been strong – there is both a shortfall in the achievement of 60 dwellings per annum, and fundamentally, a significant shortfall in the required level of affordable housing. In preparing housing needs evidence further to the 2005 Housing Needs Survey, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2009 update derived a level of affordable housing need in Newport far higher than the earlier evidence, in part reflecting inclusion of backlog need (quantified as 124 affordable dwellings requirement per annum).

At this stage, the local planning authority is not in a position of identifying a revised policy position on the basis of revised evidence of need in the form of the 2009 SHMA (this evidence needs to be revised to account for forthcoming updated population projections). The mix of up to date quantitative and qualitative evidence provided by the Housing Policy & Enabling Officer does however identify that the level of need for affordable housing in Newport remains high, and indeed has been exacerbated by failure to deliver further provision at the level (35%) required by Policy CS6 (Newport).

The need for the provision of 35% affordable housing is paramount. In the absence of a readily available evidenced alternative strategy for Newport, continuation of this target level of development defined by CS1 (Homes) as requiring 60 dwelling per annum is deemed to be the most appropriate option in order to deliver anywhere near the level of affordable housing required locally.

In accepting that the continuation of the target level of development defined by CS1 (Homes) beyond the end of the current Core Strategy can be considered appropriate, the aforementioned housing trajectory shows how the 60 dwellings per annum aggregates beyond 2016. Also shown is the trajectory (Table 3) of the homes that could be delivered by the applications under consideration as they are built out over a number of years. This indicates that by 2028 the number of dwellings being sought by the various permissions would equate to the level of housing of the 60 dwellings per annum by that date.

Conclusion in relation to housing need and supply

The delivery of affordable housing is a fundamental determinant of the development strategy for Newport in the adopted Core Strategy. Monitoring data since adoption has demonstrated that developments both completed and committed proposals have failed to deliver the required number of dwellings and level of affordable housing required by policies CS1(Homes) and CS6(Newport) respectively. The development proposed would help address both of these deficits. When reflecting on the Inspector's judgment regarding the disadvantages of brownfield sites and that large greenfield sites would be required to deliver the level of provision envisaged by the Core Strategy then greenfield sites such as Wellington Road are acceptable and necessary to help ensure delivery of the housing needs for Newport.

Granting consent for only one of the major applications under consideration alone would not meet the housing shortfall and Core Strategy target to 2016 because of lead in times and build out rates that would extend beyond 2016, therefore requiring more than one site to deliver the shortfall and Core Strategy target.

Given the number of dwellings being applied for, the total number of dwellings if granted by the Council would go beyond that required by the current Core Strategy period of 2016. However, with development of the Council's new Local Plan (Shaping Places) in its infancy there are no grounds to consider this or other applications before the Council in relation to prematurity with an emerging Plan. The local planning authority is not yet in a position to identify a revised policy position as the basis of revised evidence, in the form of the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment, needs to be adjusted to account for forthcoming updated population projections.

The Core Strategy as submitted for Examination evidenced the housing needs for Newport to 2021 before the time period was reduced to 2016 by the Inspector, predominately on the basis of Telford centric issues. With regard to the Inspectors reference to monitoring, this has revealed under delivery in dwelling numbers and affordable housing provision which the applications under consideration could address. The 2009 update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment has revealed an increased need for affordable housing.

In light of the above, it is considered that the continuation of the target level of 60 dwellings per year for Newport defined by CS1 (Homes) beyond the end of the current Core Strategy can be considered appropriate in helping meet the affordable housing needs in Newport with a realistic chance of delivery in current market conditions.

The trajectory in Table 3 shows how the 60 dwellings per annum aggregates beyond 2016 together with a trajectory of the homes that could be delivered by the applications under consideration as they are built out over a number of years. This indicates that by 2028 the number of dwellings being sought by the various applications would equate to the aggregated level of housing at 60 dwellings per annum by that date.

The one proviso is that for the sites under consideration with the Council should deliver 35% affordable housing as the justification for the continuation of a 60 dwellings per annum approach is far less justifiable, reasonable and evidenced. Without such commitment any consents issued could preclude other sites in Newport coming forward (either by applications or through the adoption of the Shaping Places document) that may be able to provide such a level of affordable housing and be acceptable in planning terms regarding other matters.

The Council's Housing Policy & Enabling Officer has highlighted the greatest need is for three-bedroom social rented houses, with a smaller number of two and four-bedroom houses. There is also an identified need for two-bedroom bungalows and for a small amount of wheelchair standard provision for all household types and sizes. This mix can be secured through a Section 106 agreement.

In securing such a level of affordable housing it is appropriate that any Section 106 agreement includes some flexibility on the delivery of house types, sizes and tenures to reflect the need for affordable housing in Newport over the lifetime of the development given that this may change. Therefore, the provision of 35% of affordable housing could either be in number or value (to allow for the inclusion of more expensive specialised affordable housing where required);

Of the total provision, the Housing Policy and Enabling Officer has suggested 80% to be Rented Social Housing dwellings and the remaining 20% in Shared Ownership unless otherwise agreed with the Council. Receipts from the disposal of any Shared Ownership dwellings to be recycled and used for the provision of further affordable housing.

Other measures to secure the most appropriate provision would include the need for affordable housing to be provided throughout the development and not left to the latter stages and also that the houses are delivered in small clusters. In order to match provision to local need a mechanism to ensure lettings are prioritised to Newport area based residents should also be agreed.

It is considered that the above position is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which outlines what Local Planning Authorities should do *'To boost significantly the supply of housing'* (paragraph 47). The NPPF also states that *"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development."* (paragraph 49).

With regard the three dimensions of sustainable development that give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles, one of the dimensions is a social role. This is defined as follows:

a social role *– supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by*

providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being;

Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development accords with one of the NPPF's Core planning principles that the planning system ought to play, this being:

'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities'

Also with regard to the NPPF, the proposed range of housing size, type and tenure in the application would contribute to the creation of sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities advocated in paragraph 50.

Whilst this application is made in outline the parameters defining the density of the development and the maximum height of the dwellings (2½ storeys) are considered appropriate in the context of Newport and this particular location.

<u>Other issues raised with regard to housing delivery.</u>
In October 2011 the Plans Board agreed a resolution to grant permission in the east of Newport for a continuing care retirement community of some 209 units (planning application ref W2008/0934). The resolution is subject to conditions and the signing of a Section 106 agreement and it is understood that the signing of this is imminent. Representations received in relation to the application subject of this report have argued that the units accounted for in the care development should count against the housing target for Newport. It has also been argued that the care development would free up further housing in Newport for re-letting or sale by local residents who would might move to the care development should it be built.

With respect to the first point, in the determination of the continuing care application it was accepted by the Council that the proposals could be defined as a 'residential institution' under the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended) as opposed to ordinary 'dwelling houses'. Because of the classification as residential institution the Council was unable to secure any affordable housing provision - with such provision forming the basis of the Core Strategy housing figures for Newport. As a safeguard to ensure the development does not in effect become dwelling houses, the applicant is to enter into a Section 106 agreement to limit the occupants of the proposed units to at least one member of the household being over 65 and in need of care.

With regard to the second point, in relation local residents moving into the care community development and freeing up housing for let or sale, there are no planned restrictions on the occupancy of those who would buy into the facility if permitted and built. Therefore, as the development could attract residents from a wider area than Newport it is not possible to accurately quantify what amount of housing might in Newport become available for sale or let from the existing local population and when this would occur. In any event any released housing would not be affordable and would be bought and let at market rates.

Because of the factors described it is not considered that the units created by the care development should count towards the housing target for Newport.

Principle of housing development in this particular location.

Location of the site outside of the existing built up area of Newport.
The Wellington Road application site is located outside of the built up area around Newport as defined in the adopted Proposals Map (originating from the Wrekin Local Plan (WLP). Although he adopted Core Strategy provides a Key Diagram, the Core Strategy is not yet accompanied by a spatial plan that identifies how the development strategy is to be accommodated. Whilst policy CS6 (Newport) recognises the function and role of Newport where future development should be concentrated, it neither allocates land for development nor establishes the extent of any revised settlement boundary to accommodate future growth beyond 2006 as shown on the WLP Proposals Map.

In this respect the boundary of the built up area as shown on the WLP Proposals Map is out-of-date. The National Planning Policy Framework states at paragraph 14 that in such circumstances development proposals should be granted permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. This accords with the wider presumption in favour of sustainable development advocated in paragraph 14. Taking into account the policies in the Framework and the policies subsequently adopted in the form of Core Strategy Policies CS1 (Homes and CS6 (Newport), the benefits outweigh any adverse impact of developing beyond the built up defined in the WLP Proposals Map.

The Council did start work on preparing a spatial plan and published the Land Allocations Preferred Options Report DPD in September 2005. This version of the DPD included the Wellington Road site as an allocated site and reference was made to the DPD and Wellington Road site in the Inspector's Report in relation to the Core Strategy. Final progress towards Submission of the Land Allocations DPD stalled as the Council concentrated its efforts to secure adoption of its Core Strategy and later on preparing an Action Plan for the Central Telford Area. Whilst the allocation in the Preferred Options Report DPD indicated that the Council viewed the Wellington Road as being acceptable for residential development, this is considered to hold little weight on its own due to the fact that work DPD has stalled and the time that has

elapsed prior to the submission of this application.

In the absence of a spatial plan which allocates land uses for the Core Strategy, it is inappropriate to conclude that development conflicts with Core Strategy Policy CS7 (Rural Area). Policy CS7 specifically seeks to limit development to meet the needs of the Rural Areas (as opposed to Newport) and focus development on three named villages outside of which development in the open countryside will be strictly controlled. This policy should not be used to prevent development that is necessary to accommodate the growth of Newport, particularly where this would be consistent with Policy CS6.

To reinforce the view that sites outside of the built up area as shown on the WLP Proposals Map can be considered appropriate, it is noted that the WLP Proposals Map identified two sites for future residential development. Both sites have since been developed and there remain only a limited number of small sites that could be developed within the built up area, with most being brownfield in nature.

As discussed above brownfield sites are limited in the number of houses such sites can deliver and have historically resulted in a lower level of affordable housing. Many of the brownfield sites are in alternative uses which may be more appropriate to other forms of development and there is limited certainty that they will come forward and be granted permission in any event.

With regard to the Core Strategy, policy CS6 specifically refers to development also meeting the needs of Newport's rural hinterland as well as needs of the town itself. Furthermore, the Inspector's Report into the Core Strategy acknowledges that Newport is not as well provided with brownfield opportunities (within the built up area) as Telford and a higher proportion of greenfield development may be unavoidable if the proposed number of dwellings (and required level of affordable houses) advocated in policy CS1 (and policy CS6) are to be achieved.

Therefore, in light of the material considerations outlined in the paragraphs above and previous acceptance that there is a clear housing need in Newport to meet the requirements for the Core Strategy policy CS1 (Homes) up to and beyond the current plan period, the principle of whether a housing development in this location is accepted on policy grounds.

<u>Coalescence of Newport and Church Aston.</u>
Representations received have based some of their objections on the grounds that the proposed development would result in the coalescence of the built up areas of Newport and Church Aston, with the latter losing some of its separate identity and character. It is accepted that part of the southern side of Newport would merge with part of the western side of Church Aston if the development were to take place and the separate identity of the village would diminish.

In considering whether this coalescence would have an unacceptable impact on the character of Church Aston, it is noted that the village has in part

already physically merged as Newport has expanded southwards and Church Aston has grown northwards. Along this north to south connection it is difficult to notice a separate distinction in identity between the two settlements. The character of the western side of the village would change as the land use would transform from rural to urban, but such change would apply to any land adjacent to the urban boundary that undergoes new development.

Whilst Church Aston is a separate parish, in planning terms the urban boundary of Newport (as defined in the Proposals Map originating form the Wrekin Local Plan) includes the built up area of Church Aston. As described above, whilst the land outside of the built up area of Newport is part of the Rural Area to which the same policies apply; there is no separate designation or policy in either of any of the saved Wrekin Local Plan policies or the Core Strategy that affords land around Church Aston any extra protection from development between the two settlements. For these reasons it is not considered that objections based on coalescence and a negative impact on character could not be justified and upheld on policy grounds.

The coalescence of Newport and Church Aston with Telford is not considered to be of material significance because of the extent of countryside between the two towns and the fact the urban area of Newport and Church Aston is already closer to Telford than the application site.

<u>Landscape capacity and sensitivity.</u>
With regard to the landscape sensitivity and capacity of the application site, reference to the Telford and Wrekin Council Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study published in 2009 is the most relevant starting point for consideration of this issue. This study aimed to assess the sensitivity of the landscape for defined areas around Telford, Newport and other settlements in the Borough. It then sought to determine the capacity of the landscape to accommodate housing development and to identify those landscapes that should be protected from development. The study identifies the site subject of this application (allocated number TWNe17 – 88) as having medium to low landscape sensitivity and a high to medium capacity to accommodate housing.

The landscape sensitivity assessment justification is identified as follows: '*The area is a large triangular site consisting of improved pastoral fields around a large residential curtilage of Aston Grove. It forms the north eastern facing slopes of a gentle ridge rising from 72-85m AOD. This slope continues to rise to the south and west. This means that while the area is visible from the north and east, i.e. from the settlement, it is not generally visible from the wider countryside. Hedgerows are generally low cut and only those to the south have substantial trees in them. Aston Grove is well screened by a mix of trees including some conifers which give it an urban fringe character. The area is therefore more open to the north where the north western edge forms the local skyline and more enclosed to the south. The southern edge coincides with development within a walled parkland/garden to the east. This signifies the edge of the settlement proper [Church Aston]'*.

In terms of accommodating housing development, the following statement is made in the assessment: *'The area has capacity for housing as it faces into the settlement and is not visible to the wider landscape. It is of low intrinsic sensitivity apart from the few mature trees which should be retained. The settlement edge starts to the east on the other side of the road. This road is a positive approach to the town so the road frontage and in particular to the southernmost tip and the area opposite the listed building at the Dark Lane junction should be carefully treated'*.

With the site having medium to low landscape sensitivity and a high to medium capacity to accommodate housing, the proposals in this application are not at odds with landscape sensitivity assessment and would appear to be acceptable in broad landscape terms. Whilst the sloping land is visible from the north/east it faces into the urban area of Newport/Church Aston and so is not widely visible to the countryside to the south and west.

Gateway location into Newport.
The site is currently part of the rural fringe that surrounds the settlement of Newport and Church Aston. Wellington Road is the primary road leading out of Newport to the south in the direction of Telford and therefore the site is one of the key gateways for transport coming in and out of Newport. The applicant proposes lower density housing at a maximum of 2 storeys on the eastern and southern fringes of the development that adjoin areas of countryside including the southern parcel of the site parallel to Wellington Road.

In certain sections of the eastern and southern boundary the Illustrative Masterplan shows access roads adjacent to these boundaries which would mean that the houses would be further set back from the rural fringe along Moorfield Lane and the southern section of Wellington Road. Along these boundaries the applicant proposes the retention and enhancement of landscape features (boundary hedges and trees). Whilst further details would be needed as part of any reserved matters application, the factors above should facilitate a better rural/urban interface as well as a more subtle feel when entering this gateway to the town. Whilst housing density and house size increases to the north and east of the site, this is an area where the urban form of Newport/Church Aston already becomes apparent on the other side of Wellington Road.

Proximity of Listed Building.
A detached private residence known as Dog Bank on the eastern side of Wellington Road opposite the site is a listed building (Grade II). The TWC Conservation Officer has been consulted and has not made any negative comments in relation to the proposals. Whilst outside of the application site it is necessary to consider the impact of the proposals on the setting of the listed building. The property takes the form of a large residential dwelling with small gardens surrounding the building. Landscaping around the property, including leyandi hedging, limit views of the building and urban development is in close proximity to building on all sides except to the west. In this respect it is considered that as the setting of the building is constrained by the limited

curtilage surrounding it and on three sides it has already been subsumed by urban development and therefore the proposals opposite the building would not have a detrimental impact on its setting. Nevertheless, if any permission is granted it would be important that the area opposite the listed building is carefully designed to reflect its presence.

Sustainability of location.

In respect of the site's physical location, the northern end of the site is some 800 metres south of Newport town centre and therefore many new residents would be reasonable able to walk to the town centre in around 15 minutes. In terms of public transport there are bus stops located north and south of the site along Wellington Road where it is possible to access buses to Newport and Telford/Stafford. Wellington Road has direct access into and out of Newport by car. To the north east of the site is Moorfield Primary School and next door to that Newport High Girls School. A little further northwards along Wellington Road is a doctor's surgery. Whilst the Agricultural Land Classification of the site is Grade 2, this is a grade of land the surrounds a large part of Newport.

In this respect as a greenfield site on the edge of Newport the application site is considered to represent a sustainable location given its proximity to the town centre, the vehicular access in and out of Newport, the location of bus stops along Wellington Road and the accessibility to schools and a doctors surgery.

In conclusion, despite the site being outside of the built up area, the principle of the development in this location is acceptable on policy grounds given the other material considerations outlined. There are no policy grounds to refuse the application in respect of coalescence between Newport and Church Aston. The site has been assessed as having medium to low landscape sensitivity and a high to medium capacity to accommodate housing, whilst the details highlighted in the Illustrative Masterplan incorporates landscape features of importance and allows for a gradual transition between rural and urban areas. Neither is it considered that the development would have a negative impact on the setting of an adjacent Listed Building. Finally, as a greenfield site on the edge of Newport, the application site is considered to represent a sustainable location given its proximity to the town centre, the vehicular access in and out of Newport, the location of bus stops along Wellington Road and the accessibility to schools and a doctors surgery.

Balance of residential and employment provision.

Objectors to the proposals have raised concern that the amount of housing being proposed by the application (and the other major applications for housing) would result in an increase of population that is not balanced with employment provision in the town. The concern is that this would result in an increase in out commuting meaning the town would become more of a dormitory settlement than a market town.

Whilst this application does not include any land for employment purposes

there are currently proposals (as part of a mixed use scheme) for the provision of a new 4.5ha industrial park at land between Station Road and Audley Avenue. Proposals for two supermarkets have also recently been submitted and are to be determined via Public Inquiry that could provide a significant number of jobs if granted permission. A larger population would increase the potential workforce in the Newport and make it more interesting to larger employers to locate. Core Strategy Policy CS6 provides explicit support for an increase in the amount of available employment land in order to provide new local employment opportunities should further proposals come forward.

More residents would generate more spending on goods and services within the town. As part of the application for the care facility mentioned earlier it is estimated that this could create around 75 jobs should it be built. Therefore, in conclusion, it is not considered that the lack of employment provision as part of this application would warrant a reason for refusal given other employment opportunities coming forward and policy support for future employment growth in Newport.

Highways and traffic.

The applicant states that the layout of the site is designed to promote walking and cycling with the creation of safe and convenient routes through the site linking to the wider area. Representations received have raised concerns regarding existing congestion in the vicinity of Wellington Road and surrounding streets that would be made worse by this proposal. Concern has also been raised in relation to highway safety and an increased risk of accidents, especially with regard to the two schools north of the site and the doctor's surgery on Wellington Road. Other issues raised include insufficient number of access points and limited public transport provision in the area.

In response to the application and the supporting Transport Assessment the Council's Highways Engineers have not raised any objection. However, there are concerns that there would be a cumulative impact on the local highway network should all the major developments currently under consideration receive planning consent and that this would be such as to cause capacity and safety issues on parts of the strategic highway network.

In light of this the Highway Authority has carried out an assessment of the cumulative impact, based on the background counts carried out in support of the
developments and on the distribution of development trips put forward by each
highway consultant for their respective developments.

Plans have been produced that indicate the scale of works necessary to accommodate all the developments and this involves junction capacity improvements to certain parts of the A518 and A41 bypass and the widening/dualling of the A518 carriageway between Station Road and the A41. The works have been costed and the cost to each development has

been apportioned based on the level of impact derived from the trip distributions.

These monies would be secured through a suitably worded Section 106 agreement with the works delivered at appropriate trigger points based on phasing of development. In terms of this application the proportional impact will require a contribution of £228,953 towards these works.

With regard to highway safety it is recommended that a requirement for a new traffic management gateway feature is built further to the south along Wellington Road, in the vicinity of Moorfield Lane and Greenvale and also to include the extension of the 30mph zone from this point prior to occupation of houses.

In respect of the site's physical location, the northern end of the site is some 800 metres south of Newport town centre and therefore new residents should be able to walk to the town centre in around 15 minutes.

With regard to public transport the applicant has considered the proximity of public transport provision but has not offered any particular enhancements. At this time the frequent service 481 bypasses the site and the nearest stops are at least 500m from the centre of the site. The existing local service only runs four times a day through the middle of the day on a one way loop.

In conjunction with other developments it is felt that the level of local bus service
provision in Newport could and should be enhanced along with the associated infrastructure by the pooling of contributions. This would encourage sustainable travel around the town and would provide linkages between residential, retail and employment areas.

The total level of development proposed will take a number of years to completely
build out. To ensure the enhanced services are still running at that time it is proposed to pool all the bus subsidies between the major developments.

The development will need to provide a subsidy of £120,000 towards bus services. Infrastructure such as bus shelters and bus boarder kerbs would be additional to this, with £20,000 on the basis of four stops on or in the vicinity to Wellington Road/Greenvale/Dark Lane. The Passenger Transport Team would procure the service and would agree the timetable.

Details on when such monies would be provided to the Council can be agreed and incorporated into a Section 106 to reflect the need for a balance between the need for funds to deliver the necessary highways related infrastructure and to help developers with cash flow in delivering a viable scheme. As with other highway based contributions, the Council would expect the agreed sums to be subject to indexation to ensure future value is not eroded by inflation.

A planning condition to develop the Travel Plan submitted for the

development would also be required to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. As part of such a condition, it would appropriate to include some of the items listed from the Section 106 Heads of Terms like the public transport pass contribution, travel plan packs for new residents, and cycle discount vouchers.

The contributions highlighted above and those in respect of the off site highways works have been calculated as part of a pooled figure reflecting the proportional impact from this development in relation to the cumulative impact of the large applications with the Council for determination. As such they represent a maximum figure that would be required. In the event that some or all of the other applications are not approved or implemented within a certain timeframe, it would be appropriate and fair to allow for a review of the contributions to establish what contributions would then be required at that time and if necessary allow for a refund for some or all of the contribution. Should Wellington Road be the only application to be granted and implemented within this timescale, the contributions to which such a review would apply to would relate to off site highway works, the subsidy to bus services and the bus shelters. Contributions in respect of Public Rights Of Way and Travel Plan monitoring would not be subject to the review as they are site specific.

Highways officers suggest standard highways related conditions be attached to any permission granted. It is therefore concluded that despite the concerns being raised there are no reasons for refusal on highways based grounds provided Section 106 contributions and conditions are applied to any consent granted at Wellington Road.

Surface and foul water drainage.

The topography of the site is that the land drains towards the north east corner of the site and here the boundary of the site is defined by the Moorfield Brook. The Moorfield Brook starts to the east of the site in Church Aston and flows northwards before becoming part of the adoptable drainage network approximately 130 metres north of the site. The surface water run off from the site currently drains to this watercourse naturally by gravity as there is no evidence of positive drainage.

The applicant has submitted a site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) as part of the application in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 25 – Development and Flood Risk and the National Planning Policy Framework. The assessment considers the potential for flooding from all possible sources – fluvial, surface run-off, overland flows, groundwater, sewers and man-made infrastructure.

In terms of flooding from the Moorfield Brook the FRA states that whilst there are known flooding issues downstream of the site (to be described later), these do not affect the development site. Modelling of the watercourse has shown that above a 1 in a 100 year predicted fluvial flood event some flooding at the site's proposed discharge point may occur, but this would be in an area

reserved as open space.

As with any new development there is a need for positive drainage in order to accommodate and discharge surface water run-off. With respect to this proposal the final outfall would be to Moorfield Brook in the north east corner of the site and would be conveyed by a combination of carrier drains, sewers and swales given that testing has shown that infiltration to groundwater is not possible because of unsuitable ground conditions. By utilising swales across the site and two balancing ponds around the proposed kickabout pitch (and using the kickabout pitch in extreme rainfall events), excess storm water will be attenuated on site and the discharge of surface water would be limited to existing greenfield run-off rates. Such an approach is supported by Severn Trent Water as this would reduce the demand on the existing sewerage network capacity, minimising the level of additional capacity that is required.

With regard to surface run-off, neither the Council's Drainage Engineer nor the Environment Agency object to the development. The Council's Drainage Engineer requires a condition specifying details to show betterment in run-off rates or improvements to the channel of the brook to increase attenuation should be provided. An additional requirement for ditch clearance and desiltation along the Moorfield Brook between Wellington Road and where it enters the Severn Trent Water public sewer network (between Ford Road and Wrekin Avenue) would provide extra capacity. In combination these requirements should not only ensure surface run-off from the development does not add to flooding downstream, it should actually provide betterment to assist some of the known flooding problems downstream.

In relation to foul water disposal, the public sewerage network within Newport is primarily split into two sewerage sub-catchments: one to the north west and one to the south east as shown on plan at the end of the report. The site subject to this application drains to the south east. There are known sewer capacity issues within parts of the southern sub-catchment and there are records of sewer flooding affecting properties and external areas such as gardens and highways in and around the vicinity of Boughey Road to the north of the site. This area of known flooding is downstream of the site in the combined Severn Trent Water foul sewer network .

Because of the existing flooding problems, Severn Trent Water has overseen mitigation measures that have been successfully installed at properties that have experienced internal flooding in the past and consequently the risk of flooding reoccurring is now reduced. However, the risk of flooding to external areas such as highways and gardens remains. The FRA has identified an increased risk of flooding as a result of the additional foul water flows produced by the proposed development. In a 30 year critical rainfall event the volume of flood water would increase by 7% (482.8m3 to 515.8m3).

In light of the ongoing flooding issue, Severn Trent Water has undertaken preliminary investigations to identify the potential impacts of the proposed development on sewer capacity. Their investigations particularly focused on the potential impacts that this site and the southern part of the Station Road

application (TWC/2011/0871) may have on the known capacity issues in the southern sub-catchment. Hydraulic modelling showed that additional foul flows from proposed development in the western part of this sub-catchment are likely to exacerbate existing flooding problems.

Consequently, a more detailed feasibility study by Severn Trent is currently underway to investigate solutions and options for providing capacity to accommodate additional flows from the proposed developments. Possible solutions that are being investigated would involve reducing the amount of surface water (rain water) that enters the foul sewers, which would free up capacity for additional foul flows and also replacing parts of the existing sewerage system with larger sewers that have sufficient capacity to accommodate existing and additional flows. The costs and benefits of each of the options would be assessed and the most suitable solution would be selected. The conclusions of the study are expected by late summer 2012 and would identify the timescales for constructing a solution. Severn Trent advise that they will liaise with Telford and Wrekin Council to provide advice on how new development should be managed whilst additional capacity is being constructed.

Severn Trent Water cannot object to development but can request that planning is reasonably delayed to allow sufficient time for capacity to be provided. This is because, under the Water Industry Act (1991), developers have a right to connect foul and surface water flows from new developments to public sewers. The Act places a general duty on sewerage undertakers, including Severn Trent Water, to provide the additional capacity that may be required to accommodate additional flows and loads arising from new domestic development. This relates to both sewerage infrastructure (including sewers and pumping stations) and sewage treatment works. In situations where there is insufficient capacity in the receiving sewerage network, the right to connect cannot be refused.

Severn Trent Water recommends that Telford and Wrekin Council use appropriate conditions for the planning applications in determination to ensure that details of foul drainage are provided by the developer and approved by the Council. In some situations they may recommend to the Council that occupation of development is delayed until sufficient capacity has been made available in the sewerage network. This position is endorsed by TWCs Drainage Engineers and the Environment Agency.

Severn Trent Water state that they will continue to work with Telford and Wrekin Council and individual developers to ensure that the outcomes of their feasibility study are delivered within a reasonable timeframe to ensure that the occupancy of new development is not unduly delayed.

In conclusion, it is accepted that the development would exacerbate the risk of flooding downstream from the Severn Trent Water foul sewer network as a result of the additional flows produced by the development. However, a resolution to the flooding issues is currently being investigated by Severn Trent Water and they have indicated that solutions can be provided to the

issue. The detailed feasibility study being prepared by Severn Trent Water is envisaged to be completed in the next few months and following this the most suitable solution to the problem will be identified. To ensure that the foul water flows generated by this development correspond to the timing of improvement works that are to arise from the feasibility study being prepared by Severn Trent, the use of appropriate conditions to ensure that details of foul drainage are provided by the applicant and approved by the Council should be imposed on any approval of permission. If appropriate, such a condition should include that occupation of development is delayed until sufficient capacity has been made available in the sewerage network.

Groundwater flooding issues have also been considered as part of the FRA. TWC Geotechnical Engineers state that the site is affected by high ground water levels. However, they still support the application subject to conditions that when designing the foundations and BRE Protocol 1 must be followed especially in relation to high ground water. Known ground water issues to the east of the site at Silverdale Close appear to be connected to their proximity to Moorfield Brook. In the case of this application the area nearest Moorfield Brook will not be built upon, being proposed as open space.

Other infrastructure issues including education provision.
In support of the application is a Utilities Supply Summary note outlining enquiries that the applicant have been made regarding connections to utilities around the site. These state that in all instances suitable connections to water, electricity, gas and telecommunications can be made to the existing networks.

However, in acknowledgement that this application is one of four major planning applications currently being considered by the Local Planning Authority and having regard to representations received at a local level, it is considered prudent to consider the cumulative effects of the proposed developments in relation to provision of physical and social community infrastructure not discussed elsewhere in this report.

The Local Planning Authority has taken the unusual step of contacting the following consultees and seeking their views on the cumulative impact of the major developments proposed in addition to those recently granted or where the Plans Board have recently made a resolution to grant permission.

- Western Power Distribution (electricity infrastructure);
- National Grid (gas infrastructure);
- Severn Trent Water (waste water treatment and water supply);
- Telford and Wrekin Primary Care Trust (Doctors and Dentists);
- TWC Education (Primary and Secondary School provision);
- TWC Parks and Open Spaces (Public Open Space provision).

<u>Electricity</u>
With regard to all three major applications under consideration, Western Power Distribution (WPD) comment that there is spare capacity at their Newport primary substation located at Longford Road (next to Vauxhall Farm)

and both 11kV feeders called ''Longford Rd Tees'' and ''Ford Road/Vauxhall ABI''.

WPD state it would only be necessary to overlay part of the 11kV cables which would feed new developments and which are mainly located in the footpaths in the adjacent area. They would deal with requests to connect to their network as they come in from developers and they do not predict any particular problems with this development area from WPD point of view.

Regarding planning permissions which have already been granted for developments at Bromfield Road – TWC/2011/0179, Audley Road – TWC/2011/0334 and Continuing Care Retirement Community – W2008/0934, WPD will deal with them in the same way as the 3 new applications which are being considered.

Gas

The proposed areas of development have been checked and currently we do not predict any major problems to the network, other than for one development for the North and South of Station Road. Should this site be fully built then major reinforcement works will be required in the area. We will deal with requests to connect to our network on an individual basis as they come in from developers.

Sewage Treatment.

In regard to the treatment of waste water, Severn Trent Water in their Position Statement advise that the foul and combined sewerage network within Newport drains to the town's sewage treatment works (STW). Foul flows arising from the proposed new development would enter the existing sewerage network and therefore would ultimately drain to Newport STW. They stipulate that the sewerage network capacity problems highlighted earlier in this report are not linked to the capacity of the STW.

Comparison of measured flow against the current discharge consent issued by the Environment Agency indicates that Newport STW currently has spare headroom to accommodate approximately 670 new dwellings within its current discharge consent. This indicates that there is spare headroom to accommodate the early phases of the proposed development across the developments proposed in Newport within the existing discharge consent.

Accommodating the total number of proposed dwellings in Newport would require a revised discharge consent to be agreed with the Environment Agency, but subject to detailed discussion this is not envisaged to be an issue. The current treatment process is performing within its current quality parameters and is expected to have some additional treatment capacity to accommodate the later phases of development. Further detailed process design analysis would be required to confirm actual treatment capacity. Any additional capacity would be provided on the site of the existing STW.

Severn Trent Water would work with the Environment Agency to ensure that the impacts of treating additional sewage on the water environment are

minimal. The impacts of treating additional sewage on air quality will be negligible. Severn Trent Water states that they will continue to work with the Environment Agency, Natural England, Telford and Wrekin Council and individual developers to manage the impact of new development on the STW and ensure that additional capacity is provided if and when required.

Water supply.

With regard to water supply, Severn Trent Water identify in their Position Statement report that Newport forms part of the Telford water supply area. Water mains may need to be upgraded to supply the proposed development and a study is currently underway to identify long term infrastructure requirements to support new development in the area. The results of the study are expected in late summer 2012 and Severn Trent advises they will continue to work with Telford and Wrekin Council to manage the impact of new development on water supply infrastructure.

The impact of new development on water and waste water infrastructure can be managed through reduced water consumption. Severn Trent Water recommends that developers are encouraged to adopt water consumption in line with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 or better (i.e. maximum of 105 litres per person per day). This would reduce the demand for water and in turn reduce the amount of foul water entering the sewerage network.

At the end of their Position Statement Severn Trent Water recommend that Telford and Wrekin Council prepares a Water Cycle Study to ensure that all aspects of the water cycle and associated infrastructure are considered for the administrative (Borough wide) area. This would enable an early appreciation of any investments in infrastructure that may be required, which can be planned accordingly. The need for such a Borough wide study has already been accepted by the Council and one has been commissioned as part of the evidence base to accompany preparation of a new Local Plan (Shaping Places). The absence of a Water Cycle Study at this moment in time does not preclude the determination of any applications before the Council.

Doctors and Dentists.

The Primary Care Trust (PCT) has estimated that if all the major applications currently before the Council (including those where a resolution to grant permission has recently been given) then there would around 2,800 new patients between 2012 and 2024. Calculations based on the existing capacity of the two Doctor's Surgeries in Newport and the possible number of new patients is detailed in the consultee section of the report. The conclusion of the PCT is that the overall impact of 2,800 patients on the two existing surgeries would be acceptable.

Whilst the position of both practices in Newport are currently suitable, the PCT state that healthcare standards and regulations need to be met and premises need to be kept up to date and with the forthcoming Care Quality Commission (CQC) registration (April 2013). As such, both practice premises will require some improvements and minor modifications in the future to ensure premises

and provision comply with CQC registration. With regard to these requirements the PCT have requested some additional funding from the proposed developments to support the Newport practices and ensure they can accommodate the future increases to the population via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Whilst this is recognised, it is not considered reasonable to ask the developers for monies for improvements to the existing facilities in order to meet CQC requirements as these are not directly linked to the developments themselves. In addition the Council does not currently have an approved CIL schedule as required by legislation.

With regard to dental provision, as the PCT does not have an up-to-date Oral Health Needs Assessment Document, capacity for dental provision is measured against performance against contracted activity. There are currently 4 Dental Practices/Contracts in place in the Newport Area. Two of these contracts persistently underperform which indicates that there is additional capacity for patients in the area. The Local Authority and the Primary Care Team at the PCT – soon to be the Local Office of the National Commissioning Board should work together to monitor current provision/capacity and put in place expanded capacity as and when the need arises. Unlike GP surgeries, dental practices do not have boundaries and so patients can be seen at other practices within Telford and Wrekin.

It is concluded that there is sufficient medical and dental capacity in relation to needs that might be generated by all of the residential developments under consideration by the Council in Newport.

Education.

As detailed in the consultee section of the report above, the number of planning applications currently being considered by the Council in Newport has resulted in TWC Education preparing a “Position Statement”, updated in July 2012.

This details the current situation in the Newport catchment whereby there is already an existing oversubscription at Secondary School level and surpluses at Primary School level falling below 5% by 2014. In line with the Audit Commission’s review on the supply of school places, a school should be considered to be at full capacity when at 5% surplus capacity or less.

In light of the circumstances as described above, the amount of development proposed by the four major applications would generate extra pupil numbers that would then give rise to the need for additional or expanded school infrastructure which would be necessary in planning terms, but are not provided for in the application. In this situation, it is considered acceptable for contributions to be sought towards this additional future provision through a planning obligation.

Where the combined impact of a number of developments creates the need for infrastructure, it is considered reasonable for the associated developers' contributions to be pooled, in order to allow the costs towards the educational infrastructure to be secured in a fair and equitable way and to avoid a

situation where contributions are burdened on later developments that may make them unviable.

With respect to contributions for school infrastructure, an indicative combined figure for Secondary and Primary provision has been calculated based on an average house size of 3.35 bedrooms and the pupil numbers this would generate. This then allows for a combined contribution figure to be divided by the number of dwellings proposed for each development so each site contributes to the needed school infrastructure in a fair and equitable manner.

In the case of this application, the contribution per dwelling of £2,464.55 would be multiplied by 285 (should that be the eventual number of dwellings that are applied for in any Reserved Matters application) to give a figure of £702,396 to be secured by means of a planning obligation.

Details on when such monies would be provided to the Council can be agreed and incorporated into a Section 106 to reflect the need for a balance between the need for funds to deliver the necessary educational infrastructure and to help developers with cash flow in delivering a viable scheme. As with other education contributions, the Council would expect the agreed sums to be subject to indexation to ensure future value is not eroded by inflation.

The contributions highlighted above have been calculated as part of a pooled figure reflecting the proportional impact from this development in relation to the cumulative impact of the major applications with the Council for determination. As such they represent a maximum figure that would be required. In the event that some or all of the other applications are not approved or implemented within a certain timeframe, it would be appropriate and fair to allow for a review of the contributions to establish what contributions would then be required at that time and if necessary allow for a refund for some or all of the contribution. Should Wellington Road be the only application to be granted and implemented within this timescale Education Officers have highlighted that no contributions would be required.

Currently some schools, for instance Moorfield Primary, are oversubscribed with pupils who are from outside their own attendance area, but are still living within Newport. If new development is located in close proximity to such a school (as is the case with this development and Moorfield Primary), then the pupils generated by the new housing would over time displace those living further away but who are still within the Newport boundary. These pupils will then have to seek places either at their own local Newport school or schools outside of the area. In these cases, it may in fact be necessary to provide additional accommodation at schools which have no new housing development within their own geographical attendance area in order to ensure that there are sufficient places.

In light of the Council's further enquiries (regarding not only this application but the cumulative effects of the major proposed developments that have been submitted) with regard to the provision of physical and social community infrastructure, it is concluded that there is either sufficient capacity that

already exists or that such capacity can be feasibly upgraded to permit the grant of permission for the all major developments proposed in Newport. Contributions to meet the need for educational infrastructure resulting from an increase in pupil numbers for permitted housing can be secured through a Section 106 agreement.

Open space provision.
The development proposes a number of properties which will contribute to the need for further recreational facilities for the area. The applicant proposes to provide an on site open space with a kickabout pitch, together with a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP), a Multi Use Games Area (MUGA), plus other informal green space and attenuation features within the development. Other smaller areas of open space are envisaged and these contain existing landscape features of interest (hedgerows and trees).

The applicant had originally indicated that the informal kickabout area could be developed as a sports pitch for use by the adjacent Moorfield Primary and Newport Girls High schools, but the schools have since indicated to the applicant that they do not consider that it would be practical for the schools to use a facility shared with the community.

The Council's records indicate that there are sufficient formal sports pitches (i.e. club use pitches) in the area to serve the local community now and in the future.

The Council's Parks and Open Spaces department consider this development proposal meets the need for play and recreation arising from the development in accordance with saved Wrekin Local Plan policies LR4 and LR6 subject to suitable conditions in relation final design, implementation and management and also a Section 106 agreement relating to the future adoption by the Council of the open space if that option is exercised by the applicant.

Ecology.
The advice from the Council's Ecology officer is that they support the application subject to conditions seeking the retention of hedgerows and trees as well as ecological enhancements through a landscaping scheme. Outside of established hedgerows, trees and the brook there is little habitat of interest as the site is predominately improved grassland. There no recorded protected species on site, although there are 2 trees (to be retained) that have the potential for roosting bats.

Natural England have confirmed that they are satisfied that either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, the proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect on the important interest features of the West Midlands Meres and Mosses (Phase 1 and Phase 2) Ramsar Sites or any of the special scientific interest features of the Aqualate Mere or Newport Canal Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

Noise impact from adjoining main road and construction activities.
Wellington Road is a primary route into the centre of Newport from the south

and is therefore a potential source of noise nuisance for any new dwellings that are constructed adjacent to it. A noise report submitted on behalf of residents of Newport and Church Aston claims that the proposed houses fronting onto Wellington Road fall into Noise Exposure Category C as defined in PPG24 (Noise) and as such planning permission should not normally be granted.

The applicants have submitted their own noise assessment and this states that noise on this site is dominated by traffic noise, predominantly from Wellington Road, with the majority of the site falling within Noise Exposure Categories (NEC) A and B, and only a narrow strip of land along the eastern boundary of the site falling with NEC C. The report concludes that with suitable glazing and ventilation provision to internal living spaces acceptable targets as set out in BS 8233:1999 could be met for dwellings as close as 6 meters from Wellington Road.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has considered the issue and notes that parts of the proposed scheme are within NEC Categories B and C (situations where noise mitigation measures may make development acceptable). They conclude that there is no objection to the proposed development, but if the Council is minded to grant the application the site would need to be protected from the effects of noise. It is recommended that the applicant prepare a scheme, in writing, for approval by the LPA, which details suitable and sufficient noise attenuation measures for the site, before any development commences. The scheme should include (but is not limited to):

- Location, and orientation of dwellings
- Location and specification of Acoustic barriers
- Provision of acoustic glazing systems (as required)
- Provision of mechanical ventilation systems (as required)

Any scheme submitted should clearly state the standards with which it would comply. The scheme should be fully implemented before occupation of the dwellings and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

It is considered that the Standard Conditions relating to Construction Noise be incorporated within any permission granted.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Conclusions

The delivery of affordable housing is a fundamental determinant of the development strategy for Newport in the adopted Core Strategy. Monitoring data since adoption has demonstrated that developments for both completed and committed proposals have failed to deliver the required number of dwellings and level of affordable housing required by policies CS1(Homes) and CS6(Newport) respectively. The development proposed would help address both of these deficits. When reflecting on the Inspector's judgment regarding the disadvantages of brownfield sites and that large greenfield sites would be required to deliver the level of provision envisaged by the Core

Strategy, then greenfield sites such as Wellington Road are acceptable and necessary to help ensure delivery of the local housing needs for Newport and its rural hinterland.

Granting consent for only one of the major applications under consideration alone would not meet the housing shortfall and Core Strategy target to 2016 bearing in mind lead in times and build out rates that would extend beyond 2016, therefore requiring more than one site to deliver the shortfall and Core Strategy target.

Given the number of dwellings being applied for, the total number of dwellings if granted by the Council would go beyond that required by the current Core Strategy period of 2016. However, with development of the Council's new Local Plan (Shaping Places) in its infancy there are no grounds to consider this or other applications before the Council in relation to prematurity with an emerging Plan. The local planning authority is not yet in a position to identify a revised policy position as the basis of revised evidence, in the form of the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment, needs to be adjusted to account for forthcoming updated population projections.

The Core Strategy as submitted for Examination evidenced the housing needs for Newport to 2021 before the time period was reduced to 2016 by the Inspector, predominately on the basis of Telford centric issues. With regard to the Inspectors reference to monitoring of the early part of the plan period, this has revealed under delivery in dwelling numbers and affordable housing provision which the applications under consideration could address. The 2009 update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment has revealed an increased need for affordable housing.

In light of the above, it is considered that the continuation of the target level of 60 dwellings per year for Newport defined by CS1 (Homes) beyond the end of the current Core Strategy can be considered appropriate in helping meet the affordable housing needs in Newport with a realistic chance of delivery in current market conditions.

It is also considered that the above position is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which outlines what Local Planning Authorities should do *'To boost significantly the supply of housing'* (paragraph 47). The NPPF also states that *"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development."* (paragraph 49). This relates to the social role of sustainable development that seeks to support *'strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being'.*

Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development accords with one of the NPPF's Core planning principles that the planning system ought to play, this being:

'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities'

Also with regard to the NPPF, the proposed range of housing size, type and tenure in the application would contribute to the creation of sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities advocated in paragraph 50.

Whilst this application is made in outline, the parameters defining the density of the development and the maximum height of the dwellings (2½ storeys) are considered appropriate in the context of Newport and this particular location.

The principle of the development in this location is acceptable on policy grounds despite the site being outside of the built up area as outlined in the report, particularly as the proposal is consistent with Policy CS6 (Newport) in meeting the local need for new homes with the required level of affordable housing.

There are no policy grounds to refuse the application in respect of coalescence between Newport and Church Aston. The site has been assessed as having medium to low landscape sensitivity and a high to medium capacity to accommodate housing and the details highlighted in the Illustrative Masterplan incorporates landscape features of importance and allows for a gradual transition between rural and urban areas. Neither is it considered that there would be a negative impact on the setting of an adjacent Listed Building. As a greenfield site on the edge of Newport, the application site is considered to represent a sustainable location given its proximity to the town centre, the vehicular access in and out of Newport, the location of bus stops along Wellington Road and the accessibility to schools and a doctor's surgery.

It is not considered that the lack of employment provision as part of this application would warrant a reason for refusal given other employment opportunities coming forward and policy support for future employment growth in Newport.

In response to the application and the supporting Transport Assessment, the Council's Highways Engineers have not raised any objection. There are though concerns that there would be a cumulative impact on the local highway network should all the major developments currently under consideration receive planning consent, that would be such as to cause capacity and safety issues on parts of the strategic highway network. In light of this concern, the Highway Authority has carried out an assessment of the

cumulative impact, based on the background counts carried out in support of the developments and on the distribution of development trips put forward by each highway consultant for their respective developments. Provided Section 106 contributions and conditions are applied to any consent granted, it is concluded that there are no reasons for refusal on highways grounds.

It is accepted that the development would exacerbate the risk of flooding downstream from the Severn Trent Water foul sewer network as a result of the additional flows produced by the development. However, a resolution to the flooding issues is currently being investigated by Severn Trent Water and they have indicated that solutions can be provided to the issue. The detailed feasibility study being prepared by Severn Trent Water is envisaged to be completed in the next few months and following this the most suitable solution to the problem will be identified. To ensure that the foul water flows generated by this development correspond to the timing of improvement works that are to arise from the feasibility study being prepared by Severn Trent, the use of appropriate conditions to ensure that details of foul drainage are provided by the applicant and approved by the Council should be imposed on any approval of permission. If appropriate, such a condition should include that occupation of development is delayed until sufficient capacity has been made available in the sewerage network.

In light of the Council's further enquiries (regarding not only this application but the cumulative effects of the major proposed developments that have been submitted) with regard to the provision of physical and social community infrastructure, it is concluded that there is either sufficient capacity that already exists or that such capacity can be feasibly upgraded to permit the grant of permission for the all developments proposed in Newport. Contributions to meet the need for educational infrastructure resulting from an increase in pupil numbers for permitted housing can be secured through a Section 106 agreement.

The Council's Parks and Open Spaces department consider this development proposal meets the need for play and recreation arising from the development in accordance with saved Wrekin Local Plan policies LR4 and LR6 subject to suitable conditions in relation to final design, implementation and management and also a Section 106 agreement relating to the future adoption by the Council of the open space if that option is exercised by the applicant (the alternative method being through a private management company).

There are no substantiated issues regarding ecology, archaeology and noise that cannot be addressed by the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

Overall, it is considered that the development proposed in the application represents sustainable development and there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in National Planning Policy Framework.

Planning Obligations
With regard to planning obligations, the consultations received in relation to this application have highlighted the need for contributions relating to the provision of affordable housing (at 35% as per Core Strategy Policy CS6), highways works and public transport, education infrastructure and possibly with regard to future adoption by the Council of the public open space and associated SUDs features.

In the responses from Council Officers in respect of Highways and Education, the combined impact of a number of developments creates the need for a greater level of infrastructure, therefore it is considered reasonable for the associated developers' contributions to be pooled. This approach allows the cumulative costs towards such infrastructure to be secured in a fair and equitable way and to avoid a situation where contributions are burdened on later developments that may make them unviable.

However, such cumulative costs are by no means assured as they have been based on a level of development proposed in the other major applications pending consideration by the Council in the Newport area. In essence they represent a maximum contribution that would be required from this applicant in contributing to the cumulative impacts that have been assessed as arising from a number of developments. If these applications are not approved then it is fair that a review mechanism exists within a Section 106 agreement so that, within a timescale to be agreed and set out in the required Section 106 agreement, the position can be assessed as to whether the applications under consideration have been or are likely to granted or implemented, and if they have or are, allow for the return of some of the funds to reflect a lower level of impact arising from developments granted. This may even be to the point where impacts are only assessed to this particular application in isolation if it is the only one approved by the Council.

Therefore, the precise amount of Section 106 payments for certain highways contributions and all the education contributions depend on whether this application is granted permission in isolation, or is one granted together with other applications yet to be determined by the Council in the near future. In addition there are other variables that can only be considered when details accompanying Reserved Matters details are submitted, for example, the precise number and size of houses in relation to calculating education contributions.

Referral to the Secretary of State
Should Plans Board be minded to approve this application the National Casework Planning Unit has requested copies of the relevant documents be passed to them to allow an assessment to be made, before any notification is issued to the applicant. This is to allow consideration of whether there are any issues of a significant enough nature to warrant intervention from the Secretary of State that is, to “Call In” the application.

Recommendation to Plans Board
Based on the conclusions above, the recommendation to Plans Board on this

application is that DELEGATED AUTHORITY be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following:

A.) Confirmation from the Secretary of State that he does not wish to call-in the application for determination;

B.) The applicants entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Council (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to:

(i) Affordable housing, to include:

- Provisions ensuring that 35% of the dwellings to be built shall be affordable housing either in number or value (to allow for the inclusion of more expensive specialised affordable housing where required);
- Of the above 80% to be Rented Social Housing dwellings and the remaining 20% in Shared Ownership unless otherwise agreed with the Council;
- Provisions ensuring that the affordable housing is provided throughout the development and not left to the latter stages and also that the houses are delivered in small clusters;
- Inclusion of details to ensure lettings are prioritised to Newport area based residents;
- Receipts from the disposal of any Shared Ownership dwellings to be recycled and used for the provision of further affordable housing.

(ii) Highways works, to include:

- Off site highway infrastructure improvements - up to a maximum of £228,953;
- Public transport service enhancements – up to a maximum of £120,000;
- Public transport infrastructure (bus shelters) – up to a maximum of £20,000.

Timescale and triggers for the payment of the contributions to be agreed. Details of reviews will need to be agreed to take into account whether other permissions have been or are likely to be granted or implemented in Newport and if not to reassess whether the maximum figures stated can still be justified for this development.

- Public Rights Of Way - £27,000;
- Travel Plan monitoring - £5,000.

(iii) Education infrastructure funds up to maximum of £702,396 provided the average number of bedrooms per dwelling across the development is under 3.35.
Timescale and triggers for the payment of the contributions to be agreed.

Details of reviews will need to be agreed to take into account whether other permissions have been or are likely to be granted or implemented in Newport and if not to reassess whether the maximum figures stated can still be justified for this development.

(iv) The provision of Open Spaces, to include (if that option is exercised by the applicant) a transfer of the open space and recreation areas to the Council at a suitable time and with payment of a commuted sum for maintenance to be agreed. Or alternatively, provide for a residents management company to maintain those areas.

C.) The following conditions (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):

1. A01 Time Limit Outline.
2. A02 Time limit – Reserved Matters.
3. B02 Standard outline some matters reserved.
4. Reserved matters regarding layout to be made in conjunction with details of a general character plan setting out design principles for potential character areas.
5. B10 Details of materials.
6. B129 Details of NEAP, MUGA and parking area for open space. Custom
8. Phasing plan for the development to include construction NEAP and MUGA prior to construction of overlooking properties.
9. B121 Landscape design.
10. B126 &7 Landscape Management and Maintenance.
11. B125 Details of earthworks.
12. B130 Tree protective fencing.
13. B131 Trees Services root protection.
14. B132 Trees No Dig Method.
15. B133 Trees replacements.
16. B57 Land contamination.
17. B150 Site Environmental Management Plan for construction works (includes measures for control and reduction f noise from works and hours of work).
18. Highways details – layout, parking, turning, drainage, construction and enhancements and alterations to PROW 7.
19. Highways details – new access junctions, details of pedestrian and cycle entry points into site, footpath widening and traffic management gateway feature (to include extension of 30 mph zone).
20. Provision of detailed Travel Plan to include details of public transport pass contribution, travel plan packs for new residents, and cycle discount vouchers.
21. Details to ensure dwellings are protected from noise.
22. Foul water disposal details to include a restriction on occupation of houses until approved works to create sufficient capacity in the foul drainage network downstream of the site have been provided
23. Surface water drainage details to include betterment of runoff rates or

improvements to the channel of Moorfield Brook.
24. Ditch clearance and desiltation of the section of Moorfield Brook between north side of Wellington Road and where it enters Severn Trent Water public sewer.
25. Details to ensure dwellings are protected from noise.
26. B145 Lighting Strategy (with regard to bats).
27. Scheme of sustainability in respect of open market houses to be submitted (with minimum requirement to Part L of the Building Regulations 2010).
28. Maximum number of dwellings permitted to be 285 units
29. Affordable housing provided to meet Code for Sustainable development level as minimum requirement).
30. Retention and protection of trees and hedgerows as provided in Tree Survey report.
31. Archaeological inspection prior to commencement of works on site
32. C08 Trees Soil Levels.
33. C92 Update Survey for ecology.
34. Development in accordance with deposited plans.

Informatives:
I106 – Section 106 agreements
I108 – Highways Licence – check?
I109 – Diversion of public right of way required
I35 – Custom - Geotechs: The site is affected by high ground water levels. This must be considered when designing the foundations and BRE Protocol 1 must be followed especially in relation to high ground water.
I35 – Custom – Environment Agency ref Groundwater: We note the Geoenvironmental Desk Study and Conceptual Model produced by WSP dated May 2011. We concur with the recommendations as stated in para 6.2.1 of that report. We support the proposals for Investigations in the area of the 2 identified wells/abstractions as they would be useful in maintaining the quality of groundwater in these areas.
I35 Custom – ref Drainage 1) A flood routing plan will be required as part of the reserved matters application. 2) Although the inclusion of water butts to properties is welcomed, they should not be included in any future surface water calculations as they may be removed by the property owner after purchase.
I25m – Nesting Birds Vegetation;
I35 – Custom – Bat Activity Surveys
I25e - Custom - Trenches
I40 - Conditions
I44 – Reasons for grant of Approval

REASONS FOR APPROVAL:
The delivery of affordable housing is a fundamental determinant of the development strategy for Newport in the adopted Core Strategy. Monitoring data since adoption has demonstrated that developments for both completed and committed proposals have failed to deliver the required number of dwellings and level of affordable housing required by policies CS1(Homes)

and CS6(Newport) respectively. The development proposed would help address both of these deficits. When reflecting on the Inspector's judgment regarding the disadvantages of brownfield sites and that large greenfield sites would be required to deliver the level of provision envisaged by the Core Strategy, then greenfield sites such as Wellington Road are acceptable and necessary to help ensure delivery of the local housing needs for Newport and its rural hinterland.

Granting consent for only one of the major applications under consideration alone would not meet the housing shortfall and Core Strategy target to 2016 bearing in mind lead in times and build out rates that would extend beyond 2016, therefore requiring more than one site to deliver the shortfall and Core Strategy target.

Given the number of dwellings being applied for, the total number of dwellings if granted by the Council would go beyond that required by the current Core Strategy period of 2016. However, with development of the Council's new Local Plan (Shaping Places) in its infancy there are no grounds to consider this or other applications before the Council in relation to prematurity with an emerging Plan. The local planning authority is not yet in a position to identify a revised policy position as the basis of revised evidence, in the form of the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment, needs to be adjusted to account for forthcoming updated population projections.

The Core Strategy as submitted for Examination evidenced the housing needs for Newport to 2021 before the time period was reduced to 2016 by the Inspector, predominately on the basis of Telford centric issues. With regard to the Inspectors reference to monitoring of the early part of the plan period, this has revealed under delivery in dwelling numbers and affordable housing provision which the applications under consideration could address. The 2009 update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment has revealed an increased need for affordable housing.

In light of the above, it is considered that the continuation of the target level of 60 dwellings per year for Newport defined by CS1 (Homes) beyond the end of the current Core Strategy can be considered appropriate in helping meet the affordable housing needs in Newport with a realistic chance of delivery in current market conditions.

It is also considered that the above position is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which outlines what Local Planning Authorities should do *'To boost significantly the supply of housing'* (paragraph 47). The NPPF also states that *"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development."* (paragraph 49). This relates to the social role of sustainable development that seeks to support *'strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being'.*

Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development accords with one of the NPPF's Core planning principles that the planning system ought to play, this being:

'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities'

Also with regard to the NPPF, the proposed range of housing size, type and tenure in the application would contribute to the creation of sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities advocated in paragraph 50.

Whilst this application is made in outline, the parameters defining the density of the development and the maximum height of the dwellings (2½ storeys) are considered appropriate in the context of Newport and this particular location.

The principle of the development in this location is acceptable on policy grounds despite the site being outside of the built up area as outlined in the report, particularly as the proposal is consistent with Policy CS6 (Newport) in meeting the local need for new homes with the required level of affordable housing.

There are no policy grounds to refuse the application in respect of coalescence between Newport and Church Aston. The site has been assessed as having medium to low landscape sensitivity and a high to medium capacity to accommodate housing and the details highlighted in the Illustrative Masterplan incorporates landscape features of importance and allows for a gradual transition between rural and urban areas. Neither is it considered that there would be a negative impact on the setting of an adjacent Listed Building. As a greenfield site on the edge of Newport, the application site is considered to represent a sustainable location given its proximity to the town centre, the vehicular access in and out of Newport, the location of bus stops along Wellington Road and the accessibility to schools and a doctor's surgery.

It is not considered that the lack of employment provision as part of this application would warrant a reason for refusal given other employment opportunities coming forward and policy support for future employment growth in Newport.

In response to the application and the supporting Transport Assessment, the Council's Highways Engineers have not raised any objection. There are though concerns that there would be a cumulative impact on the local

highway network should all the major developments currently under consideration receive planning consent, that would be such as to cause capacity and safety issues on parts of the strategic highway network. In light of this concern, the Highway Authority has carried out an assessment of the cumulative impact, based on the background counts carried out in support of the developments and on the distribution of development trips put forward by each highway consultant for their respective developments. Provided Section 106 contributions and conditions are applied to any consent granted, it is concluded that there are no reasons for refusal on highways grounds.

It is accepted that the development would exacerbate the risk of flooding downstream from the Severn Trent Water foul sewer network as a result of the additional flows produced by the development. However, a resolution to the flooding issues is currently being investigated by Severn Trent Water and they have indicated that solutions can be provided to the issue. The detailed feasibility study being prepared by Severn Trent Water is envisaged to be completed in the next few months and following this the most suitable solution to the problem will be identified. To ensure that the foul water flows generated by this development correspond to the timing of improvement works that are to arise from the feasibility study being prepared by Severn Trent, the use of appropriate conditions to ensure that details of foul drainage are provided by the applicant and approved by the Council should be imposed on any approval of permission. If appropriate, such a condition should include that occupation of development is delayed until sufficient capacity has been made available in the sewerage network.

In light of the Council's further enquiries (regarding not only this application but the cumulative effects of the major proposed developments that have been submitted) with regard to the provision of physical and social community infrastructure, it is concluded that there is either sufficient capacity that already exists or that such capacity can be feasibly upgraded to permit the grant of permission for the all developments proposed in Newport. Contributions to meet the need for educational infrastructure resulting from an increase in pupil numbers for permitted housing can be secured through a Section 106 agreement.

The Council's Parks and Open Spaces department consider this development proposal meets the need for play and recreation arising from the development in accordance with saved Wrekin Local Plan policies LR4 and LR6 subject to suitable conditions in relation to final design, implementation and management and also a Section 106 agreement relating to the future adoption by the Council of the open space if that option is exercised by the applicant (the alternative method being through a private management company).

There are no substantiated issues regarding ecology, archaeology and noise that cannot be addressed by the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

Overall, it is considered that the development proposed in the application

represents sustainable development and there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in National Planning Policy Framework.

TWC/2011/0959 Isombridge Farm, Isombridge, Shropshire, TF6 6NF
Conversion of 2no. redundant agricultural buildings to a combined live/work unit

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Brian Evans	07/11/2011

PARISH	**WARD**
Rodington	Wrockwardine

THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED AT 11TH APRIL PLANS BOARD TO ENABLE THE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT FURTHER INFORMATION TO DEMONSTRATE THE ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT

Following the deferral of the application, officers have requested additional information to establish marketing and any potential take-up of the live/work unit, to demonstrate that the proposal is a genuine and viable proposition and would not result in the creation of a new dwelling in the open countryside. The Agent has requested that the application is referred back to 1st August Plans Board.

At 11th April Plans Board, the application was recommended for refusal on the following grounds:

1. The Local Planning Authority considers the proposed conversion of the existing agricultural buildings to a live/work development is unacceptable because the buildings are not considered to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit and do not make a significant contribution to the character of the area to justify conversion to ensure their retention. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

2. The application site is located outside the suitable settlements in the rural area and is within the open countryside where development will be strictly controlled. The Local Planning Authority considers insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that live/work development is required in this location in the open countryside. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy and Policy E6 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

With regard to the proposed refusal reason 1 and the relevant planning policies in the Wrekin Local Plan, officers wish to clarify that Policy H18 states residential use will be permitted where it is part of a scheme for the re-use of a building or complex of buildings for employment purposes. This element of Policy H18 is a material consideration in assessing the proposal and both Policies H18 and E6 refer to the reuse of existing buildings. Therefore providing the residential element is tied to the work element, the proposal would accord with this part of Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan. In this regard, the Applicant has now confirmed that he would be prepared to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to tie the residential element to the business

and ensure the live/work unit remains in perpetuity and does not result in a new unrestricted dwelling in the open countryside. It is therefore considered that the first reason for refusal has now been addressed.

With regard to refusal reason 2, further information has been submitted with regard to possible businesses who would occupy the live/work unit. The Agent has submitted three letters from potential businesses – one from a local florists business who lives at Marsh Green in close proximity to the application site; another from the owner of a family-run business who makes crèpes, and is currently based in Denbigh, Wales; and a third letter from a local business based in Rodington that makes and sells snooker cues. The letters are supportive and all state that the opportunity to live and work at the same site would be positive for their business. The Florist suggests that the live/work unit would become the shop outlet instead of Wellington, where she must vacate from her current retail unit. She lives in the local area already and her customers are local to the site. The potential occupant who makes crepes does not provide any further information regarding his business or how it would operate from this site. Officers wonder whether these businesses would be viable in a rural location or whether they require a retail unit in a town or village. The third potential occupant operates his business from a unit at the nearby Rodenhurst Business Park in Rodington, thus the business is already based in the rural location.

It is acknowledged that there is some interest in the live/work development. Further information is due to be submitted by the Agent from local estate agents to identify other interest in the live/work unit. This information has not yet been submitted; therefore, at this stage officers cannot establish that the Applicant has adequately demonstrated the live/work development is required in this open countryside location. However, if this additional information is submitted prior to the Plans Board meeting, an update will be prepared for Members.

The original report presented at 11th April Plans Board is attached below.

COUNCILLOR SEYMOUR HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS APPLICATION IS DETERMINED BY MEMBERS AT PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of Development in the Countryside, Historic and Architectural Merit, Commercial Viability, Design, Character and Appearance

THE PROPOSAL: The application seeks planning permission to convert two agricultural buildings located at either end of a small field on the edge of Isombridge Farm to a live/work unit.

The Applicant's Agent has submitted a number of reports with regard to the historic and architectural merits of the buildings and has amended the design of the development.

Despite discussions between the Applicant's Agent and officers, no information has been provided to outline the type of business which would occupy the work element of the live/work unit. The original submission states that the business would fall within Use Class B1 which includes offices, research and development and light engineering.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The application site comprises 2 linear red brick and tile agricultural buildings. The buildings comprise a small barn (stables or implement shed) which abuts and fronts the farm access road and dates back to approx. early 20th Century and a mid-19th Century four-bay open cartshed set back within the field. The roof trusses are constructed of an assortment of timbers from other buildings and machine-cut clay tiles. A brick boundary wall links the southernmost corner of the cartshed to the southwest corner of the barn.

The application site is located approx. 50 metres to the north of the farm house at Isombridge Farm, and the buildings subject of this application are isolated from the rest of the farm, with agricultural land to the north, east and west of the site. There are a number of residential properties within the farm complex including a row of 17th century timber-framed cottages adjacent that are Grade II listed, with 2 modern detached properties located opposite. The site is located in the open countryside; with the nearest settlement, Longden-on-Tern located some 1.5km to the north of the application site.

PLANNING HISTORY:
W2004/0050 Change Of Use Of Agricultural Land To Residential Use, Conversion And Extension Of Existing Farm Building To Form New Dwelling, Conversion Extension To Existing Farm Building To Form Garages & New Vehicular Access, Full refused for the following reasons:
The site was located in the open countryside where new development would only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. The barn was not of sufficient architectural or historical merit to warrant its retention; there was no structural survey and the proposal was contrary to Policies H9, H11 and H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan Furthermore, no information had been submitted to demonstrate that the development could be satisfactorily drained, thus contrary to Policy EH2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

W2008/0420 Conversion of Barn to form 1no. 2 Storey Dwelling, Withdrawn

W2010/0017 Conversion of redundant farm building into dwelling house and garaging, Approved at Plans Board. Members considered the farm building was of sufficient architectural merit to accord with Policy H18 and an exception to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
National Planning Policy Framework

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
UD2 Design Criteria

E6 Rural Employment General
H9 Location of New Housing
H18 Conversion of Non-Residential Buildings to Residential Use in Rural Areas
H24 Affordable Housing Rural Exceptions Policy

LDF Core Strategy
CS1 Homes
CS2 Jobs
CS7 Rural Areas
CS15 Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:
Rodington Parish Council supports this application. The buildings are redundant agricultural buildings which should be developed to improve the local area.

Conservation Officer: Objects to the proposal and does not consider the two buildings are of any outstanding architectural merit or historical value. They are isolated farm buildings, disjointed, not forming part of any recognisable 'typical' farmsteads that may convey some element of historical agricultural development nor any model farm. The architecture is generic and commonly seen in many farms around the area. The quality of the building is rather poor too and this may explain their decayed state. The proposal conflicts with saved Wrekin Plan Policy H18 which requires: *"In addition to the above criteria, elsewhere in the Rural Area, the conversion of non residential buildings to residential use will only be permitted where the building is, in the opinion of the Council, of sufficient architectural or historic merit or makes a significant contribution to the character of the local area,"*

Following submission of reports regarding the condition of the buildings and a site meeting, the Conservation Officer has assessed map data and notes that the small stable building was constructed post 1919, whereas the cartshed, and other structures that have since been demolished, appear on the 1843 map. Many of the roof trusses have been reused from other buildings, with some more modern machine cut timbers, and the use of machine cut clay rooftiles of the interwar years. The roof of the cartshed appears to have been rebuilt in the 20th Century. No information has been submitted by the agent as to the structural integrity of the roof and whether the existing roof timbers would meet building regulations standards or require any replacement.

The stable/shed are likely to be an early 20th Century construction using reclaimed materials including a possibly 20th Century tiled roof. The roof timbers are various and do not represent a singular roof structure but a combination of various different elements from various other buildings and of varying ages. Cannot therefore find that the building is of any particular age in itself or representative of a unified style or character that merits preservation through development. As regards the cart shed, this appears to be the older of the two buildings with some indication of a presence in the early Victorian period, though there is a question mark over what does survive from this

period. Certainly the roof is a later reconstruction, possibly done at the same time as the building of the shed/stables as there is broad similarity in the way it has been constructed out of re-used materials and machine cut tiles. As with the stables/shed it does not stand out on its own merits a single readily identifiable period roof structure but rather 'dogs breakfast', to speak in the vernacular, of re-used timbers from other buildings, some 19th Century some 20th Century. We must therefore question what is being preserved here. These two structures do not represent any kind of complete or even near complete survival of historically significant farm structures. The historical integrity as a singular record of an agricultural building type is undermined by the significant re-building and/or re-use of parts from other buildings.

When Shropshire County Council carried out their farmstead characterisation survey of 1994 as part of an English Heritage Initiative, it is notable that these remaining structures were not deemed to be part of a readily identifiable dispersed historic farmstead, being omitted from the survey for the farm. The buildings sit some way away from the farm and according to the historical research these buildings may relate to constructions done under separate tenancies/ownerships. There is some suggestion both in the report by Jill Ming and the Shropshire County survey that Isombridge Farm may have at one time been two separate farmsteads that were later joined together. Therefore there must be some question of which farm these structures relate to. No evidence has been submitted to clearly indicate the historical provenance of the structures as part of the main Isombridge Farm site. The buildings are largely comparatively recent 19th/20thC re-builds and there is limited survival of anything that could be argued to be original to the construction. They represent structures that are neither rare nor unique within the landscape, locally or otherwise. Therefore cannot find that it is of sufficient architectural or historic merit to warrant residential conversion to ensure its retention.

An amended plan has improved the design with more vertical emphasis to the windows; however it does not overcome any of the inherent concerns regarding historical value and the proposal is considered contrary to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

Highways: no objection subject to Condition C12 Car Parking and standard highways informative I11.

Drainage: No objection subject to condition B61 regarding Foul and surface water drainage details to be submitted and approved.

Geotechs: no comment

Ecology: Initial objection to the proposal as a further survey was required to establish whether great crested newts would be affected by the development. The results of the updated survey established that there were no great crested newts found in adjacent ponds; therefore there were no further objections subject to a Condition regarding Erection of nest boxes and Informatives regarding Bats, Lighting, Refuges and Update survey.

Shropshire Council: no comment

Shropshire Fire Service: Advice regarding Access, Water supplies and Sprinkler systems

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:
The proposal comprises the change of use of vacant agricultural buildings in the countryside to a live/work development. The smaller building to the east of the application site adjacent to the highway would become the one-bedroomed residential element and the cartshed would become a work unit with workshop, office and kitchen/w.c facilities. The live/work units would face into the courtyard/parking area, with designated parking to the north of the site.

In terms of national policy and guidance, Live/work development is not clearly defined; however Circular 03/2005 *Changes of Use of Buildings and Land* describes it as Sui Generis use, as it comprises both residential and business use. The *Taylor Review of the Rural Economy and Affordable Housing* in 2008 and subsequent Government response in 2009 have recognised the need for rural enterprise, and the option of home-based working to support the rural economy.

The broad principles of live/work development meet sustainable criteria in terms of living within or next to a place of work without the need to travel. Paragraph 28 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies should support sustainable economic growth in rural areas and promote diversification of agriculture.

As well as national studies of live/work development; a feasibility study by Live/Work Network was commissioned to assess potential live/work developments in Telford & Wrekin. This was undertaken in December 2009. A shortlist of 8 sites within The Ironbridge Gorge, Lightmoor Village, Priorslee, Newport and its rural hinterland were appraised. All of the sites had some constraints to development such as Conservation Area designation and flood risk; however the opportunities were considered to be redevelopment of brownfield sites, good accessibility to local shops and services, links to existing local businesses and complementary to surrounding land uses. It was recognised that sites in the open countryside were constrained by planning policy, and the most suitable location was considered to be one of the sites in the Ironbridge Gorge.

There are currently no local planning policies for live/work units. Therefore it is considered that the proposal should be assessed against extant housing (barn conversion) and economic policies as well as design policies.

In this regard, Isombridge is not one of the suitable settlements listed in H9 of the Wrekin Local Plan or Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy where new residential development in the rural area would be permitted. The policy states that development within the rural area will be focussed on 3 key

settlements, namely High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Beyond these settlements, development will be limited, and development within the open countryside will be strictly controlled. The application site is located on the edge of Isombridge Farm, in the open countryside. Therefore it is considered that there must be a clear justification for any new residential development. Furthermore, the feasibility study of potential sites for live/work development in Telford & Wrekin listed good accessibility and links to other businesses as important factors. Therefore, further justification is required for live/work development in this location in the open countryside.

With regard to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan, the conversion of non-residential buildings to residential use in the rural area will be strictly controlled. Any proposals for such conversion must meet criteria with regard to marketing for business reuse, be of permanent construction, not lead to dispersal of activity, scale and design appropriate to the surroundings, buildings capable of conversion without major reconstruction, conform to policies regarding pollution control and must conform with rural housing numbers in CS1, unless specifically for an agricultural or forestry worker's dwelling. In this regard, the application includes details of earlier marketing of the buildings between 2008 and 2010 for B1/B8 Use Class (business/storage and distribution) whereby the majority of interest was for residential conversion; the buildings are considered to be capable of conversion without major reconstruction and the buildings are relatively modest in scale.

The proposal is not strictly for a new residential unit alone as it is proposed to have a work unit linked to it. Another exception to the creation of residential development outside the key settlements in the rural area would be where the proposed development would create an affordable dwelling; however in this instance, the application does not propose an affordable dwelling. If the live/work development were deemed to be appropriate, in order to strictly control the development in the open countryside, the Applicant has been advised that to ensure a standalone residential unit does not result from any approval, it would be a requirement to tie the residential and work elements together with a Section 106 agreement.

In addition to the above criteria, Policy H18 sets out that where the proposal is located outside the suitable settlements in the rural area – in this case in the open countryside, the conversion of the buildings will only be permitted where the building is, in the opinion of the Council, of sufficient architectural or historic merit or makes a significant contribution to the character of the local area.

The Applicant's Agent has submitted additional information to seek to demonstrate that the buildings are of sufficient merit. Officers have thoroughly considered the condition and character of the buildings. The Planning and Conservation Officers have undertaken site visits and a site meeting with the Applicant and Agent, and have also assessed all the documentation submitted in this regard, such as the local history research, and updated report on the merits of the buildings. However, in the Council's opinion, the buildings are not considered to be of sufficient architectural or

historic merit, nor contribute significantly to the character of the area to justify their retention and conversion. The Conservation Officer considers the buildings are 19th/20th Century and comprise substantial rebuild or construction with materials and timbers from other buildings. No definitive evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the buildings are of sufficient architectural or historic merit to warrant conversion. Accordingly it is considered that the proposal fails to comply with Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

In accordance with Policy E6 of the Wrekin Local Plan, employment development should be related to agriculture or forestry or assist in the diversification of the rural economy, including farm diversification. This should be achieved through the conversion of existing rural buildings, in or adjacent to a settlement, or within a farm unit for purposes of farm diversification, or enable expansion of an existing employment use. The development would constitute conversion of existing buildings; however this is outside a settlement and the Applicant has not demonstrated that the proposal would constitute farm diversification. Policy E6 also asserts that where development is in the open countryside, it will be strictly controlled.

Officers have requested that additional information is submitted to demonstrate the type of business proposed in the work element, B1 use class is a viable business option as in the Marketing Report submitted with the application, the conclusions state that there was little or no demand for commercial use (including B1 use class) at the time that marketing on the buildings was undertaken. The report states that most enquiries were for residential rather than commercial use. Furthermore, officers have requested more information to clarify the types of businesses that have shown an interest in live/work development referred to in the letters from Barbers Rural (Estate Agents and Chartered Surveyors) which have accompanied the application, in terms of why this site and the buildings would be suitable, and that live/work development is essential in this open countryside location. This information has not been forthcoming.

Unfortunately, without more detailed information, it is not possible to assess the viability of a business in this location. It is possible that a compatible business for the farm's surroundings could be accommodated; however officers cannot consider the suitability of live/work development in this location without further information. Officers are concerned that without a strong economic justification and market demand for continued employment use, granting planning permission for the live/work development could result in the creation of a new residential dwelling in the open countryside, which would be contrary to the aims of the Core Strategy (policies CS1 and CS7). Accordingly, in its current form, there is a lack of information to demonstrate that the proposal conforms to Policy E6. Furthermore, the Applicant has failed to address the conclusions in the submitted marketing report which states B1 use class is not a viable option; thus the proposal cannot be recommended for approval.

Officers note the design of the development has been amended from the initial submission and the revised design is an improvement to the original design, maintaining the character of the agricultural buildings, with vertical boarding infill panels. However officers would still assert that the principle of live/work development in this open countryside location and the economic justification for the proposal has not been demonstrated, and the Applicant is not prepared to enter into a S106 legal agreement to tie the residential and employment elements together. Furthermore, the buildings are not of significant architectural or historic merit to justify their retention and conversion; and the amendments to the design will not overcome the fundamental policy issues.

RECOMMENDATION: to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

1. The Local Planning Authority considers the proposed conversion of the existing agricultural buildings to a live/work development is unacceptable because the buildings are not considered to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit and do not make a significant contribution to the character of the area to justify conversion to ensure their retention. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

2. The application site is located outside the suitable settlements in the rural area and is within the open countryside where development will be strictly controlled. The Local Planning Authority considers insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that live/work development is required in this location in the open countryside. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy and Policy E6 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

TWC/2012/0031 Land adjacent to, The Shires, Shifnal Road, Telford, Shropshire, 2 9NN
Erection of six detached houses fronting Shifnal Road and a four storey care home to the rear of the site, with new access and associated works

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Chander Jain	13/01/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
St. Georges and Priorslee	Priorslee

THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED FROM PLANS BOARD ON 11TH JULY FOR MEMBERS TO CONDUCT A SITE VISIT.

----------Original report----------

THE WARD MEMBER, COUNCILLOR IAN FLETCHER, HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS APPLICATION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED BY THE COUNCIL'S PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES:
Principle of development, green network, layout and design, highways, noise and air quality, trees and impact on neighbouring properties.

THE PROPOSAL:
Erection of 6 two storey dwellings along frontage and a four storey nursing home to rear, along with associated works including highways.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The site is located in Priorslee approximately 1 mile from Telford town centre. It is situated along Shifnal Road with a mixture of university, commercial and residential buildings surrounding the site.

The site slopes upwards from East to West and contains a number of embankments notably those to the South and West. The motorway (M54) is located to the South of the site beyond an area designated to the Green Network which houses the South embankment.

The west of the site is currently residential, single family dwellings, which are set back from the road in a cul-de sac formation, with side boundary and substantial planting creating the boundary with Shifnal Road

To the east of the site is more residential development, of a more traditional form, set at back of pavement and two storey in height. There is a public house and a guest house adjacent to the residential dwellings and further along Shifnal Road is substantial development of 3 storey university accommodation buildings.

The local architectural character is varied in style and age; however residential properties in the immediate vicinity are traditional 2 storey Victorian terraces and 1980's detached speculative housing.

A public foot path runs adjacent to the eastern and southern boundary of the site, which is bounded by hedge and fencing.

PLANNING HISTORY:

TWC/2011/0176 – Erection of a 69-bed Care Home and 6no. detached dwellings and formation of new access - withdrawn June 2011

TWC/2010/0009 - Erection of 5no. detached dwellings with detached garages to include access (Outline Application) – Approved February 2011

Planning permission was granted to Telford Development Corporation (TDC) in 1985 for residential development on the site, under the provisions of the New Town Act 1981. The permission, which remains extant, is equivalent to outline planning permission, and at the time TDC believed that 6 to 8 dwellings could be accommodated on the site.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
National Planning Guidance
NPPF

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
H6 – Windfall Sites in Telford and Newport
UD2 – Design Criteria
UD4 Landscape Design
OL3 – Green Network
OL11 – Woodland and Trees
EH14 - Land stability
EH7 Contaminated Land
EH8 Remedial action on Contaminated Land
LR6 – Developers contributions to outdoor recreational open space provision within new residential developments

LDF Core Strategy
CS1 – Homes
CS11 – Open Space
CS12 – Natural Environment
CS13 – Environmental Resources
CS15 – Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

St Georges and Priorslee Parish Council
Objects on the following grounds:

- The design of property is incompatible and would mar the street scene.
- It is understood that there are no proper sewage connections to that site.
- The development would be over-development of the site.
- This development would be 80 units on a cul de sac site with no alternative access.
- Insufficient parking spaces are proposed - access and egress not satisfactory.
- The development would over-shadow the house "Rutherglen".

Cllr I Fletcher objects for the following reasons:

1. The design of the main building is incompatible with the surrounding properties and will dominate the landscape in what is a historic residential area. It will mar the street scene due to:
   - Size at four storeys
   - Design and appearance – Does not fit in with residential area and has the appearance of a detention centre
   - Location – near the front of the site (moved forward nearer the road from previous withdrawn application)
2. The design of the 6 detached dwellings are incompatible with the surrounding properties:-
   - Flat roofs versus pitch roofs etc
   - White painted garage doors
   - Design and appearance
   - Are they for staff? If not they will not sell due to location
3. The sewage connections in the area cannot handle the current capacity and already block to our premises on a regular basis
4. Over development of the site – the plot should be used for private dwellings
5. This development would be 80 units on a cul de sac site with no alternative access
6. Insufficient parking spaces are proposed which would lead to additional vehicles parking in Priorslee Village blocking residence access
7. There will be loss of habitat
8. A nursing home or similar usage would be a 24 hour operation, which will lead to a number of issues that will affect the existing local residence.
   - 24 hour noise from visitors, staff, commercial, public service vehicles and ambulances (some using sirens)
   - Light pollution
   - Parking and traffic management

<u>Drainage:</u> Standard Conditions: B62 & B75
The proposal includes the use of soakaway to control surface water. There is concern that due to the former use of the site, whilst it is agreed that the ground conditions appear to be allowing surface water to soak away, there is no guarantee that this water is reaching the underlying sandstone and leaving the site. In addition there is no guarantee that the direction of large volumes of surface water to specific areas as a result of the creation of soakaways will

not have an effect on inundation settlement of the fill material. Any houses within influence of the associated settlement may not be able to tolerate the total or differential settlement. Even infrastructure or buried services may be seriously affected.

For this reason, unless further information can be provided to address these issues, a Stability Declaration Agreement (or similar) should be entered into. The purpose of this is for the developer to undertake the responsibility of any future drainage issues or ground stability issues created from the drainage solution on building foundations and ground stability, given that the Councils Engineers have raised concerns over the proposed drainage solution.

Although the use of surface water soakaways may be permitted on this site, subject to the above agreement being reached, any foul flows produced by the development must be directed to either the public sewer in Shifnal Road, or a separate private gravity system (with the agreement of each user). Details on the proposed method of foul water disposal should be submitted for approval.

Geotechnical: The site is a colliery spoil mound. The council do not routinely allow development on spoil mounds. The developer must demonstrate that the whole site is stable and will remain stable in respect to the proposed development. A full slope stability assessment would be required prior to determination of any application at this site. This should also include an assessment of newly proposed slopes, and the embankments of the M54. The assessment should identify a safe stand off position from these slopes and a layout plan adhering to these recommendations should be submitted with any full planning applications.

The current retaining wall has been assessed and report provided however its integrity has not been considered with respect to the proposed development. A detailed assessment considering the changes in slope profiles through the whole site and the new loading to the site need to be considered in addressing the retaining structures suitability.

There is no supporting earth works information to this application. A detailed method statement including a cut and fill analysis would be required. This must include a demonstration of the temporary stability of the site during the works. All newly proposed slopes must be supported by a full slope stability analysis. Any consideration to compaction on the site must follow Series 600 with all details conveyed in the method statement.

Spoil material can give rise to contamination. A detailed contamination investigation must be undertaken in line with the requirements in condition B57. This will include gas monitoring.

The foundation design of each proposed unit will need to be submitted in full for approval prior to work commencing on site.

Arboricultural Officer: There are a number of individual trees and groups within the proposal that have been identified to be removed to facilitate the development.
To ensure that the correct trees are removed, these should be clearly identified and highlighted via marker paint.

Although T4, has been highlighted as Category A, in relation to BS: 5837 (2005). Forethought should be given to its removal, it is a Hybrid Poplar, and it is growing South East of the development proposal, the tree has the potential to double its size and spread which may lead to sunlight issues in the future, it is also growing adjacent to a footpath and the M54 which may lead to tree safety issues.

If consent is afforded to the application, then the following conditions should be imposed;

- Trees – protective,
- Details of enclosure
- Details of Earthworks,
- Landscape Management & Maintenance Plan,
- Trees – No Burning.
- Trees – Soil Levels.
- Trees – Materials Storage.
- Landscape Implementation Hard & Soft,

Highways: No objections to the proposals. I do however have the following comments on the proposals:

1. The dropped kerb for unit 6 needs to be widened to allow sufficient manoeuvrability on and off the driveway due to the reduced road width as a result of the build out feature. This however can be dealt with under condition relating to footway construction detail.

2. Double yellow lines are indicated on the application plans but I would only wish these to be implemented if necessary via a S.106 contribution of £5000, which is to be made on first occupation of the site. The money will be held for 5 years and if the yellow lines are not required after this period the monies will be repaid. To note, any yellow lines have to be implemented under a traffic regulation order by the local authority and not by the developer as part of planning application.

I recommend the following highway conditions

- Parking/Turning/Loading
- visibility splays of a depth of 2.4m and a length of 43m from the centre point of the junctions

- Footway across the frontage of the site will be widened to 1.8m.

Informative

- Highways

Parks and Open Space: have no objection to the application subject to the proposed condition of securing Recreation upgrading off site open space in vicinity at £5000

Ecology: From the mitigation measures provided in the 2010 ecological surveys by Peak Ecology and TEP, I recommend the following conditions and informatives:

Conditions

- Bat, Bird and Invertebrate boxes
- Planting scheme
- Lighting Strategy

Informatives

- Japanese knotweed treatment
- Retention of habitat features
- Nesting birds (vegetation)
- Hand stripping of ivy
- Hand removal of brash piles
- Badgers
- Refuges
- Update survey
- Ponds

Sustainability: There are some very positive sustainability aspects of the residential development, for example the residential aspect of the development is being built to Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) Level 4 as a minimum standard. This standard of CSH level 4, should be conditioned.

However, greater consideration by the developer could also be given to the four storey care home. A statement is required in the design and access statement where the developer should look to explain how they believe they have developed a valid and sustainable design solution for the care home. One of the most effective ways of securing a more sustainable development, and reducing climate change emissions, is to develop care home buildings to achieve BREEAM standards. Minimum proposed standards of BREEAM "Very Good", with a requirement to consider "Excellent" should be recommended.

Shropshire Fire Service: No objection subject to informatives

THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

There are four letter of objection to the proposal and the issues can be summerised as follows:

- Loss of privacy through overlooking
- The design of development is not characteristics of the local area
- There is a lack of adequate parking provision
- The road already has traffic and congestion issues, this will exacerbate problems
- This development would be 80 units on a cul de sac site with no alternative access
- Cars reversing from drives onto Shifnal road will cause delay and danger
- Care home constitutes overdevelopment of the site, due to the size and number of occupants.
- Sewerage and surface Water Disposal, The application states that sewerage will be disposed of into the mains drainage, there is no mains sewerage to the site so the application should be refused.
- The sewage connections in the area cannot handle the current capacity and already block to our premises on a regular basis
- Intrusion of adjoining properties, the four story care home block will dwarf adjoining properties.
- Proposal will affect the value of the adjoining properties.
- Gross over development of the site; the site is excessively over developed, building a four story care home and 6 detached houses.
- Design criteria, the adjoining properties are either Victorian in design or complementary design. the design would not be in keeping with the current surroundings.
- The design of the main building is incompatible with the surrounding properties and will dominate the landscape in what is a historic residential area. It will mar the street scene due to size at four storeys, design and appearance does not fit in with residential area and has the appearance of a detention centre, location – nearer the front of the site
- The design of the 6 detached dwellings are incompatible with the surrounding properties, due to Flat roofs, white painted garage doors, design and appearance. Also are they for staff? If not they will not sell due to location
- Destruction of TPO trees, the previous application made provisions for this in retaining the most important trees and protective measures for these trees. This has been ignored by the application.
- There will be loss of habitat
- A nursing home or similar usage would be a 24 hour operation, which will lead to a number of issues that will affect the existing local residence; 24 hour noise from visitors, staff, commercial, public service vehicles and ambulances (some using sirens), Light pollution and parking and traffic management
- There are more suitable sites for a nursing home are available within the area. For example, the land opposite HMRC at the Priorslee roundabout is large and open with plenty of access and has buildings nearby of a similar appearance. Building what would for all intents and purposes be a large commercial premises in a residential area should not be acceptable

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:
Principle of development and green network

Most of the site is shown as ‘white land’ on the Wrekin Local Plan where residential development is considered to be acceptable in principle. A small part along the southern boundary is designated as Green Network on the Local Plan. The planning permission granted to Telford Development Corporation in 1985, which remains extant, also establishes the principle of residential development on this site.

National planning policy framework (NPPF) has a presumption in favour of development n sustainable locations thereby promoting the efficient use of land, promotion of mixed use development, conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. Furthermore, housing development should deliver a wide choice of high quality homes to create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.

Officers consider that in principle the site is suitable for residential development, as it meets the aspiration of NPPF by proposing a mixed use development, includes retention of the part of the site designated as green network with enhancement to biodiversity and represents an efficient use of the land. Furthermore, the development will provide decent affordable housing with a mix of type and size to meet local needs in accordance with policy CS1 of the core strategy and policies H6 and OL3 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

Layout, scale and design, impact on neighbouring properties

The proposed layout comprising 6 number two storey dwellings along the northern boundary would help to create a strong street frontage, which whilst set back from the footpath to allow for access for parking, continues the character of development to the east of development facing the street. Within the rear of the site, located behind the houses is a four storey care home in an L-shaped configuration, and set into the slopes of the site. It is noted that a number of objections have been raised regarding the issue of over development of the site; however, Policy H6 (Wrekin Local Plan) requires site of between 0.4 and 1 hectare to generally be of higher density. Officers consider that the proposal is an efficient use of the land and will significantly boost the supply of residential housing in accordance with guidance in NPPF. Furthermore, the proposal is for a mix of housing to serve a wider community, an approach encouraged within NPPF.

NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and should positively contribute to making places better for people, with high quality and inclusive design. Planning should not impose architectural styles or particular tastes and should not stifle innovation. Development should however seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

The design of the proposed dwellings is a modernistic interpretation of the Victorian dwellings adjacent to the development, rather than a pastiche replica. The dwellings are flat roofed with a strong red brick, tall narrow windows to reflect the vertical emphasis of the building, with one large window to replica bay windows. A deep reveal to the windows and doors is to give depth and shadowing and add interest to the building rather then using more traditional window cill and headers. The scale of the dwellings are wider, but shorter than the existing Victorian dwellings, but have sufficient height and vertical emphasis to reinforce the character of the area.

The design of the care home take is again flat roofed, with a stepped nature to take into account changes in ground levels. As the dwellings to the west are set on significantly higher ground the height of the care home is level with these properties. To the east properties are lower, but the building is pulled away from this boundary and separated by a public footpath. Given the physical separation from side boundaries, being set well back into the site and sloped nature of the site, officers consider that the scale of the property is appropriate and in keeping with the street scene and character of the area

The eastern elevation contains no windows in the main flank wall facing neighbouring properties to the east; furthermore there are no windows at the second of third floor levels in the western elevation. The are three bedroom windows on the first floor, but this is level with the ground level and given the separation form the boundary, and the level of screening with fence and planting, these are considered acceptable. Officer are satisfied that windows have been sensitively located on the northern and southern elevations to ensure no adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers of existing dwellings in terms of loss of privacy and overlooking. To ensure that this is retained, a condition removing permitted development rights to insert new openings in these elevations is considered appropriate.

In summary officers consider that the proposal respects and responds positively to the context through high quality design, with an integrated design which respects the landscape setting and topography, reinforces the existing street pattern and produces an safe and secure environment, in accordance with policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan, CS15 of the LDF core Strategy and design guidance in NPPF.

<u>Highways</u>

Previous proposals have sought to install the access to the northern eastern corner of the site, as the ground levels are more akin with the existing road. However, for this level of development and given the proximity of the public footpath, the highways engineer had concerns about levels of visibility. The proposal is for a more central access point, which achieves the necessary visibility splays, does not impact on existing road calming features and will assist in creating a focal square for the new development. The development is therefore considered to accord with policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan, CS15 of the core strategy and guidance in NPPF>

Residents have raised an issue with on street parking and officers recognise that this should be avoided. The proposed development provides 2 parking spaces for each of the 6 dwellings, with two visitor spaces at rear along with a further 9 spaces (including 3 disabled spaces) for the care home. This level of parking provision accords with guidance and is considered acceptable by officers. Officers have requested £5000 to be held by the council to monitor the development and if necessary seek a traffic regulation order and install double yellow lines in the vicinity to ensure the proposal does not adversely impact on free flow of traffic along Shifnal Road. The development also includes cycle storage facilities to assist in the promotion of sustainable model of transport.

Ground conditions

The proposal is supported by the geotechnical report, given the previous quarrying use of the site, and potential for land contamination in the made ground. The report is clear that the site has no record of abandoned mine entries or areas affected by shallow mining. The ground is largely made up ground following reclamation after sandstone quarrying. As the make up of the ground is not known, there is potential for gas emissions. Due to the ground conditions, Officers recommend conditions for a detailed land contamination investigation, which would include gas monitoring.

The site is a colliery spoil mound. The council does not routinely allow development on spoil mounds. The geotechnical officers have advised that the developer must demonstrate that the whole site is stable and will remain stable in respect to the proposed development. A full slope stability assessment is required prior to determination of any application at this site. This should also include an assessment of newly proposed slopes, and the embankments of the M54. The assessment should identify a safe stand off position from these slopes and a layout plan adhering to these recommendations should be submitted with any full planning applications. The planning officer forwarded this request to the applicants and was awaiting further details. The applicants requested that such matters be dealt with a through use of conditions; however officers considered that this was not appropriate for the size and scale of the development to ensure the long term stability in accordance with policy EH14 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

During the determination process of the application NPPF has come into force. Whilst existing policies in the development plan, in this case the Wrekin Local plan, are still to be accorded with new guidance is a material consideration in the determination of applications. The guidance further explains that full weight should be given to existing policies provided they conform to NPPF or where there is limited conflict.

In other cases the weight given to existing policies relates to the level of accordance to NPPF.

NPPF in Paragraph 120 states that 'to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land stability, planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. … Where a site is affected by contamination or stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.

The information previously requested was to satisfy policy EH14 of the Wrekin Local Plan, and whilst this policy is still relevant. It is considered by officers that this policy does not fully conform to the NPPF and the approach within NPPF should be given greater weight.

Given the previous planning history for the site and as a consequence of the change in policy, officers are no longer requiring this information on land stability prior to determination other than in exceptional circumstances and recommend details to be submitted as conditions prior to commencement of development, and will need to include foundation designs.

The current retaining wall has been assessed and a report provided. However its integrity has not been considered with respect to the proposed development. A detailed assessment considering the changes in slope profiles through the whole site and the new loading to the site will need to be considered later so that the suitability of the retaining structures can be addressed.

There is no supporting earth works information to this application. A detailed method statement including a cut and fill analysis will be required. This must include a demonstration of the temporary stability of the site during the works. All newly proposed slopes must be supported by a full slope stability analysis.

<u>Drainage</u>

The proposal includes the use of soakaway to control surface water. There is concern that due to the former use of the site, the ground conditions appear to be allowing surface water to soak away. That said, there is no guarantee that this water is reaching the underlying sandstone and leaving the site. In addition there is no guarantee that the direction of large volumes of surface water to specific areas as a result of the creation of soakaways will not have an effect on inundation settlement of the fill material. Any houses within influence of the associated settlement may not be able to tolerate the total or differential settlement. Even infrastructure or buried services may be seriously affected.

The Council’s Engineers have raised concerns that the drainage solution will impact on ground stability and foundation design, but as discussed above NPPF is clear that such issues are the land owners and developers responsibility to ensure safe development.

Although the use of surface water soakaways may be permitted on this site, any foul flows produced by the development must be directed to either the public sewer in Shifnal Road, or a separate private gravity system (with the

agreement of each user). Details on the proposed method of foul water disposal should be submitted for approval. Officer considers that issues of drainage can be adequately covered through appropriate conditions.

Noise and Air Issues

In view of the fact that the rear boundary of the application site is approximately 50 metres from the M54 Motorway a noise assessment has been carried. This assessment concludes that noise levels from road traffic on almost the entire site, during both day and night, fall within noise exposure Category 'B', which is generally considered acceptable for residential development, albeit with appropriate mitigation measures to ensure adequate levels of protection. A 3m high economy acoustic green barrier consisting of 120mm rock delta core, covered in woven will is to be erected within the tree belt to the rear of the care home to provide acceptable amenities for future residents. The design of the barrier with the willow is considered appropriate within this natural setting.

The proposal is supported by an air quality assessment which recognises that the construction of the development will give rise to dust and potentially impact on air quality; this can be mitigated through appropriate conditions. In terms of long term impacts, the potential exposure to poor quality area from road traffic emissions is not considered an issue with the development and there site is deemed suitable for development in terms of air quality, in accordance with guidance in NPPF.

Trees, Ecology and Landscaping

The development will result in the loss of some trees on the site, but due to the nature/type of the trees, they are no longer protected. Furthermore, none of the trees are considered potential for bat roosts. So there is no objection in principle to the loss of some of these trees which are categorised as low or moderate value with those trees surveyed as having the best quality shown for retention in the scheme. This loss can be mitigated through appropriate planting and management of retained trees. There are protected trees on land adjacent to the proposal, and to ensure these are retained without damage, officers recommend a number of conditions. The development therefore accords the policy OL11 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

The site does not have any protected species within it or nearby. The existing hedgerow along the eastern boundary is species poor and the woodland ahs been intensively managed. Whilst the site is not botanically diverse the loss of broad leaved woodland represents a loss of biodiversity value, however there will be a low impact o the habits network. Any trees identified has having potential for bat roost are in the north west of the site are due to be retained. The impact on biodiversity of the development can be mitigated through the retention of some trees use of native hedgerow species and new tree planting. Officers consider that this is acceptable and recommend conditions to secure the appropriate mitigation.

The development is accompanied by a detailed landscaping plan, which has utilised the willow acoustic barrier to define distinct area. The views from the public footpath will be retained with trees retained and enhancement planting and management. Within the site some areas of clearance are proposed to create paths and lawns for the enjoyment of care home residents for recreation, whilst retaining the green character and accords with green network principles. The landscape plan has also incorporated the recommendations for the mitigation of impacts on trees and biodiversity. The development therefore accords with policy OL11 of the Wrekin Local Plan, CS12 of the Core Strategy and guidance on biodiversity and natural environment in NPPF.

Sustainability

The proposed development contains some very positive sustainability aspects of the residential development, for example the residential aspect of the development is being built to Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) Level 4 as a minimum standard. Officers recommend that this should be conditioned.

However, greater consideration by the developer could also be given to the four storey care home. An effective ways of securing a more sustainable development, and reducing climate change emissions, is to develop care home buildings to achieve BREEAM standards. Minimum proposed standards of BREEAM “Very Good”, officers consider that this is reasonable and suggest this is controlled by condition.

Planning Obligations

The proposed development will have an impact on services and facilities in the locality which need mitigation. The development will led to a requirement for recreational facilities, as the site is not sufficient to accommodate such facilities parks and open space have request a contribution of £5000 to upgrade existing facilities in the vicinity of the site.

With regards to highways as discussed above there maybe future issues of on street along Shifnal Road, and to mitigate such impact a sum of £5000 is requested to undertake a Traffic Regulation Order and provide double yellow lines to mitigate the impact on highway safety.

A further £2500 is requested for financial planning and monitoring in relation to the S106 agreement.

Conclusions

The development is acceptable in principle due to historical consents for residential development and the reuse of white land as designated in the local plan in this sustainable location.

The scale and layout of the development takes advantage of the topography of the site and exploits the sloped nature to provide a substantial building

(care home) which does not dominate the streetscene. The residential dwellings give a strong street frontage to reflect the character of adjacent properties.

The design of the dwellings is contemporary in nature, but includes an interpretation of detailing of adjacent properties and is an innovative approach, which reinforce the character and appearance of the area. Officers consider that this is acceptable as it is not the role of planning authorities to limit architectural design or impose particular tastes.

The issue of impact on adjacent properties has been raised and the design of the buildings has had full consideration to these relationships to ensure no adverse impact on amenities of future occupiers.

The development seeks to retain and enhance the area of the site designated green network and improve access and use for recreational purposes in association with the development. Issues relating to trees, ecology and landscaping have been adequate considered and mitigation can be controlled though conditions.

Other technical issues such as Noise, air quality, ground conditions and drainage have been considered and again can be mitigated though conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: to subject to the signing of a S106 agreement for £5000 for recreational facilities, £5000 for highways and £2500 for financial planning and monitoring GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1.	A04	Time limit
2.	B11	Samples of materials
3.	B12	Brick Samples
4.	B42	Parking turning and Loading
5.	BCustom	Footpath details
6.	B56	Soil gas
7.	B57	Land contamination
8.	B58	Slope Stability
9.	B59	Retaining structures
10.	B62	Surface water drainage
11.	B75	Greenfield run off rates
12.	B125	Details of earthworks
13.	B127	Landscape management and maintenance plan
14.	B130	Trees protective fencing
15.	B145	Lighting strategy
16.	B146	Planting scheme
17.	B150	Site Environmental Management Plan
18.	BCustom	Sustainability levels
19.	C14	Visibility splays
20.	C50	Completion of noise attenuation

21. C70 Trees no burning
22. C71 Trees soil levels
23. C72 Trees materials storage
24. C76 Landscaping implementations
25. C92 Update survey
26. C100 Bird/Bat and Invertebrate Boxes
27. D09 No further windows

Informative
I06 S106 Agreement
I11 Highways
I17 Minerals Area
I18 Landfill Gases
I19 Mineral Consultation Area
I20 Contaminated land
I22 Protected Species
I25d Updated survey
I25j Retention of habitat features
I25l Refuges
ICus Japanese knotweed treatment
ICus Hand stripping of ivy
ICus Badgers
ICus Ponds
I Shropshire Fire Service

REASON FOR APPROVAL:
The development is acceptable in principle due to historical consents for residential development and the reuse of white land as designated in the local plan in this sustainable location. The scale and layout of the development takes advantage of the topography of the site and exploits the sloped nature to provide a substantial building (care home) which does not dominate the streetscene. The residential dwellings give a strong street frontage to reflect the character of adjacent properties.

The design of the dwellings is contemporary in nature, but includes an interpretation of detailing of adjacent properties and is an innovative approach, which reinforce the character and appearance of the area. Officers consider that this is acceptable as it is not the role of planning authorities to limit architectural design or impose particular tastes. The issue of impact on adjacent properties has been raised and the design of the buildings has had full consideration to these relationships to ensure no adverse impact on amenities of future occupiers.

The development seeks to retain and enhance the area of the site designated green network and improve access and use for recreational purposes in association with the development. Issues relating to trees, ecology, landscaping noise, air quality, ground conditions and drainage have been adequate considered and mitigation can be controlled though conditions.

TWC/2012/0053 North Lynn Manor, Lynn, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9BB
Erection of a 20kw wind turbine on a 20m high tower *****ADDITIONAL NOISE ASSESSMENT RECIEVED*****

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Mr Mark Davies	04/01/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote	Church Aston and Lilleshall

THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED AT PLANS BOARD ON THE 28TH MARCH 2012 TO ENABLE RESIDENTS TO HAVE MORE TIME TO CONSIDER THE FURTHER NOISE ASSESSMENT IN RESPECT OF POTENTIAL NOISE NUISANCE AND THE CUMULATIVE NOISE OF THE EXISTING 18M HIGH WIND TURBINE AND THE PROPOSED 27M HIGH WIND TURBINE.

A letter from Richard Buxton lawyer, acting on behalf of some residents, was submitted at Plans Board requesting that the Council defer the application to give residents more time to consider the submitted noise assessment; that the EIA screening opinion was not properly carried out in the absence of adequate noise data, and that the permission for the existing wind turbine W2010/0093 be revoked as an EIA screening was not undertaken.

Following some residents' concerns regarding cumulative noise issues at the nearby Lynn Cottage located approximately 500m southwest of the wind turbines and deferral of the application at Plans Board, the applicant has since commissioned a technical wind farm noise specialist AARDVaRC to undertake an assessment of the cumulative noise levels from the existing and proposed wind turbine.

In addition the Local Planning Authority has commissioned an independent noise consultant (Sharpe Redmore Partnership) with wind turbine expertise to independently review the original noise data and AARDVaRC's assessment and conclusions.

Further consultation responses
On receipt of the applicant's additional noise information, the Council undertook a further round of public consultation.

9 further letters of objection have been received from residents living in Newport. In addition the Parish Councillor, who is also an objector, asked residents living in Newport to support him in objecting to the proposal. The comments received are summarised below:-

- Turbine is completely unsightly, spoils the environment and Parish Council against it too,
- This clearly will be an "eyesore" on the local area and should be rejected. I am not against renewable energy but there has to be better areas than this where turbines can be sighted.

- Although in principle not opposed to this form of renewable energy, do believe that any development should plan to minimise impact on local residents. The positioning of this proposal will clearly have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of local residents and it will also spoil a beauty spot enjoyed by many.
- Development appears to be against every single other person's interests apart from the developer. In Newport there's the Moorfields 'overdevelopment', the unwanted Sainsburys hyperstore and now the threat of inflicting a wind farm on the tiny village of Lynn.
- As a business lecturer, the global zeitgeist is one of ethical trading and corporate social responsibility. Can you tell me why Newport is being subjected to these completely unprincipled attacks on its quality of living and why the planners in TWC aren't doing more to head them off? You are familiar with 'boiled frog syndrome' I trust?
- We is a market town with some beautiful outlying villages who do not want unscrupulous developers treating us in the same way that BP treated the Gulf of Mexico recently.
- The applicant has already been allowed to install a turbine but it is against the wishes of local people to erect yet more turbines in the proposed position which will cause unbearable noise and affect their wellbeing. The residents of Lynn are not opposed to renewable energy but their needs must be considered by the Planning Committee in a fair and balanced way. Hope the wellbeing of local people will be uppermost in your considerations and that you will refuse this application as it is currently proposed.
- The turbine is too close to neighbouring properties and at 82ft tall it will be a massive blight on the landscape.
- The Noise Survey has been done from a distance of 458m from the proposed turbine site, but the houses concerned are within a 400m radius, so the Noise Report is invalid
- The noise survey does not take account of the background noise and it should
- The farmer could position the turbine further North, but it would mean him taking down a hedge (which has no scientific/wildlife value) which he won't do
- He could site it towards his own property but of course he won't do this
- The siting of this turbine will cause maximum disruption to the residents
- These turbines are extremely inefficient but the Developer is rewarded massively by government subsidies, another case of wealthy landowners profiteering at the expense of local, hardworking residents, whose lives could be ruined by such installations.
- The residents of Lynn are not opposed to renewable energy and indeed did not object to the Developer installing the turbine he has opposite his farm now, because it was a sufficient distance away from their properties. However, this has been used as a springboard to apply for another turbine and where does this end? Because residents didn't object to the first one this has been used against them by the planning officer and applicant.

3 letters of support have been received from residents living in Church Aston and Chetwynd Aston. The comments are summarised below:-

- Support the application - both the government and the Council locally support the development of appropriate renewable energy.
- This turbine is sensitively sited in the landscape and will make a considerable contribution to the electricity requirements of the farm. A similar proposal, for two turbines, was approved by the plans board after a site visit, and there are no good planning reasons to object to this more modest proposal.
- Continuing to rely on fossil fuels to generate our electricity is unsustainable, as the government's carbon reduction targets recognise. This proposal to generate up to 50,000kwh of clean renewable energy is a viable and worthwhile project and it should be supported.
- This is the 3rd letter I have written and am surprised that the matter has not yet been settled,
- The time spent on this application seems beyond all logical reason and in these stricken times how on earth can such a simple application go on for so long,
- Having visited the existing turbine and from beyond 30m it was virtually inaudible and the traffic noise from the A41 was louder,
- Two turbines does not equate to twice the noise only an additional 3dB which is barely discernible,
- This is not a massive wind farm,
- T&W Council should resist spurious opposition to such a small simple scheme,
- The cost to all parties not least the tax payer is becoming insupportable.
- The erection of a turbine at the farm at Lynn will provide the farmer with clean, renewable energy to keep his potato store cool and to dry grain in the autumn for storage over winter. Compared to conventional forms of power generation wind compares favourably as regards efficiency (conventional approximately 30% efficient, turbines 20 - 30% depending on location [US Dept of Energy]) and contrary to popular belief the energy pay back time for a turbine is less than 1 year (i.e. the time the turbine has to be in operation to make the energy used in its construction, including concrete for installation), (Kenny, Law & Pierce 2010).
- Modern turbines are geared to create less noise pollution and given the proximity of the turbine to the A41, this claim is invalid. Whilst there may be wildlife concerns, modern turbines are designed to mitigate many of the problems that were found with older wind farms. Any wildlife concerns will be addressed with the environmental impact survey to be carried out.
- If shadow flicker is to be a problem for the neighbours the turbine can be braked until the very specific weather conditions that cause this phenomenon pass.

- It is a sensitively sited addition to the renewable energy mix that we must start to address in this county.

Marches Energy Agency - fully support. It is a very exciting and necessary proposal.

Telford Christian Council support:-

- The churches are supportive of the Council's very positive attitude to the environment, which we heard about last year at a seminar with FoE that included Mr Barker; as such we would sincerely hope that the Council will be supportive of what sounds like a fairly modest change in turbine height and size in order to directly benefit this farm whilst minimising the environmental impact.

Friends of the Earth – support. Comments are summarised below:-:

- Having read through the various objections, very disappointed at seeing that so many people can be misled into copying and regurgitating spurious objections against such a positive initiative.
- Councillors had made a site visit to assess for themselves the situation given a number of objections, including I believe some of those persons also objecting to this new application. The same spurious objections were made then and considered by the Councillors who unanimously voted in favour of the application.
- The Minutes of that Plans Board meeting record:
  "*Members welcomed the generation of power from a renewable energy source and, referring to the site visit undertaken that afternoon, considered that the proposed turbines would not dominate local views and noise levels would be unlikely to cause a nuisance.*
  RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0069 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report."
- The quality of the objections made is revealed in, for example one asserting that the applicant *'is now applying for a further two'* turbines which is demonstrably untrue given the Council website planning application documentation. The objector also makes reference to having '*contributed by Tax'* and also their '*Electricity bill increase*.' Payments to generators of electricity originate from electricity bills, part of which is to subsidise a range of renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency improvements. The objector will have suffered far more from taxation to subsidise the nuclear industry over many decades - and will continue to do so - than has ever been spent on subsidising renewables. The principal cause of electricity price rises is the cost of gas and very, very little to do with renewables. The media has often presented this in the reverse of reality.
- This particular objector also suggests '*on shore wind turbines …. to be 12% - 23% efficient*.' In 2003 fossil fuelled power generation was on average and weighted according to energy mix some 43% efficient (Graus, W., Voogt, M., Worrell, E., (2007). International comparison of energy efficiency of fossil fuel power generation. *Energy Policy,* 36(7) pp 3936-3961.) Given this suggests wind power to be around half as

‘efficient’ I would suggest that given wind power does not rely on such dirty fuel as coal but the free resource of wind it is in practice far more efficient. We do not have to import wind at great expense as we do coal and gas. See also DTI (2004), Digest of United Kingdom Energy Statistics 2004, Table 5.10 Plant loads, demand and efficiency, available online at http://www.dti.gov.uk/energy/inform/energy_stats/electricity/dukes5_10.xls

- The objector also appears to see solar or biomass as more appropriate. Solar energy is around 13 – 15% efficient at the panel, before inversion to alternating current, so is at least ‘extremely inefficient’ on the objector’s own analysis. Less efficient than wind power at any rate. Is the objector suggesting the applicant instead propose a biomass power station rather than a single turbine? I think this would be somewhat more ‘obtrusive’!
- Regarding “*Shadow flicker and glinting… a distraction to road users and an annoyance to local residents”* quoted in the standard objection see the quote from an anti-wind wind group below.
- “*Flicker can also occur as a result of sunlight glinting off the rotating glossy blades of the turbine and is particularly apparent within 10 rotor blades distance of the turbine.”* http://www.toveactiongroup.org/shadow-flicker
- Given the proposed turbine has a rotor diameter of approximately 13m this suggests any flicker problem would be limited to roughly 65m distance – i.e. 10 rotor blades distance. Even if one used the overall diameter the problem would be limited to 130m distance and this also assumes a clear line of sight from the rotating blades directly to the house. There are no residences anywhere this close to the proposed turbine. The objectors’ standard statement includes *“They will cause health issues to local residents, the nearest being 400m away.”*
- Given the objectors can be so wrong - and even give facts that demonstrate they are so wrong - is to deliberately mislead councillors and officers, or at best to mislead out of prejudice and ignorance.
- Request that officers and councillors discount the inaccurate and misleading objections and grant planning permission for this application consistent with the earlier permission.

A further representation has been received from the owner of a local property who advised that noise does not affect him as his main residence is in Teesside.

Applicant’s Noise assessment
The applicant has since employed the services of AARDVaRC Ltd, who specialise in technical analyses for renewable energy developments, to consider the noise levels at the nearby Lynn Cottages from the proposed turbine in conjunction with the existing Gaia-Wind turbine that is already operating at the site. Their wider expertise includes other related technical analyses such as visualisation and noise studies, shadow flicker, power yield, site optimisation and full site prospecting services. The report details the works conducted, the results and conclusions.

Based on coordinates cited on the application, separation distances between Lynn Cottages and each turbine have been calculated as 515m from the existing turbine and 458m to the proposed turbine. ReSoft's WindFarm software was then used to calculate noise levels based on noise data provided. A simplified manual calculation was also conducted for comparison to show the basic method and the step-by-step workings.

The report concludes that the proposed wind turbine meets the guidance on cumulative noise levels i.e. at a wind speed of 10m/s measured at 10m above ground level, the cumulative wind turbine generated noise level at Lynn Cottages is less than 35dB(A).

The 'WindFarm' software noise calculation tool predicts a cumulative noise level of 34.60dB(A) at Lynn Cottages from the existing and proposed turbine, with a 10m/s wind speed at 10m height. A simplified manual calculation predicts a cumulative noise level of 33.74dB(A) at Lynn Cottages from the existing and proposed turbine, with a 10m/s wind speed at 10m height. It is expected that the manual calculation would be slightly less than the WindFarm prediction as the latter used a more complex calculation with worst-case assumptions. All of these values are within the guidance specified in ETSU-R-97 which remains the official guidance for assessment of wind farm noise in England.

Concern was previously raised by the objecting neighbours that the noise trials for the proposed wind turbine were not conducted at a representative site in that they relate to Ireland. AARDVaRC Ltd has advised that whilst no site can be truly representative of another, the methodology used is valid. The background noise level with the turbine inoperative is measured, followed by the noise level with the turbine operating, and then the difference between the two sets of measurements is taken to get the turbine generated noise. The method is typical for wind turbine noise testing and is the only way to get practical 'real-world' measurements.

If the measured background noise is excessive compared to the turbine-generated noise, then it would be harder to accurately measure the additional noise from the turbine, but this is not the case here. The background noise is of relatively low intensity (all data points are below 40dB (A) up to a wind speed of 5m/s – a gentle breeze on the Beaufort scale). There is no reason to suppose that the background noise level or any other environmental factor at the test site invalidates the results. Furthermore, it is noted that the A41 lies less than 800m from the dwellings in question so road traffic alone may be expected to generate noise levels of perhaps 40dB (A) at this location, and there is nothing to suggest that the trial location in Ireland could be an unacceptable representation of the North Lynn Manor site.

It is not practicable to conduct acoustic tests for wind turbines at all the locations where they will eventually be built. However, the noise generated by a wind turbine is almost entirely a function of the wind and not the location - the same laws of physics apply in both Co. Galway and Shropshire. Thus

there is no reason to consider that the test location in Ireland somehow changes the measured noise from the turbine. Accordingly, the acoustic tests conducted for the CF20 wind turbine used a valid method and there is no reason to suppose that background noise during the testing or other environmental factor somehow invalidates the results.

A principal objector (Bob Parsons) together with a noise consultant (Mike Barnard) submitted an account of the shortcomings of the AARDVaRC report and questioned their qualifications. AARDVaRC Ltd have submitted a rebuttal and point out that Mr Barnard had not specified any errors in the report. It was also noted that Mr Barnard had not supplied his qualifications.

The Council's independent noise consultant
The consultant has reviewed the various noise data and reports submitted with the appellation. He did advise that cal cautions be made at other nearby dwellings and this has now been done (addendum done by AARDVaRC). The Stroma summary report contains all the data needed to assess the proposal. The AARDVaRC report considers the impact of both wind turbines operating at the same time. The consultant has done his own calculations, based on distances and assumptions given, and believes the calculation values to be robust and even pessimistic (based on ARRDVaRC's assumption of hard ground close to the noise source and receptor). The consultant considers that it is acceptable that there are no actual site noise measurements. ETSU R97 guidance states that if no survey is conducted and L_{A90} value of 35dB must be achieved – this is the value that has been used in the assessment, hence no survey is necessary. The consultant agrees with the applicant's submitted conclusion i.e. there will be no adverse impact at Lynn Cottages – and considers that the information, calculations and conclusions are robust and even err towards a lightly worst case.

EIA Screening Opinion
An addendum to the EIA screening opinion has been undertaken in light of the additional noise information that has been submitted. Officers still conclude that there will not be any significant adverse impact arising from the proposed development, particular with regards the cumulative visual and noise impact from the resulting two turbines. Hence an Environmental Impact Assessment is still not required.

Revoking previous turbine consent W2010/0093
Whilst an EIA was erroneously not undertaken for the existing turbine, officers consider that had there been a Screening Opinion carried out it would have concluded that there would be no adverse impact and that an EIA was not required. This position endorsed by the conclusion that the resulting two turbines do not have a cumulative adverse visual or noise impact and that members also granted planning permission for 2 additional turbines last summer (that would have resulted in 3 turbines on the site). Therefore the Local Planning Authority does not consider it necessary to revoke the planning permission for the existing turbine under W2010/0093.

Conclusion:

The applicant's original noise data submitted by Stroma Technology has now been peer- reviewed by both AARDVaRC and an independent noise consultant appointed by the Council. The applicant's additional noise assessment report concludes that the cumulative noise levels of the existing wind turbine together with the proposed turbine at Lynn Cottages, where the main objector lives, will be less than 35dB(A). This noise level is within the guidance specified in ETSU-R-97, which remains the official guidance for assessment of wind farm noise in England.

The Council's appointed independent noise consultant concludes that noise data correctly concludes that the cumulative noise levels from two turbines within acceptable noise level limits and there will be no adverse impact on Lynn Cottages.

Therefore Officers are satisfied with these results and maintain the opinion that the cumulative noise levels of two turbines on the site will not have a significantly detrimental impact on nearby residents by way of noise disturbance or nuisance.

Officers maintain their view that the simple design and sympathetic siting of the turbine will not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the countryside in the vicinity of the site. The profile of the land and the existing mature trees mean that there are very few locations from where the whole turbine will be seen from, and very few people will see it above a skyline. As such the turbine will not appear overly dominant or intrusive in the landscape, even when viewed from the nearest residential property, and will not have a detrimental impact on the prevailing visual amenities of the surrounding area.

There is no further information that serves to demonstrate that the turbine will distract drivers' attention to any significant extent, or pose a danger to existing wildlife in the area. The scheme will provide a limited but valuable source of renewable energy for the farm that will play its part in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and our carbon footprint.

Recommendation:
Therefore, there is no change to the original officer recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION: to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:-

1. A04 Time limit
2. C38 Development in accordance with submitted plans

**********UPDATE to ORIGINAL REPORT**********

INFORMATION RECEIVED SINCE PREPARATION OF ORIGINAL REPORT and presented to Plans Board on 28th March 2012

Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish Council has now objected to the application. Councillors consider that the Turbine would be too close to neighbouring properties.

Since the Plans Board report was written the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has come into force (27.03.12). As a result all previous Planning Policy Statements and Guidance (PPG's and PPS's) have been deleted and therefore are no longer relevant.

However, paragraph 95 of NPPF states that LPA's should support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings.

In addition, paragraph 97 of NPPF states that to help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy, LPA's should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources. They should have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources.

Furthermore, when determining planning applications, LPA's should not require applicants for energy development to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy and also recognise that even small-scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions.

For clarity, the distances mentioned in the officer's report in respect of the location of the proposed turbine to the nearest residential dwelling not owned by the applicant are scaled distances taken from the Ordnance Survey (OS) data.

The report states that *'the turbine would be located over 400metres from the nearest residential property not owned by the applicant, and there are six other properties within approximately a 400m radius, two of which are owned by the applicant'*

It should be noted that the two dwellings owned by the applicant, these being North Lynn Manor and 22 Lynn are approximately 335 and 360m away from the proposed turbine respectively. Lynn South Farm, no's 19, 20 & 21 are all over 400m away, and Lynncroft is approximately 560m away.

The applicant has stated to the case officer that physical measurements taken on site show that No. 21 is actually 440m to the garden boundary of No.21 and 460m to the house.

The Council's Environmental Health Department has confirmed that there have been no noise complaints in respect of the existing wind turbine.

**********ORIGINAL REPORT**********

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Appearance, Siting, Visual Impact and Intrusion, Highway Safety, Noise, recent approval for the erection of two 20kw wind turbines on 20 metre high towers.

THE PROPOSAL:
This application relates to the erection of a single 20kw wind turbine on land at North Lynn Manor, Woodcote, Newport. The tri-bladed turbine will be mounted on a free-standing 20m high galvanised steel tower, with a 5 sqm reinforced concrete base, to a depth of 1m. Each of the three blades will be 6m long and have a blade swept diameter of 12.8m, and thus the total height of the turbines when the blades are fully extended in a vertical position, including the hub, would be 27 metres. The turbine can produce 20,000kW/hrs.

The proposed turbine would stand approximately 75m to the west existing 18 metre high wind turbine (W2010/0093).

Members will recall granting planning permission at Plans Board on 13^{h} July 2011 for 2 wind turbines (20m high towers). Due to a technical issue regarding an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening opinion, it was agreed that planning permission be quashed. Hence this is a new replacement application – it is not in addition to the previous application. This new application is for a single 20m high wind turbine tower, whereas the quashed application was for two 20m high turbine towers.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The site lies in the open countryside approximately 4 miles south east of Newport, one kilometre the east of the A41, and 250 metres North West of North Lynn Manor. The site forms part of the 384.5 hectare agricultural holding at North Lynn Manor.

The landscape here is fairly undulating and the turbine would be located perpendicular to the existing turbine, which is sited along an old field boundary on one of the lowest parts of the farm. The closest farm building at North Lynn Manor lies 200 metres away from the nearest proposed turbine, the farm house at North Lynn Manor lies approximately 300 metres away, and the nearest residential properties not owned by the applicant lie between approximately 420 metres (Lynn Cottages) and 900m away to the south west of the proposed site . There is a mature hedge that runs along the southern and eastern boundaries of the field that would contain the new turbines.

BACKGROUND:
North Lynn Manor is an owner-occupied farm which extends to approximately 950 acres (384.5 hectares), being a combination of agricultural land, farm

buildings, and farm house. The principal enterprise is arable cropping, being a combination of winter wheat, oil-seed rape and potatoes.

The total electricity demand on the farm is in the region of 130,000kW/hrs, equating to an annual cost of approximately £13,000. The main demand for electricity is providing a constant supply for the grain drying facilities and potato storage.

The existing wind turbine, which was granted planning permission in 2010 (TWC/2010/0093), has been running for almost 18months and is on target producing 22,000kW/hrs per annum. The new turbine would produce an annual production of 50,000kW/hrs, thus giving a total of around 72,000kW/hrs (approximately 55.4% of the farm's electricity demand).

The average wind speed at this site is 5.4 m/s at a height of 25 metres. The turbines will produce electricity at wind speeds as low as 2.2m/s.

The applicant states that this is not an exercise to make a profit but a way of seeking to control the cost of energy used by the business, whilst at the same time contributing to the Government policy in respect of providing a renewable energy source.

The principal objective of the wind turbines will be to reduce the applicant's need to purchase power. At times when electricity is not required on the property surplus energy will be exported to the national grid. This is unlikely to occur on a regular basis due to the farm's requirement to keep the potato store at a constant temperature, and use of the grain drying facilities in the summer months.

Planning application TWC/2011/ 0069 for the erection of two 20kw wind turbines on 20 metre high towers on land at North Lynn Manor, was approved by Members of Plans Board on 13th July 2011. Before members made their decision they carried out a site visit to the farm and stood beneath the existing turbine, stood in the garden of one of the objectors and drove the lanes around the site. The proposed development then comprised two turbines and had 3 blades, 6 metres long, and the maximum height of the turbines when the blades are fully extended in a vertical position, including the hub, was 27 metres. Each turbine was capable of producing 40,000kW/hrs. The two turbines would have stood alongside the existing 18 metre high wind turbine forming a line of three turbines. Planning permission was later quashed by the Court because of a technical issue regarding an EIA screening opinion.

An EIA screening opinion has been undertaken for this current application and it has been found that the development, alone and in combination with the existing turbine, will not have a significant effect on the environment and hence an EIA is not required.

PLANNING HISTORY:
W2009/0441 – Erection of a 15kw wind turbine on a 15 metre high tower – approved 29.7.09

W2010/0093 – Erection of 11kw wind turbine on an 18 metre high tower (amendment to application W2009/0441) – approved 8.4.10
TWC/2011/ 0069 - Erection of two 20kw wind turbines on 20 metre high towers – approved 15.7.11, but later quashed.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
National Planning Guidance
PPS7 – 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas'
PPS22 – 'Renewable Energy'. PPS22 states that planning authorities should recognise the full range of renewable energy sources, and the wider environmental and economic benefits of renewable energy projects. "Small-scale projects can provide a limited but valuable contribution to overall outputs of renewable energy and to meeting energy needs both locally and nationally. Planning authorities should not therefore reject planning applications simply because the level of output is small".

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
Policy NR1 – 'Location of Renewable Energy Developments'. The policy supports proposals for the generation of power from renewable energy sources within the District.

Policy NR2 – 'Proposals for Wind Turbines'. The policy permits the development of schemes to generate energy from the wind provided that the visual impact on the landscape is minimised; sensitive skylines are avoided; there is no detrimental impact on wildlife habitats; and the turbines are located so as to minimise their impact on residential development and highways.

LDF Core Strategy
Policy CS7 – 'Rural Area'
Policy CS13 – 'Environmental Resources'. The policy promotes small and large scale renewable energy projects. "The production of energy from renewable sources will be supported where this is consistent with other policies and national guidance".

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:
1 letter of support has been received which can be summarised as follows:-

- There is more noise from the A41 a mile away than from the rotating turbine
- The case of renewable energy is logical and sensible
- It is essential that we the members of the public retain a sense of balance and proportion when assessing these schemes.
- This is not a Wind Farm consisting of multiple towers of great height which we have seen can have a severe impact on the landscape.
- A further turbine to complement the one already at this farm will be scarcely visible from the surrounding countryside as they generally lie beneath the sight line of the horizon.
- It would be appropriate for the planning authority to approve this application.

30 letters of objection have been received, of these 20 are copies of a duplicate letter (4 from the occupiers of the same property and 2 from the same person) they are form residents in the surrounding area in including Newport, Priorslee and Sheriffhales) which can be summarised as follows:-

- The application lacks proper compliance with ETSU97-R regulations by not having an EIA.
- It does not conform to the Telford and Wrekin NR2 plan on wind turbines.
- lack of compliance with ETSU 97-R because of suspected and unevaluated noise and flicker effects on nearby residents who are in any case too close to the site.
- This device will produce more CO2 producing energy than it will save, once lifetime hot spinning reserve, construction, maintenance, and post life site restitution is properly offset. Thus this application is a dis-benefit which is a valid objection under planning regulations.
- It would be directly in my line of sight and detrimental to the beauty of the area- does the person applying intend to erect more and more turbines so he has a wind farm?
- It will be visible from my house and taller than the existing turbine,
- Why does he not site it in front of his own property so he can look at it as well?
- Safety of the bat population which we have in the area as I have heard turbines disrupt their ability to use their sonar hearing and can be a danger to them, and birds,
- Hazard to passing road users, noise pollution, shadow flicker, interference with telecommunications, no benefit to local community or environment.
- Solar panels are less intrusive and the applicant does not meet the criteria for wind turbines,
- Two Bills are progressing through Parliament to limit proximity of turbines to residential properties,
- MP's are asking for generous subsidies to be ended and making it easier for communities to object,
- No objection in principle to alternative energy sources,
- The photomontage is misleading, the turbine is not assimilated into the countryside, so how will two more look?
- The withdrawal of the previous approval is humiliating and costly to tax payers,
- Officer's refusal to allow removal of the hedgerow is intransigent stubbornness, the planning department has shown gross inconsistencies,
- Climate change has to be addressed and planning works best when communities are involved,
- This is the start of a wind farm,
- Health issues and wind turbine syndrome for which the applicant and the planning department will be accountable for,
- The acoustic report was done in Ireland,

- Mechanical failure could result in burning objects threatening nearby properties,
- Onshore turbines are the most inefficient provider of energy and national statistics show them to be only 12% -23% efficient and hardly provide any output in extreme cold conditions when it is most needed or when there is no wind or too much wind.
- They are very expensive compared to other forms of " green energy", such as solar or biomass which are also much less obtrusive and the only reason they are constructed is because of the huge subsidies paid by the taxpayer and energy users. At a time of austerity I do not want to contribute to these subsidies to line the pockets of developers.
- In the third quarter of 2011, £7m was paid to wind farm operators to shut down their turbines as the grid was unable to take the electricity generated.
- With sites approved at Rodbaston, the A5 at Stretton, proposed at King Street, Brineton, a turbine already at Lynn the whole area from Penkridge to the Wrekin will be soon be covered with these monstrosities.

1 letter has been received which is objecting to an application for a turbine at Walton Grange Farm which is in Staffordshire.

The Parish Council has not commented.

The Ministry of Defence has no objections to the application.

The National Farmers Union previously supported the application. It was considered that the existing turbine blends in discreetly against the tree-lined backdrop and that a similar turbine that will be sympathetically sited in the same area. "This small scale operation allows electricity production without disrupting the landscape. The enterprises carried out on the farm will allow much of this electricity production to be used on site with any surplus then being exported in the national grid for other local users to benefit from a green energy source. By generating electricity from the wind turbines Mr Davies will be able to lower his carbon footprint by generating electricity from wind rather than conventional sources. This enterprise in investing in renewable energy sources on a small local scale should be encouraged".

The Council's Sustainability Officer has no objections to the application. She states that Planning Policy Statement 22 encourages planning authorities to support the use of renewable energy. She advises that any adverse impacts should be addressed satisfactorily, but should not preclude the development of specific renewable technologies other than in the most exceptional circumstances. Planning permission should only be refused where the concern relates to a heritage asset protected by an international or national designation and the impact would cause material harm, or removal of significance in relation, to the asset and this is not outweighed by the proposal's wider social, economic and environmental benefits. Council's should give significant weight to the wider environmental, social and economic benefits of renewable projects whatever their scale.

The Council's Ecologist has no objections to the application. She notes that the turbine is being located almost 75m from habitat features (hedgerows, woodland, water etc.) so the risk of harming any protected species is extremely low.
There is a risk of bird and bat collision with the turbines but this is very small given the number of turbines and their position in the landscape.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has advised that overall noise level should not be an issue, in particular due to the relatively low noise levels generated by the equipment. At higher wind speeds levels will increase but this is likely masked by the general noise from the wind.

The Council's Highways and Geotechnical Engineers have no objections to the application.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:
This application is for a single 20kw 20m high wind turbine tower with 3 blades each 6m long and would reach a maximum height, when blades in vertical position, of 27m. It would stand near to the existing 18m high wind turbine, resulting in 2 turbines on the farm.

The applicant has previously stated that he looked at all the possible locations for these wind turbines on his land, taking into account the direction of the prevailing wind, obstructions, personal preferences, planning considerations, and the distance from the distribution board. The application site meets all the requirements.

However, in an attempt to appease his neighbours the applicant has reduced the proposal from 2 turbines to a single turbine. This takes the wind turbine development a further 50m away from the objector's property which members visited on the site visit.

The possibility of using solar energy in preference to wind turbines has also been explored. However, the applicant states that photovoltaic cells are not ideally suited to this holding, given the amount of roof space available, and the costs involved. The capital investment would be double, with the same output as one turbine. This would not be enough to meet the electricity needs of the farm.

The site lies in the open countryside, but does not lie within an area which has been given any special designation in relation to its countryside, amenity, or wildlife value. It is not within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or an Area of Special Landscape Character, and neither is it a Site of Special Scientific Interest or a nature reserve.

The turbine would be located over 400 metres from the nearest residential property not owned by the applicant, and there are six other properties within approximately a 400 metre radius, two of which are owned by the applicant. Only five dwellings would see the entire turbines – two of which are

approximately 900 metres away and the others over 400 metres away. The existing turbine is 18 metres high and it is considered that the proposed 20m high turbine would not appear significantly dominant when viewed from the nearest cottages that lie over 400 metres away. A series of photographs, with the proposed turbines superimposed on them, have been submitted with the application, and these have helped in the visual assessment of the proposal to demonstrate that the turbine will have a minimal impact on the surrounding landscape.

As previously with the approved application TWC/2011/0059 for 2 turbines, Officers consider that 1 turbine would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the landscape in the vicinity of the site. The most prominent point from which the turbine will be seen would be from the A41, one kilometre to the west, from where long views of the turbines would be glimpsed. However, even from here the turbine would be difficult to detect as it would be below the horizon, and a backdrop of mature woodland would help to assimilate it within the landscape.

The nearest public highway to the proposed site – the one that runs through Lynn - is approximately 300 metres away and the high hedge that borders this road will effectively screen the turbine to a considerable extent from most of the road users. The natural galvanised or light grey colour of the turbines will also help to minimise their visual impact on the landscape.

The Council's Highways Engineer has no objections to the application. He does not believe that the rotation of the turbine blades would distract drivers of vehicles on local roads to any significant extent. Neither does he feel that any light flicker off the turbine would pose a danger to passing traffic.

The principal source of noise emitted by the turbine would originate from the rotation of the blades. However, the applicants have submitted an acoustic report in respect of the proposed turbine which states that even at a distance of 60 metres from the turbine the maximum noise level would only be a modest 40dBA. Such a noise level comes within Category A of the Noise Exposure Categories contained in PPG24 (Planning and Noise) where such noise is not considered to be an issue when determining planning applications. At distances of over 400 metres from the turbine the noise levels would be well below existing ambient background noise levels. Therefore, the Council's Environmental Health Officer has advised that noise is unlikely to be a nuisance to those residents living in the nearest dwellings to the site.

Additionally the agent has provided further calculations of the cumulative effect of the existing turbine, together with the proposed turbine. The SPL (Sound Pressure Levels) or dBA levels have been calculated at the nearest dwelling, being 450m from the proposed turbine.

At wind speeds of 10m/s, it shows that the cumulative effect of both turbines gives a reading of 34.9 dBA. This sound level is equivalent to a quiet library. It should also be noted that the sites average wind speed is only 5.4m/s at 25m

high. Accordingly, it is deemed that the result of two turbines on the site will not adversely impact upon residential amenity of the residents living in the locality.

The Council's Ecologist has no objections to the application. The siting of the proposed turbine follows good practice by being located more than 75 metres from habitat features such as hedgerows and woodland which could be used as foraging and commuting routes for bats and birds, and away from buildings where bats may be roosting. Therefore, there is a very low risk of harm being done to any wildlife.

It is acknowledged that this application has met with a considerable amount of local opposition from people living in East Shropshire and West Staffordshire. However, after careful deliberation of the issues and for the explanations stated above, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable.

It is considered that the proposed wind turbine would be acceptable. It is deemed that their simple design and sympathetic siting will not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the countryside in the vicinity of the site, even when considering the cumulative impact of 2 turbines. (Members previously considered that 3 turbines on the site were acceptable when they approved the application TWC/2011/0069 at Plans Board on 13.07.11). The profile of the land and the backdrop of the existing mature trees ensure that there are very few locations from where the whole turbine will be seen from, and very few people will see them above a skyline.

The turbine will not appear overly dominant or intrusive in the landscape, even when viewed from the nearest residential property, and will not have a detrimental impact on the prevailing visual amenities of the surrounding area. The turbine will not distract drivers' attention to any significant extent, or pose a danger to existing wildlife in the area. The scheme will provide a limited but valuable source of renewable energy for the farm that will play its part in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and our carbon footprint.

RECOMMENDATION: to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:-

1. A04 Time limit
2. C38 Development in accordance with submitted plans

REASON FOR APPROVAL:
The simple design and sympathetic siting of the turbine will not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the countryside in the vicinity of the site. The profile of the land and the existing mature trees mean that there are very few locations from where the whole turbine will be seen from, and very few people will see it above a skyline.

The turbine will not appear overly dominant or intrusive in the landscape, even when viewed from the nearest residential property, and they will not have a

detrimental impact on the prevailing visual amenities of the surrounding area. The turbine will not distract drivers' attention to any significant extent, or pose a danger to existing wildlife in the area. The scheme will provide a limited but valuable source of renewable energy for the farm that will play its part in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and our carbon footprint.

TWC/2012/0143 Land at junction of Moss Road/Rookery Road, Wrockwardine Wood, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 7BL
Demolition of 2no. dwellings (The Nyth and Erindale) and erection of a block of 13 apartments with associated car parking and amenity area

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Andrew Cockayne	22/02/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
Wrockwardine Wood and Trench	Priorslee

THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED AT PLANS BOARD ON 11TH JULY 2012 TO ALLOW MEMEBNRS TO MAKE A SITE VISIT.

ORIGINAL REPORT BELOW
****

CLLR IAN FLETCHER HAS REQUESTED THIS APPLICATION BE DETERMINED BY PLANS BOARD.

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: YES.

MAIN ISSUES:
Principle of Development, design and appearance, highway safety, residential amenity, impact on TPO'd Monkey Puzzle tree and protected species, s106 contributions.

THE PROPOSAL:
This is full application for the demolition of a pair of semi detached dwellings (The Nyth and Erindale) and the erection of an 'L' shaped 2-3 storey block of 13 apartments with associated car parking and amenity area. The apartments comprise 2 bedroomed units with a kitchen/diner, lounge and bathroom. Each apartment has patio doors of the main living room and the 1st and 2nd floors have Juliette balconies too. There is a shared 250 sq.m. amenity space to the rear.

There is an extant planning permission for 4 dwellings (W2010/0060) adjacent the proposed apartment block which will share the proposed access.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The application site is designated as "white land" in the Wrekin Local Plan, and is located in the built up area of Telford.

Erindale and The Nyth is a very large traditional style building which was originally a Coaching Inn, then tied housing owned by British Coal and latterly 2 private dwellings. The premises are currently vacant and the surrounding land overgrown and unkempt. The site is located on the corner of Moss Road and Rookery Road.

The is an existing vehicular access off Moss Road and a large area of tarmacadam to the front and left (north west) of the property, and a large mature TPO'd Monkey Puzzle tree located at the front of the existing building. There is a hedgerow and a row of pollarded Beech trees to the front boundary, some of which are showing signs of decay and a large area of un-utilised land located to rear, at much lower level, bounded by a substantial row of conifers to the side and rear. The area of open land to the rear (the eastern half) is not in the ownership of the applicant. The northern half benefits from planning permission (W2101/0060) for the erection of 4 detached dwellings. The aforementioned Beech trees are to be removed as part of the previously approved application W2010/0060.

Rookery Road runs along the southern boundary to industrial units beyond. There is a known mineshaft on the adjacent site and a sewer crossing the rear of the site, and Green Network land to eastern boundary of site. Moss Road has a varied mixture of ages, styles and designs of single and two storey properties.

PLANNING HISTORY:
W88/0233 Erection of 3 detached dwellings OLR – 21/06/88.
W89/0725 Erection of 3 detached dwellings FG – 12/02/90.
W91/0596 land filling of garden with sub soil and inert builder's rubbish Withdrawn - 11/06/92.
W91/0617 tipping of imported sub soil Withdrawn – 11/06/91.
W91/0841 Erection of a dwelling FG -13/12/91.
W93/0006 erection of 3 dwellings (renewal of W89/0725) OLG – 23/02/93.
W96/0051 Residential development OLG –19/03/96.
W99/0076 Renewal of O/L permission W96/0051 for residential development OLG – 26/03/99.
W2001/0220 single dwelling and integral garage FG – 30/04/01.
W2005/1509 three 3-4 bedroomed dwellings and new access OLG – 03/03/06.
W2008/1316 Erection of 4no. dwellings (full planning), Withdrawn – 29/01/09.
W2009/0189 Erection of 3no.detached dwellings with new vehicular access (outline application) renewal of planning permission W2005/1509 OLG - 21/04/09.
W2009/0632 erection of 4 dwellings and new access Withdrawn – 25/09/09.
W2010/0060 Erection of 4no. dwellings FG – 23/04/10
TWC/2011/0395 Erection of 6 dwellings and 22 apartments Withdrawn – 02/08/11.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
<u>National Planning Guidance</u>
Nation Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF)

<u>Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies</u>
EH7 Contaminated Land
EH14 Land Stability
OL11 Woodlands and Trees

H6 Windfall Sites in Telford & Newport
H22 Community Facilities
LR4 Outdoor Recreation and Open Space
LR6 Developer Contributions to Outdoor Recreational Open Space Provision Within New Residential Development
UD2 Design Criteria

LDF Core Strategy
CS1 Homes
CS5 District and Local centres in Telford
CS9 Accessibility and Social Inclusion
CS12 Natural Environment
CS13 Environmental Resources
CS15 Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:
Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council objects to the proposal and have made the follows comments:

- The Council are concerned that there will be a significant increase of traffic on a very busy road.
- The development increases the need for the traffic light scheme at the end of St. Georges Road.
- The junction of Rookery Road with St. Georges Road needs upgrading, it is heavily overused.
- The Waterways on this site need safeguarding.
- The Monkey Puzzle tree on site should be considered.
- This whole area needs tidying.
- The development of the area seems to be 'piecemeal'.

Cllr Ian Fletcher objects to the development on the following grounds

- Over development of site
- Increase in amount of traffic onto Moss Road when combined with adjacent development for 4 houses
- Development will damage Monkey puzzle tree which is TPO'd.

The Council's Drainage Engineer has no objections to the proposed development, subject to conditions which require the submission of foul and surface water details, that soakaway tests are undertaken to demonstrate the suitability of the site for soakaway drainage and that any soakaways are located more than 5m away from any boundaries, buildings and the highway.

The Council's Arborist initially objected to the application as it failed to take into account the future growth to the TPO'd Monkey Puzzle tree growing at the front of the existing building. However, amended drawings have been received which now address the Arborist's concerns and thus the objections

have been withdrawn subject to the imposition of conditions to ensure that the tree is not compromised during the construction phase and the long term health of the tree is preserved. These include the submission of a Landscaping Design; Service runs & planting plans, the erection of Tree Protective Fencing, details of trees & services, A 'No Dig' Method adjacent the TPO'd tree, no burning on site, no alteration to the soil levels adjacent the TPO'd tree, no material storage beneath the tree and the implementation of the hard and soft landscaping plan.
Furthermore, to ensure that the TPO'd Monkey Puzzle is adequately protected throughout the construction process an Arboricultural Method Statement detailing the schedule of works on site will be required.

The Council's Highways Engineer had no objections in principle to the proposed development, subject to a condition which requires full access details including the layout, construction, and visibility splays to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Moreover, an informative will advise the developer to contact the Council's Highways & Transport Maintenance department prior to commencing works on the adopted highway.

The Council's Geotechnical Engineer has no objection subject to conditions in respect of shallow mining and contaminated land and gas mitigation measures given the mining history of the site and the known mineshaft.

The Council's Parks and Open Space Officer requires £600 per 2 bed property minus the existing 2 dwellings which are to be removed (11 in total) provided prior to commencement of development.

The Council's Education officer has requested a £27,005 contribution towards education facilities in the vicinity of the development (£16.798 for primary schools and £10.207 for secondary schools) given the number and type of dwellings proposed.

The Council's Ecologist has no objections subject to conditions which require the erection of nest boxes to compensate for lost nesting/roosting opportunities, and a planting scheme to enhance the site for biodiversity. In addition informatives advising that a Natural England EPS Development Licence
is required for the proposed development. A pre-commencement badger check and nesting Birds (vegetation) are also recommended. Other informatives suggested are vegetation cutting, trenches, enhancement planting, lighting and green roofs.

Shropshire Fire Authority has suggested informatives in respect of Access for Emergency Fire Service Vehicles, and Water Supplies for Fire fighting and Sprinkler Systems - Residential

Severn Trent Water has no objection subject to a condition which requires the submission of foul and surface water details.

A Site Notice a 13 direct neighbour letters have publicised the application; no representations have been received.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:
Principle of Development:
NPPF gives Government advice on new housing developments, amongst other issues it states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The mix, type size and tenure of housing should reflect local demand.

The site comprises 1.545 sq. and is designated as 'whiteland' on the Wrekin Local Plan (WLP) proposals map. Policy H6 states that housing development will be permitted on land under 0.4 hectare that is within the Telford built up area when the site can be adequately accessed and parking provided, when the site can be adequately drained, when the Council is satisfied that, where there are land stability and contamination issues, the developer has taken adequate remedial action, where the proposal does not have an adverse impact on the local environment, especially in its relationship with adjacent land uses and where the proposal shows a high quality of design. Policy CS1 states that housing development will seek to provide every household in the Borough with an affordable, decent and appropriate home. Policy CS5 requires all new residential development to be situated in highly accessible locations, creating vibrant, safe and attractive places, with designs which respect and respond to the locality.

The location is within the built up area of Telford in close proximity to Donnington and St Georges, employment opportunities, various amenities and public transport facilities, and considered a sustainable location. It is therefore considered that the proposed development is acceptable in principle and compliant with policy H6 of the Wrekin Local Plan, policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained within NPPF.
The principle of development comprising 4 dwellings on three separate occasions has been already been approved within the original curtilage of Erindale to the north western side of site.

Design, appearance and amenity:
National guidance contained in NPPF, asserts that development should be of high quality design, respond to local context and should reinforce local distinctiveness. In addition it states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Policy CS15, amongst other issues, states that development will assist in creating and sustaining safe places, positively influencing the appearance of the local environment. Policy UD2 provides guidance to assess whether or not proposals are of an appropriate design quality and relate positively to their context. It advises the Council to assess proposed development in relation to its scale, massing, form, density, orientation and layout, proportions, materials, landscape elements, access, parking and spatial quality.

With this in mind the loss of this large building is regrettable however, it does not benefit from statutory or non-statutory protection and thus it is not possible to resist its demolition. Indeed, the redevelopment should be seen as an opportunity to bring this now vacant site which is suffering from the early signs of neglect back in to useful occupation and thus will result in an enhancement to the visual amenity of the area. The scale and design of the proposed apartment block is deemed acceptable and appropriate in context and will not adversely impact upon the streetscene. The external materials include brickwork and render, both of which are present in the vicinity. The ridge height will range between 9, 10 & 11m. The varied roof will help to break up the mass of the building as will the mix of facing materials (brick and render). The proposed building will also be set back from the highway by almost 22m (similar to the existing building), and thus will not appear overly strident within the streetscene. The majority of the parking is proposed at the front of the building which is similar to the existing situation. Suitable soft landscaping and boundary treatment will ensure that this does not detract unduly from the visual amenity of the area.

The proposed units will provide an acceptable standard of living accommodation and adequate shared private amenity space for this type of development. Suitable bin storage is provided within the site to the rear of the smaller parking area to the side (north) of the proposed development. The separation distances between the proposed block, the previously approved 4 detached dwellings and the existing neighbouring dwelling are adequate and this together with the orientation and topography of the site will ensure that there is no adverse impact upon mutual residential amenity by way of over-looking or over-bearing. The proposal is therefore considered compliant with policy UD2 of the WLP, policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained in NPPF.

Highway safety
The proposed layout indicates that the vehicular access will be in a similar position to the existing one to the front of the site. Nevertheless, the Council's Highway Engineer requires full details of the improved access to ensure that it is satisfactory to the Council's standards.

The issues of increased traffic movements raised by the Parish and Ward Councillors are noted. However, this matter does not justify the refusal of this application which could then be substantiated at any subsequent appeal. It should be noted that the existing very large building (which is currently 2 houses), could accommodate a significant number of occupants (up to 12 without the need for planning permission or improvements to the existing vehicular access via the imposition of conditions), which could generate a comparable number of vehicular movements to the application. Accordingly, the proposal will not adversely impact upon highway safety and is therefore compliant with policy UD2 of the WLP, policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained NPPF.

TPO'd tree

Policy OL11 advises the Council to resist development proposals that would result in the loss of trees which make a valuable contribution to the character of the landscape or have a significant ecological value. With this in mind the layout, in particular the car parking to the front of the building has been amended in line with the Council's Arborist's requirements to ensure that the impressive Monkey Puzzle tree towards the front of the site is not adversely affected during or post the development of the site. The proposal is therefore compliant with policy OL11 stated above and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy which states that the natural environment of the Borough will be protected.

Previous mining in the locality
There is a known mineshaft on the adjacent site and suitable 'stand-offs' have been achieved. Nevertheless, it is considered necessary to impose conditions in relation to mining. Furthermore, given that the area was formerly an area of coal and mineral extraction, circa 1880. The site is therefore of 'potential concern', with respect of land contamination and is therefore is a material planning consideration, and it is necessary to impose conditions to address these concerns. The proposal is therefore compliant with policy EH14 of the WLP and policy CS13 of the Core Strategy which ensure that issues in respect of land stability and contamination are suitably mitigated against.

Protected species and Habitats Directive
Bats: In the initial (March 2011) ecological assessment, approximately 30 droppings were found in the roof void of 'The Nyth'. These were believed to be from pipistrelles and were scattered across the floor, mainly towards the western gable-end. 'The low number and scattered nature of the droppings suggested occasional use of the void by a low number of bats.'
A nocturnal bat survey was carried out in June 2011 and the following evidence was observed:
- large numbers of common pipistrelles and two small *Myotis* bats foraging on and commuting across the site, particularly in between Erindale and Moss Road, during the two dusk surveys.
- large number of common pipistrelles and a noctule commuting across the site, with a small number foraging on site before continuing their commute.

During the activity surveys, no bats were observed swarming around or entering the buildings on site. The surveys concluded that The Nyth is used occasionally by low numbers of pipistrelles. The site is also a well-used commuting route. A Natural England European Protected Species Development Licence will therefore be required to carry out the works. An informative will advise of this.

Reptiles and amphibians: A full reptile survey was carried out in 2011 following the initial ecological assessment. No evidence of any reptiles or amphibians was observed.

Badgers: No evidence of badgers was found on the site during the ecological assessment or the nocturnal bat survey. A pre-commencement badger survey is nevertheless recommended.

Birds: The trees, scrub and ruderals have the potential to support nesting birds. No red list or BAP (at risk) species were recorded during the ecological assessment, however common species were recorded.

Under Regulation 9(5) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, competent authorities must *have regard to* the Habitats Directive in the exercise of its functions. The mitigation proposed in the ecological report, when written into a mitigation strategy (as part of the Natural England licence application), will be sufficient to ensure the continuing maintenance of the local bat populations at favourable conservation status. Mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures will include supervised demolition under an ecological clerk of works, the erection of alternative roosting sites and the maintenance of the existing commuting and foraging route through the retention of a vegetated corridor with no or low level illumination to limit light spillage. Therefore the test in respect of the Habitats Directive is met, and the proposal is compliant with policy CS12 of the CS and national guidance contained within NPPF.

S106 Contributions
Policies LR4 and LR6 require developers to contribute to the provision of recreational open space and policy H22 requires contributions towards community facilities. Based on the proposed scale of development, the above policies require the developer to contribute £27,005 to education facilities in the vicinity and £7,200 towards recreational facilities. This will be secured by way of a s106 legal agreement.

Conclusion
The site is located within a sustainable location within the built up area of Telford and therefore the principle of residential development is acceptable. The proposed demolition of this building is regretful but cannot be prevented as the building has neither statutory nor non-statutory protection. The proposed apartments will help to provide the mix of dwelling type required by both local and national policy. The proposed development of this site will result in a beneficial effect upon the appearance of the site which is currently unmanaged and will have no adverse impact upon the streetscene, whilst providing an opportunity to enhance the biodiversity of the site. There will be no adverse impact upon the TPO'd tree on the site, highway safety or the mutual residential amenity of the future occupiers of the apartments, the neighbouring dwelling, the previously approved detached dwellings to the west and north of the site. Financial contributions will be paid to support the recreation facilities and education provision in the area. Therefore, having regard to consultation responses and planning guidance, it is considered that on balance, the principle of redeveloping this site for residential use is acceptable subject to conditions and mitigation works.

RECOMMENDATION: Subject to the developer entering in to a Section 106 Agreement to provide financial contributions of £7,200 for recreational facilities and £27,005 to education facilities in the vicinity, then GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION following conditions:

1. A04 Time limit
2. B10 details of materials
3. B31 access details
4. B42 parking, turning laid out
5. B46 on site construction
6. B47 mud on road
7. B50 shallow mining
8. B57 contaminated land
9. C22 gas mitigation measures
10. B61 foul and surface water details
11. B64 soakaway tests
12. B65 soakaways located 5m away from any boundaries, buildings & highway
13. B121 Landscaping; Service runs & planting plans
14. B130 Tree Protective Fencing,
15. B131 Trees & Services,
16. B132 Trees 'No Dig' Method,
17. Bcustom Arboricultural Method Statement detailing the schedule of works on site
18. C38 Development in accordance with approved plans
19. C70 Trees No Burning,
20. C71 Trees Soil Levels,
21. C72 Trees Material Storage
22. C76 Landscaping Implementation Hard & Soft.
23. C101 Bat and bird boxes
24. II06 Section 106
25. I11 contact highways
26. I25e trenches
27. I25g enhancement planting
28. I25h vegetation cutting
29. I25K bats and birds
30. Icustom pre-commencement check nesting birds (vegetation) and Badgers
31. Icustom lighting
32. Icustom green roofs
33. Icustom Natural England EPS Development Licence is required.
34. I32 Fire Authority
35. I40 Conditions
36. I41 Reasons for approval.
37. RaCustom reason

Reasons For Decision:
The site is located within a sustainable location within the built up area of Telford and therefore the principle of residential development is acceptable. The proposed demolition of this building is regretful but cannot be prevented as the building has neither statutory nor non-statutory protection. The proposed apartments will help to provide the mix of dwelling type required by both local and national policy. The proposed development of this site will result in a beneficial effect upon the appearance of the site which is currently unmanaged and will have no adverse impact upon the streetscene, whilst

providing an opportunity to enhance the biodiversity of the site. There will be no adverse impact upon the TPO'd tree on the site, highway safety or the mutual residential amenity of the future occupiers of the apartments, the neighbouring dwelling, the previously approved detached dwellings to the west and north of the site. The financial contributions will be paid to support the recreation facilities and education provision in the area.

TWC/2012/0211 Land To The Rear Of, Maynards Croft, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 7SZ
Residential development comprising the demolition of a detached house (No.25) and erection of 34no. dwellings and garages, served off a new estate road with associated parking, drainage, sewage pumping facility, landscaping and associated accommodation works *****AMENDED PLANS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RECEIVED*****

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Mrs Jayne Smith	08/03/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
Newport	Newport East

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES:
The principle of development outside the development boundary of Newport, design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area, residential amenity, noise and disturbance during construction, highway safety, drainage, ecology and biodiversity.

THE PROPOSAL:
This is a full application for residential development comprising the demolition of a detached house (No.25 Maynard's Croft) and erection of 34no. dwellings comprising a mix of 16 three and four-bedroom detached houses; 8 three-bedroom semi-detached houses; 4 two-bedroom terraced houses and a two and a half storey block of 6 two-bedroom apartments, with garages and/or parking facilities, served off a new estate road with associated parking, drainage, sewage pumping facility, landscaping and associated engineering works. This will result in an average density of 38 dwellings per hectare. The proposal will provide 35% affordable housing.

The site is located to the rear of Nos. 21, 23, 25, 27 and 29 Maynard's Croft at the head of the cul du sac on land that has become garden land to these properties. However, the site lies outside the built up boundary of Newport, as shown on the Wrekin Local Plan Proposals Map, and hence lies in the countryside.

Demolition of No. 25 will facilitate the creation of an access road off the cul du sac that will then serve the proposed estate.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The application site is 0.9 hectares and comprises garden land, vegetable plots and grazing land with various sheds/stables. The site is relatively level, although it falls away slightly towards the north-eastern corner.

The north and eastern boundaries are lined with broad leaved trees. The former Newport Branch of the Shropshire Union Canal, which is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and the towpath run along the western

boundary of the site. Norbroom Park recreation ground lies beyond the north eastern site boundary. The western/south western boundary adjoins the rear garden boundaries of no's 21 – 29 Maynard's Croft and the south eastern boundary runs along the extended rear garden boundary belonging to no. 31 Maynard's Croft.

Maynard's Croft is part of a 1970's residential housing estate in the north east of Newport, consisting of two storey detached dwellings finished in light red/brown facing brick with detailed panels on the 1st floor front elevation and concrete tiled pitched roofs.

Whilst the site lies just outside the built up boundary of Newport, the land is currently used as garden land and semi domestic use and immediately adjoins an existing and established residential area of Newport. Hence due to the land's existing use and location, it is not regarded as a truly countryside location.

PLANNING HISTORY:
W78/0774 Erection of 23 Four Bedroomed, Detached Houses With Alterations To Existing Access, land off Vineyard Road- Full Granted 18/12/1978,

W78/0376 Substitution of House Types On Site - Full Granted, 06/09/1978,

W83/0483 Change of Use To Garden Area To Extend Gardens 23/25 Maynards Croft - Full Granted 12/09/83

W86/0408 Change of Use of Land From Agricultural Use To Mixed Agricultural/Garden Land Use land To The Rear Of Maynards Croft - Full Granted 04/09/86

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
National Planning Guidance
NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework

LDF Core Strategy
Policy CS1- Homes
Policy CS6 - Newport
Policy CS7 – Rural Area
Policy CS11 – Open Space
Policy CS12 – Natural Environment
Policy CS15 – Urban Design

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
Policy UD2 – Design Criteria Policy
Policy H9 – Location of new housing
Policy H10 – Scale of development
Policy H23 – Affordable housing (for Telford and Newport)
Policy H22 – Community Facilities
Policy H23 – Affordable Housing
Policy H24 – Affordable Housing Rural Exceptions Policy

Policy T22 – Planning Obligations
Policy LR4 – Outdoor Recreational Open Space
Policy LR6 – Developers Contributions to Outdoor Recreational Open Space Provision within New Residential Developments

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Newport Town Council - objects to this application on yet another green field site.

- There are existing brown field sites and derelict land languishing in prime locations within the town centre.
- The Town Council urge Telford & Wrekin in the strongest terms, to bring forward the existing outstanding projects, such as the former Audley Road Business Park Site TWC 2011/0334 which is to provide 61 houses and apartments - this would alleviate the apparent short fall of Housing Land Supply provision in Newport being quoted by many developers and quoted along with extracts from the Core Strategy housing requirement.
- The LPA should dissuade developers from chasing green field sites and concentrate on the existing currently available sites.
- It was noted that the agent (Andy Williams) acts for one of the landowners on Water Lane, again a prime location and sited in the SHLAA to include a figure of at least 39 dwellings - this area was considered to be of a more preferable site than Maynard's Croft for a development of this type and technical difficulties can be of little difference to complications associated with poorly drained, peat based soil and the installation of 30ft concrete piling on the Canal side.
- The increase in traffic to the area in Maynard's Croft, Vineyard Road and Hampton Drive will have a significant impact and loading on the existing estates, there will be increase not only in residential traffic, but also from service and delivery vehicles. Hampton Drive, Vineyard Road is the main tributary route for access into the town centre for the majority of residents in the East Ward, and the main route into Norbroom Park.
- Moreover the well-established, quiet cul-de-sac will be changed into an estate road and have a very significant change to the existing environment and pleasantness of the area for the current and future residents; it will be a blight to create a benefit for a new development.
- Concerns about the proximity of the development to the Canal.
- The Canal is a well-used major asset to the town and subject to a potential long-term restoration programme by the very dedicated group, The Canal Trust. It has SSSI status, and Members feel that no enduring damage should be caused either by construction or the effect of development.
- An assurance that a full ecological and habitat survey has been undertaken was expressed.
- Acknowledge that the development is of a small scale and includes elements that support the recently adopted Planning Principles.

- The mixture of housing and the ‘affordable element’ are welcomed, as is the mix of dwellings.
- The landscaping along with the sensitive and careful layout of the site that provides some seclusion was considered to be well thought out.
- However, the overriding objection remain the preference is for development to be built on brown field space, to dispense with wilderness of urban decay that exist on such areas as Water Lane and Audley Road, not on green space next to our beautiful park.

The Council’s Geotechnical Engineer - the report submitted with the application identifies peat in the near surface ground strata which will require appropriate foundation design to take this in to account. Therefore, impose condition requiring a foundation schedule. In addition conditions are necessary with regards gas mitigation measures.

There were some initial issues about the stability of the canal retaining walls in light of the piling and possible flow of peat into the abutting voids of the newly placed gravel causing wash out in the peat and a destabilisation effect on the canal embankment.

In light of this the Councils Geotechnical Engineer has had further discussion with the applicant’s engineers (Wardell Armstrong) and some additional drawings have been submitted. Wardell Armstrong have advised their solution is the placement of a geotextile between the two materials. This textile would need to be placed against the piles prior to the placement of the gravel and care should be taken not to damage the textile on removal/withdrawal of the pile.

In addition Geotechs had a few queries regarding the submitted drawing showing section B-B’ and a ‘split level’ to the North of Plots 14-19, the purpose of the pumping station and issues of possible penetration of the underlying sandstone and possible pollution of ground water.

In response Wardell Armstrong have confirmed that:-

- the retaining wall is no longer required as the garden will ‘battered’ at an even grade from the apartments to the end of the rear garden.
- the pumping station referred to is the foul pumping station. This will be a sealed system pumping foul sewage only. There is no intention to pump groundwater from the site.
- the proposed development is not within the former landfill site. The boreholes and trial pits did not identify any evidence of any significant amounts of made ground or landfill materials on the site. The chemical testing exercise carried out at the site did not identify any evidence of significant contamination at the site

The Councils Geotechnical Engineer has as a consequence of the additional information submitted recommended that issues relating to the foundation are conditioned through the planning process and a detailed foundation schedule and accompanying explanations can be forwarded in due course.

The Council's Highway Engineer - Has commented that there are no technical highways reasons to justify any objection to the proposal. They do make the following observations:-

- A robust vehicular trip rate at an AM or PM peak hour is 0.8 per dwelling. Therefore the site would be expected to generate 27 additional trips onto the local highway network at each of these hours. Although the distribution of these trips across a peak hour is not totally uniform, it could be stated that generally an additional vehicle trip will be generated every 2 minutes. It is considered that this level of traffic generation at a peak hour would have no notable effect upon the capacity or continued safe operation of the local highway network. This has been demonstrated clearly in the applicants supporting Transport Statement using the national industry standard analysis and modelling programs.
- With regards construction traffic, this matter can be suitably managed by an appropriate planning condition ensuring an approved site traffic management plan is agreed with the Authority prior to the commencement of any development at the site.
- With regards the safe operation of the narrowed carriageway at the bend on Maynard's Croft, which lies to the south of the proposed development, driver forward visibility does drop to around 18-20 metres across this bend but this visibility is within the standards recommended in DfT Manual for Streets for an arrangement of this nature and the associated low vehicle speeds. Any issues occurring at this bend are likely to be the result of poor driver discipline where the cutting of the corner onto the opposing lane takes place. This issue may exacerbate once the development is in use but usually an increase in use and familiarity results in an increase in the awareness of proceeding with caution on the bend. Suggest a S.106 contribution which could be used to implement appropriate traffic management measures at this bend if the Highway Authority considers there is a problem in the future as a result of the development.
- No refuse vehicle tracking has been submitted as part of the application and experience suggests that a 4.8m road width and 16m turning heads with 7m radii will not allow the comfortable 3 point turn of the authority's 11.3m refuse lorry. To overcome this utilising the existing layout, both turning head areas must become raised shared surface with no vertical delineation of carriageway and footway. This will allow an 8.8m carriageway width at these points with 18m turning heads. A shared surface layout such as this will also go some way in achieving a better sense of place over the more traditional cul de sac arrangement and provide better manoeuvrability for vehicles exiting driveways around these areas. These specific details can be addressed under condition in the approval of the actual construction details prior to commencement of development.
- It is also noted a sub 15m Centre Line Radius is proposed and therefore some widening may be required at the 90 degree bend within the site. The amount will depend on the tracking of a 11.3m refuse vehicle around the bend or again a suitable shared surface

arrangement here could provide a solution. Detail for this can be picked up under the approval of submitted construction details.

- Suggest the following planning conditions if consent is given: B34 (Full highway construction details), C17 (On site construction parking), C18(Protection of public highway from mud deposits), C13 (Parking, loading, unloading and turning), C14 (Visibility splays stating 2.4m x 43m), C11 (Access prior to other operations), and Construction Traffic management plan.
  S106 indexed contributions - £10,000 for the implementation of tactile pedestrian dropped crossing facilities between the development site and Newport Town Centre and £5,000 for the implementation of appropriate traffic management measures, if considered necessary, on Maynard's Croft and any unspent monies after 5 years will be returned.

The Council's Drainage Engineer supports the proposal subject to conditions in respect of sustainable surface water drainage, groundwater ingress into proposed SUDS feature due to the high ground water in the area, outfall details for the proposed surface water drainage system and an exceedance flood routing plan.

The Council's Education Officer

- Education have considered the overall housing provision arising from the three major residential schemes and this application in a more strategic manner considering the scale of overall development being proposed for Newport.
- The Newport area at secondary level is served by Burton Borough secondary school (LA maintained), Adams Grammar School (Academy) and Newport Girls High (Academy)
- As at July 2012, there is an oversubscription of pupils of over 3% in the Newport area at secondary level. This is set to continue for the foreseeable future.
- As there are two grammar schools situated in Newport who take children from a very wide area, Burton Borough, as the only comprehensive school, takes the vast majority of secondary aged children living in Newport. Although the school will benefit from Building Schools for the Future funding, this is not providing additional accommodation, rather it is modernising and refurbishing current provision.

The Newport area at primary level is served by: Church Aston Infant, Edgmond St Peters CE Primary, Moorfield Primary, Newport Infant, Newport Junior, St Peter & Pauls Catholic Primary Muxton Primary, and Lilleshall Primary schools.

- As at July 2012, there is a surplus of primary places of above 5%, however projected within the next 5 years is a reduction in this surplus to 5% or below.
- In line with the Audit Commission's review on the supply of school places, "Trading Places: The Supply and Allocation of School Places" (published December 1996, reviewed 2002), a school should be considered to be at full capacity when at 5% surplus capacity or less.

- The projections provided were completed June 2012. Data is updated annually, therefore it is expected that projected numbers for both primary and secondary school will be updated between March and May 2013 for the whole Borough.
- The schools included which are located in the rural area outside the Newport town boundary tend to attract applicants from the Newport urban area. These pupils tend to be the nearest children outside the rural schools' defined attendance areas, and as such get priority over other children living further away.
- Parents are able to express a preference for any mainstream school, and if there are places available the school are obliged to offer them a place. If a school is going to be full, the admissions authority have to then apply the published admissions criteria to decide which pupils will get places. When schools are full parents have the right to appeal to an Independent Appeals Committee who can decide to place a child over the admission number.
- Some schools, for instance Moorfield Primary, are oversubscribed with pupils who are from outside their own attendance area, but are still living within Newport. If development is located in close proximity to such a school, then the pupils generated by the new housing will displace those living further away but who are still within the Newport boundary. These pupils will then have to seek places either at their own local Newport school or schools outside of the area. In these cases, it may in fact be necessary to provide additional accommodation at schools which have no new housing development within their own geographical attendance area in order to ensure that there are sufficient places.
- Education contribution calculations are based on current numbers and upon an average 3.35 beds per dwelling for the following sites:
  - Wellington Road
  - Audley Avenue
  - Station Road
  - Maynards Croft
- The calculations are based on the assumption that 35% of the housing will be affordable housing, in line with Telford and Wrekin Planning Policy for Newport.
- Ideally, we would want to provide accommodation before need arises, particularly as Newport is somewhat isolated geographically and it is undesirable for very young children to have to travel to access reception class provision.
- In the current financial climate it is no longer possible for Local Authorities to 'bank roll' schemes pending receipt of section 106 contributions on the completion of sites. We would seek to negotiate when the release of funds would best suit the Council and the developer. Considering the limited options for Newport residents in accessing out of area places, we would require 50% upon commencement of development, 25% on 25% occupancy, and the remaining 25% at 50% occupancy.
- As with other education contributions, we would expect the agreed sums to be subject to indexation to ensure future value is not eroded by inflation.

The applicants have submitted viability assessments based upon an education contribution of £72,000 for primary and secondary education. This has been considered to be acceptable by officers in light of earlier discussions with the developer prior to this position statement being produced.

The Council's Recreation Officer had requested that the existing Canal Towpath should be upgraded either via a commuted sum payment of £41,360 or by the developer doing the works themselves.

Additionally, the site is near to a popular and busy park with play facilities (play area / ball court / BMX track and trails and the largest skate park in Shropshire) which hold a number of community events throughout the year. These events are run by a local community group and contain some music and large numbers of children and young people. Therefore, it is recommended that properties facing the parks car park are protected from potential noise nuisance as much as is possible through soundproofing / orientation / positioning of windows etc.

The Council's Housing Officer
Original comments:-

- Whilst 35% affordable is welcomed in principle, the affordable tenure, dwelling size/mix and location is not considered to be ideal
- The most recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for the borough identifies that the majority of affordable homes (80%) in the borough should be for social rent, with the balance for shared ownership.
- The tenure of the units described as 'shared equity/low cost' is not clear, but these should meet the definition of 'affordable housing' and 'Low cost market housing' is not part of this definition.
- While 100% 'staircasing' purchase of shared ownership affordable homes is acceptable, these should be let using a model Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) model lease which protects them in the long term for use as affordable housing.
- The dwelling size balance is uneven as all of the smaller dwellings are for affordable housing, none of the 4-bed homes are for affordable housing, only 2 of the 14 three bed homes are affordable, and all of the 2 bed homes (and all of the apartments) are affordable.

- Appropriate sizes, floor areas and occupation levels for the affordable homes need to be agreed.
- It is preferred that the affordable housing is spread more evenly across the development in small clusters.
- The proposal that the affordable housing 'will be indistinguishable from the open market dwellings…' is welcomed.
- The S106 agreement should link the completion and transfer (to a Registered Provider) of the affordable housing to the completion of open market dwellings.
- The Registered Provider will be asked to agree an appropriate local lettings plan with the local housing authority.

- Following the developer's assessment of all the S106 requirements, they submitted a viability appraisal. As a result the developer has revised affordable housing mix. No change to the apartments, i.e. all affordable rent, 3 x 2b being low cost/shared equity units at 80% OMV, 1 x 2b shared ownership at 65% shared ownership and 2 x 3b shared low cost/shared equity at 80% OMV.

The Housing officer revised comments that the 'affordable' dwelling mix, tenure balance and location is less than ideal. However on this occasion because of the viability appraisal, which includes,abnormal costs, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

However there is a need to ensure that the rented element remains as 'social' rather than 'affordable' rented. In addition a 'local connections' approach to lettings/sales would also be appropriate as Newport is the least affordable area in Telford & Wrekin.

The Council's Sustainability Officer has advised that a statement is required in the design and access statement where the developer should look to explain how they believe they have developed a valid and sustainable design solution. One of the most effective ways of securing more sustainable developments, and reducing climate change emissions, is to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH). However, there are currently no policies which require new development to comply with CSH.

The Council's Contaminated Land Officer (Environmental Health) –
Support the application with full contaminated land conditions placed on it. Further gas monitoring of the site was being conducted by the consultant but have need to see results. Would expect to see a remediation/mitigation report for the site to further detail gas protection measures and the result of the re-test for Arsenic. At present I would advise gas protection measures be placed within the construction of the houses (gas proof membrane etc) due to the close proximity to the old landfill site.

Comments on noise to follow – members will be updated.

The Council's Ecologist
Initial objection, but now is satisfied and has suggested various conditions and Informatives.
Initial objection concerned the following:-

- There are records of bats within the vicinity of the site and the site provides some potential habitat for foraging and commuting bats and the proximity to the canal corridor means that that area could be of value for local bat populations.
- The building due for demolition has not been subject to a bat survey. This is essential to ensure that no bats/birds are roosting in the building. The application should not continue until there has been an internal and internal inspection of the building and activity surveys on the site.

- There is a pond to the north-east of the site which has not been mentioned in the ecological report. There is a road separating the pond from the site, which may be a barrier to newt dispersal, but the report should contain consideration of this pond in relation to great crested newts.
- Prior to any vegetation clearance within the site, any pieces of wood or debris that can be cleared by hand should be collected and removed from the area. Does this mean that there are pieces of debris on the site at present, and if so, were these examined for reptiles and amphibians during the survey?

Following the Ecological Appraisal and further submitted surveys for bats, GCN and otters, the ecologist makes the following comments summarised below:-

<u>Canal</u>

- Pleased to see that native species are used along the riverside hedgerow.
- Newport Canal SSSI is adjacent to the site. Sensitive design and construction operations will be required to prevent any alteration to the hydrology of the watercourse (i.e. leaving a significant buffer zone during the construction phase) and this can in the form of a condition.
- The canal and 'the area of wet willow carr in the north-east corner of the site could provide refuge for amphibians, although no evidence for the presence of amphibians was found during this survey.'

<u>Bats</u>

- As the building will be demolished as part of the proposed development, this will result in the destruction of a bat roost and the potential killing/injury of bats. Therefore the Habitats Regulations 3 derogation tests must be answered by the LPA, and the works must take place under a Natural England EPS licence.
- There are a number of bat roosts in the area and in other properties in Maynards Croft/neighbouring residential roads.
- However, with appropriate mitigation, don't consider that the loss of this roost will be significant to the local bat population, nor will the development constitute the loss of an important foraging resource.
- Various informatives and conditions can be added.

<u>Great crested newts</u>

- A Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) assessment was carried out on a pond and a drain in Norbroom park, both of which scored below average. A garden pond in 3 Maynards Croft was also assessed and netted and was found to have a very low potential to support great crested newts. The resident at 63 Fisher's Lock also reported newts present in their pond, but a request to access the pond to undertake a HSI was refused.
- There is a pond to the north-east of the site which was not mentioned in the Ecological Appraisal. It has since been confirmed that the pond was considered and the potential for GCN was scoped out as this pond is '*isolated from the site (and canal) by the A41 which is a barrier to movement for GCN and is approximately 500m from site. These factors*

and due to the lack of ponds in the area around the site, the potential for GCN to be present at the site is considered highly unlikely.'

- The report considers that GCNs, even if they are in the locality, are highly unlikely to be present on proposed development site.
- Common amphibians (smooth newts, common frogs and common toads) are present in the wider area, and the precautionary measures (as informatives) will ensure that amphibians are not harmed.

<u>Reptiles</u>

- The ecologist has confirmed that all debris on the site, e.g. the stone and wood debris piles in the allotments, was checked for the presence of reptiles and amphibians and no evidence was found.
- The report considers that there are 'limited areas of suitable habitat within and adjacent to the site' and it recommends the following precautionary approach during construction and informatives can be added

<u>Badgers</u>

- No evidence of badgers was found during the survey. However there are records of badgers to the north and east of the site and *'the grassland provides potentially suitable foraging habitat for the species and the earth embankments surrounding the site to the east could provide potential sett building opportunities*.'
- Therefore the report recommends that a pre-commencement survey is carried out prior to the commencement of works and this can be conditioned

<u>Watervoles</u>

- Although there are historical records of watervoles in the wider area, 'the site itself does not provide suitable habitat to support water vole and no evidence of this species was found during the survey.'

<u>Otters</u>

- There are records of otters in the wider area 'and the woodland between the canal and the site may provide lying-up opportunities for otter'. The otter survey found no evidence of otters, but the report recommends a precautionary approach and informatives can be added.

<u>Birds</u>

- The Ecological Appraisal did not record bird species present during the survey. The trees, scrub, shrubs and derelict buildings on site could support nesting birds, although the report considers that BAP species are unlikely.
- Tree removal should take place outside bird nesting season.

The Council's Arborist initially objected for the reasons stated below, but is now satisfied.

Initial objections were;

- A number of trees currently growing within the application site do not feature on the proposed plans. Therefore these have been TPO'd to protect the group of 16 Alders (0412 -0427) in the North West corner and the Silver birch (0402) growing on the boundary of 21 Maynards Croft & the application site.

- The Tree Survey Plan, Tree Constraints & Tree Protection Plans submitted with the application are an amalgamation of 7 different plans on 7 different pages all with varying scales with no consistency. There should be one plan identifying the location of the trees, and a second plan which stipulates the location of the trees to be retained, the location of the protective fencing and any other protective measures such as 'no dig' areas within the application site.
- The Tree Protection Plan should also include the TWC owned trees growing on the canal bank with roots growing within the site. This is to ensure that they are paid due diligence e.g. trees 0409, 0408 & 0410 the current plans show built structures within the root protection areas.
- Growing on the boundary of 21 Maynard's Croft is the aforementioned Silver birch (0402), along the boundary line there are a number of Alders which currently offer a substantial screen separating proposed new from old houses. Clarification is needed as to what is to happen to these trees as there has been no landscaping proposed in this area, are they to remain? If they are to be removed a new screen should be established which will be condition of any planning approval.
- The Southern area of the site is bordered by a native broad leaf hedge G2 (0399) which straddles the boundary between No.31 Maynard's Croft and the development site. The hedge provides an established screen of native broad leaf trees which separates existing gardens from the ones proposed within the application. As the hedge contains species which enhance the ecological value of the site it should be managed and retained as such. However it does not appear on the plans. If it is to be removed we will condition that a new screen is established if the application is approved.
- The Tree Survey has been carried out with regard to BS: 5837 (2005) but this British Standard has now been withdrawn and replaced with BS: 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.
- The additional information submitted 1/5/2012 has two conflicting site Layout Plans: Plan C-828-01 shows the landscaping proposals but has the 2.5 storey apartments in there original location facing south, whereas the block plan 2797-01-Rev J shows the 2.5 storey apartment block facing west?
- With regard to the TPO'd Alder trees growing on the northern boundary further information is requested;
  - Does the land drain need to be replaced which runs beneath the trees?
  - Will it be necessary to remove the peat in which the trees grow?
  - What will be the applicant's mitigation strategy if either of the above answers are 'yes'?

- If the trees are to be retained given that the layout is only indicative there seems to be scope to move both the Ingleton and Belford house types southward away from the trees. The Belford terrace also appears to have a shared access to all four properties running behind the Alder trees, through a ditch/ water gully.
- The native broadleaf hedge growing on the southern boundary of the application still does not feature on the plans however, the plans do show

that a garage and Shelford type house are to be built as close as is practically possible to the hedge, which will be on the south side of 6 dwellings thus casting them in shade for most of the day.

The Alder trees have now been protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

Following the submission of various additional information and the amendment to the layout to move the apartment block away from the Alder trees, the tree officer no longer has objections and recommends the following conditions:- B121 landscaping design, B130 Tree protective fencing, B131 Tree services & roots, B134 Trees extent of works, C70 No burning, C71 Soil Levels, C72 Material storage, C73 hedge protection, C77 Landscape implementation hard & soft, C79 Suitable contractor.

Severn Trent Water have no objections subject to a condition in respect of the disposal of foul and surface. They had advised that there is a pumping station near the planning application site, and any new development must not restrict access to the sewerage pumping station. In addition, due to the close proximity of the proposed new development the occupant may experience noise/smell pollution for the existing pumping station.

Natural England Initially objected, but have now withdraw their objection.

- Initial objection was based on their being insufficient information to determine the effects of European Protected Species, as there were areas suitable for Great Crested Newts (GCN) nearby and reports from residents of newts in their ponds but no information had been submitted as to why these areas had been excluded from ecological surveys.
- Further information has now been submitted that addresses these issue and show that the adjacent wet areas have a below average suitability for the breeding GCN. Whilst some smooth newts were discovered, these are offered more limited protection.
- Attempts to gain access to a further pond was denied by a landowner, so the presence of GCN cannot be completely ruled out. Therefore a precautionary approach is advised to construction and the submission of a Working Statement prior to commencement should be made a condition.
- A working statement should include the appointment of an experienced ecologist to watch over initial site preparation and inform staff of protected species issues. If any GCN newts are discovered works should cease and a licensed newt worker should be contacted and works at night should be avoided.
- With regards bats, further survey information and an outline mitigation plan have now been submitted. Based on the additional information Natural England's advice is that the development is likely destroy bat roots. However the proposed mitigation would maintain the favourable conservation status of the bat population identified. A licence will be required – views on this planning application do not represent confirmation that a separate licence will be issued.

- Suggest the imposition of conditions for the following:- that i) development be in accordance with the Halcrow report dated 12 June 2012 and ii) that the statement of work details the precautions to be undertaken including the size of any buffer and details of proposed groundwork's near the canal during construction in order to ensure the integrity of the SSSI of the Newport Canal.

The Fire Authority have advised that Access for Emergency Fire Service Vehicles and Water Supplies for Fire fighting will be required. This issue will be dealt with at the Building Regulations stage of the development and an informative will advise this.

Shropshire Wildlife consider that the ecological survey has not fully investigated all the impacts on protected species that may be present on the site. This is particularly relevant to potential bat roosts. Survey information should be available to inform the planning decision and not subject to condition.
Concerned over the lack of natural/semi natural green space in Newport as identified in the PPG17 Assessment. The Borough's current and emerging planning policy clearly indicate that the town's natural environments should be respected and enhanced.
The proposed scheme runs contrary to such policies. The site in question is far more suitable for inclusion in the town's green infrastructure to provide an ecological buffer for both Norbroom Park and the SSSI.

The Shrewsbury & Newport Canals Trust has objected to the proposed development.

- They consider that the development does little to preserve the immediate environment adjacent to the canal and that the scale and type of the housing is out of keeping with the canal side area. In particular the proposal for up to 3 storey buildings does little to enhance the existing area and in fact will significantly detract from it. The vista from the canal, which is supported by a very large proportion of Newport's residents as an under-utilised asset, will be irreparably damaged by the proposed housing.
- This current area of open space is one of the few areas that remain as open land in Newport and, given its location immediately next to the canal is enjoyed by significant numbers of people who walk, fish, jog, cycle and walk dogs along the canal. These leisure activities are likely to be significantly disrupted by the applicant's proposals.
- The Trust is currently working to try and restore the Canal through to Norbury Junction and is working with Natural England to maintain the abundance of wildlife that has populated and flourishes within and adjacent to the canal. They are aware that Natural England have designated the Newport stretch of the canal as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and find it difficult to understand how the proposals to use driven piles for the house foundations will preserve and protect the wildlife. It is also of concern that there appears to be a possible leak in this section of the canal and any use of piles will create vibration which could further damage the canal embankment.

- They remain unconvinced by the developer's proposals for drainage, both temporary and permanent. It appears as though dewatering will be required during the construction period whilst the plans for dealing with permanent drainage and surface water run-off require further detailed consideration, if there is not to be an adverse effect on the canal.

British Waterways have no adverse comments as this is a minor scale development which falls outside their remit.

West Mercia Constabulary has commented that the general layout of the site is good.

Neighbour consultations:
134 letters of objection and a petition with 93 signatures have been submitted. The comments have been summarised below:-

- Question the need for demolition of No.25 Maynards Croft
- Concern about increase in traffic with extra 70-80 cars going through Maynards Croft once development is completed and narrow road concerns.
- Land is not sustainable for residential use.
- Development will result in the loss of recreational play facilities at Norbroom Marsh.
- The impact on environment i.e. Ecology issues – bats and great crested newts have previously been spotted on site.
- Drainage issues for whole of development with special concern of drainage for south of site.
- Concern about flooding of the site
- Excessive noise levels during construction period, with concerns for parking of construction vehicles on A41 lay-bys.
- The height of proposed 3-storey apartment block and overlooking issues with the Skate Park and BMX track.
- Norbroom Marsh is listed in the Doomsday book
- Concerns over rights of way around Maynards Croft as to why they do not appear on Taylor Wimpy plans.
- Concern of buildings located directly next to a SSSI (Newport canal).
- Damage to the eco-system of Newport Canal.
- Proposed homes to be built won't be of a sustainable nature or be affordable housing.
- Loss of green space and amenity for Maynards Croft.
- Taylor Wimpy is Garden Grabbing.
- Potential sewage problems with site.
- Poor design of 3-storey apartment block and not in character of street scene.
- Poor quality Transport Survey completed (Completed during wrong time of day) i.e. not a peak times.
- Poor quality of Ecological survey.

- Road safety concerns with potential of increased traffic during construction e.g. not safe for children using skate park or BMX track nearby.
- Taylor Wimpy state many trees and hedgerows to be demolished, concerns that some of the trees are TPO's.
- Heavy piling during construction stage of development to affect noise level and already leaking canal.
- No need to build on Greenfield land when other Brownfield sites are available. Concerns over amount of peatland on site.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The principle of development outside the development boundary of Newport with regards housing need and supply in Newport
This issue needs to be considered in a wider context especially as there are three major residential appellations currently before the Council all of which lie outside, but immediately adjacent the built up boundary of Newport, and together taken with this application would account for approx 880 dwellings. One of the major applications TWC/2011/0821 for 285 dwellings on land off Wellington Road is also on this agenda for consideration. Officers have had regard to these other major applications when considering this one and hence it is necessary to explain the rationale behind the Council's overall approach.

<u>Background to housing policy for Newport in the adopted Core Strategy</u>
With regard to housing provision, Core Strategy Policy CS1 (Homes) states that '*Newport's local housing requirements will be met by approximately 60 new dwellings per annum'.* Policy CS6 (Newport) states that '*Development will be limited to that required to meet local needs, including those of its rural hinterland, and to support the town's regeneration. New housing development will be expected to deliver affordable housing to the level of 35% of all such development'.*

The Core Strategy for Telford and Wrekin covers a 10 year period from 2006 to 2016. In this respect the total number of houses envisaged to be provided over that period to meet Newport's needs is 600 (60 per annum x 10 years).

By way of background to the 60 new dwellings per annum figure in the Core Strategy the following commentary is relevant. When the Core Strategy was submitted for Examination in Public it pinpointed that the delivery of affordable housing was the critical determinant of the housing strategy proposed for Newport. The evidence to support such an approach was derived from documents such as the Housing Needs in Telford and Wrekin (2004) and its Summary Update (2005).

The housing needs analysis identified that 22 new affordable households per annum would be required in order to meet identified local needs. As such, an overall level of development of approximately 60 new dwellings per annum would be required, with an affordable housing contribution of 35% from new residential development to meet the identified need. It should be noted that this level of affordable housing would not address the existing backlog of

affordable housing need in Newport, due in part to the fact that no new affordable homes had been provided in the period 2001 to 2005, beyond the provision of 14 closed care dwellings in 2005.

The preferred development option for Newport prepared by the Council for the Core Strategy Examination proposed a balanced provision of new dwellings. Delivery whilst marginally above the rate of new household formation was deemed to be both, realistic and have the potential to make a significant contribution towards meeting the identified need for affordable homes. The need for affordable housing in Newport was identified as the second highest in the Borough.

The Inspector's report following the Examination in Public endorsed the Council's approach regarding the quantum of housing to be delivered in Newport over the Core Strategy period (60/pa). The Inspector enhanced the policy wording with specific reference to the proportion of affordable housing required of new housing development at 35% in accordance with Policy CS6 (Newport) such was the importance of this aspect.

In relation to the current applications under consideration in Newport, the Housing Policy & Enabling Officer comments that since the Core Strategy was adopted in December 2007 an update of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has been prepared by the Council in 2009. Along with other evidence, this supports the continued need for a high level of affordable housing provision in Newport and shows that this need has in fact increased over the last decade. The rise in property prices, together with consistently low incomes and difficulty in obtaining mortgages even when house prices have fallen has led to the current situation where local people, particularly young couples and families, have left the town to find accommodation elsewhere or remain in overcrowded and unsuitable accommodation. There are also many older people who need alternative accommodation.

In particular the SHMA, updated in 2009, now shows that 124 affordable dwellings are required each year over a twenty year period to meet the needs of Newport residents. This is considerably higher than the 22 affordable dwelling need shown in the 2005 housing needs summary and takes into account the lack of suitable existing provision and the backlog of need.

It was clear through the Core Strategy process that 35% affordable housing provision would only address a proportion of the affordable housing need in Newport. In reality, in order to meet the backlog of affordable need in Newport as well as newly arising need, a greater percentage would have been required. It is also clear from the 2009 SHMA that since the Core Strategy evidence base was produced, the need has increased and the affordable housing shortfall has worsened. It is therefore essential to achieve 35% on each of the Newport proposals in order to help meet identified needs and enable local households to remain in the area.

<u>Expectation of greenfield development in Newport</u>

Objections to this application raise the availability of brownfield provision within Newport and the associated desirability of building on such sites in preference to a greenfield site. The general preference in favour of brownfield development over previous years is acknowledged and is still encouraged in the Core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework. Indeed the delivery of housing during recent years has largely been on brownfield sites in Newport.

The Inspector presiding over the Examination of the Core Strategy considered a range of housing delivery options for Newport including concentrating development on previously developed land within the current built up area which equated to approximately 25 dwellings per annum. Whilst this option provided a number of advantages including the use of brownfield and under utilised sites, a number of disadvantages were identified. These being that it "*would not achieve the necessary levels of affordable housing, since urban sites would commonly fall below the threshold size for affordable provision"* (para 3.47). As will be highlighted in this report, monitoring over the first 5 years of the Core Strategy has indicated that this has appeared to be the case.

It was also noted by the Inspector that: *"Moreover, if focussed on the town centre, pressure for housing could displace other uses and thus diminish rather than support the role of Newport as a market town." (para 3.47).* Furthermore, remediation costs associated with the redevelopment of brownfield sites are often cited by developers in justifying a lower level of affordable housing on the basis of the effect a higher level has on viability.

The Inspector acknowledged the option of 60 dwellings per annum would ultimately entail extensive use of greenfield sites in Newport and this was quantified as being *"the most likely to achieve the required level of affordable housing." (para 3.47). Furthermore, the Inspector highlighted that because Newport is not as well-provided with brownfield opportunities as Telford that "a higher proportion of greenfield development may be unavoidable if the proposed dwelling numbers are to be achieved in Newport." (para 3.49).*

It is therefore concluded from the above paragraphs, as well as further evidence regarding the delivery of affordable houses over the last 5 years (as to be described below), that there are sound planning reasons why greenfield sites need to be used for residential development in and around Newport.

<u>Delivery of housing and affordable housing in Newport to date</u>
In considering the determination of the three large scale planning applications currently awaiting determination in Newport, including this smaller one, it is necessary to establish what residential development has already taken place and is committed, as this will assist in gauging housing need in Newport.

Data recorded as part of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) prepared by the Council represents the key source of information as to the number of dwellings built, as well as what is likely to be built through permissions granted or in the process of being granted. Application of the Core Strategy

policy of 60 additional dwellings per annum commenced in 2006, setting a target of 360 additional new dwellings to 31st March 2012. Headline figures from the AMR work for the years between 1st April 2006 and 31st March 2012 (6 years) are set out below. It should be noted that the figures for included for the 2011-12 year are internal calculations and have not been formally published yet by the Council as the AMR for this reporting year is not due to be finalised until December 2012.

- A total of 252 dwellings have been completed against the aggregated target of 360.
- Houses under construction during the 2010-12 monitoring period totalled 12 dwellings.
- The number of dwellings where permission had been granted but work had not been started was 58.
- Dwellings granted permission between 1st April 2012 and 30th June 2012 was 30.
- Planning applications where the Council has made a resolution to grant permission would provide a further 61 dwellings upon the grant of consent.

The figures described above are incorporated into Table 1 below and shown against the aggregated requirement of 600 houses for Newport for the period covering the Core Strategy (2006 - 2016).

Table 1 - Monitoring of housing completions and commitments in relation to Telford and Wrekin core Strategy Policy CS1 (Homes) in relation to Newport.

Monitoring of housing in Newport area	**Dwellings**	**Brown field**	**Green field**	**Outstanding requirement 2006-2016 CS1 *Homes* – 600 dws (60 dws per annum for Newport)**	**Affordable provision**		
					Total provision	**Brown field**	**Greenfield**
f) Completions 2006-2012	252	94%	6%	**108 (360–252)1108**	35 (14%)	35	0
g) Under construction 2011-12	12	83%	17%		0 (0%)	0	0
h) Dwellings with permissio	58	90%	10%		0 (0%)	0	0

n not started							
Sub-total	**322**	**93%**	**7%**	**278 (600 - 322)**	**35 (10.5%)**	**35**	**0**
i) dwellings receiving planning permission 1st April – 30th June 2012.	30	0%	100%		15 (50%)	0	15
Sub-total	**352**	**87%**	**13%**	**248 (600 – 352)**	**50 (14%)**	**35**	**15**
j) where there is currently a resolution to grant consent	61	100%	0%		9 (15%)	9	0
Built and committed Total	**413**	**89%**	**11%**	**187 (600 – 413)**	**59 (14%)**	**44**	**15**

This table highlights that for the 2006 - 2012 monitoring years there is a shortfall of 108 completed dwellings (252 minus 360) against the aggregated target of 360 (60pa X 6 years). Rolling forward the aggregated target of 600 dwellings for the 10 year period of the Core Strategy (2006 - 2016) and taking into account dwellings under construction, dwellings permitted and where there is a resolution to granted consent; there is an outstanding requirement for a further 187 dwellings.

Table 1 also highlights how the majority of housing completed or to be built are brownfield sites with 89% of dwellings being on this type of land.

With regard to the delivery of affordable housing since 2006, the right hand side of the above table shows how many affordable houses have been or are likely to be secured as a result of dwellings built or to be built through Section 106 obligations. This shows that the delivery of affordable housing (14%) is significantly below the Core Strategy target of 35% in policy CS6 (Newport). This indicates a correlation between a low level of affordable housing and the high level of development on brownfield sites (89%). This bears out the thoughts of the Inspector for the Core Strategy as referred to above regarding the disadvantage of relying on the use of brownfield sites as well as the view that extensive greenfield developments were the most likely to achieve the required level of affordable housing required.

Housing delivery and trajectory

As highlighted above, monitoring data shows a shortfall of completed dwellings against the aggregated target to 2012 and even with dwellings under construction and those permitted or resolved to be permitted there is a need for a further 187 dwellings to be consented to cover the period of the Core Strategy up to 2016. In short there has been a serious under delivery of housing in Newport between 2006 – 2012 both in terms of number of dwellings completed and permitted but, even more importantly, in relation to the delivery of affordable dwellings.

The applicant intends to build out this site quickly and most likely within a year of getting consent, if it were forthcoming. However, in relation to the 187 dwellings that require consent up to meet the aggregated figure of 600 houses to 2016, this figure would only marginally be reduced by the Maynards Croft proposals. Whilst granting consent for one of the alternative large major applications could meet this deficit in quantitative terms, any permission for one of these major applications would be unlikely to see the delivery of all those houses prior to 2016. By way of example, in the case of Wellington Road application, the applicant estimates that following any outline permission being granted, the build out of the site to completion would take approximately 9 years taking delivery beyond the end of the Core Strategy period (2016). This is based on the applicants estimation that the first dwellings could be delivered on site by mid 2013 (having successfully secured Reserved Matters consent and site preparation) with annual build rates of approximately 30 units per annum, subject to market conditions. The build out rate for the Audley Avenue application has been submitted as being completed by 2019 and in respect of the Station Road application the corresponding date is 2025.

This is shown in the attached housing trajectory table (Table 2 at the end of the report) which shows over a number of years the delivery of sites already permitted or resolved to be permitted together with the anticipated build out rates of applications currently with the Council for determination. This is set against the annual 60 dwellings per annum requirement set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1(Homes).

A number of sites coming forward at one time have the benefit of jointly making up the shortfall in provision to date as well as ensuring the delivery of the housing figures to 2016 by that date. Whilst this significantly increases building rates In Newport above that seen in recent years there is clear justification to allow more than one site to ensure the provision and acceleration of housing delivery in line with the Core Strategy. A number of sites would increase choice for consumers and competition between house builders and minimise risks associated with a single site being mothballed or land banked by a builder.

Allowing a number of separate sites would result in a higher intensity of house building over a number of years, particularly during the years between 2013 and 2019. The trajectory estimates that this will peak at 151 units per year during 2015 -2016 and this is considerably higher than recent years where under delivery has occurred. However, past monitoring rates that the Council

has recorded indicates that between 1992 and 1997 a total of 534 houses were built at an average of 89 per annum with one particular year (1994) seeing 141 completed dwellings in Newport and so such an increase in the building rate quantum has been experienced in the past and therefore feasible.

Housing trajectory beyond the end of the Core Strategy period (2016)
Another consequence of permitting a number of separate sites, as currently with the Council for determination, is that the total number of houses involved is greater than needed to meet the current shortfall in delivery and to the end of the current Core Strategy period. It is therefore necessary to consider the post 2016 housing situation in relation to the applications under consideration, when the Core Strategy period comes to an end.

Work is underway within the Council to put a new Local Plan in place over the next 2 years and the Council is referring to this plan as “Shaping Places”. It is proposed this plan will set out the spatial development vision, objectives and strategy for the T&W Council area, with borough-wide policies for different forms of development and key site proposals.

In setting out where new homes, jobs and green spaces are to be located and how areas across the Borough should develop to meet the needs of residents, employees and visitors up to 2030, the Shaping Places plan will need to take account of any significant planning permissions in place.

Preparation of a new Local Plan is not normally a reason to delay consideration of planning applications. Whilst "prematurity" can be a material planning consideration, government guidelines and case law indicate that this should not be viewed as such, unless relevant plans are very close to completion, in particular where they are submitted for examination. This is the case with the Shaping Places plan as it is at the earliest stage of development.

With regard to the Core Strategy, the overriding reason identified by the Inspector for reducing the plan period of the Core Strategy from 2021 to 2016 related to the capacity of the Strategy to provide adequately, and with the necessary flexibility, for new housing development. The principal issues behind this step relate to Telford centric issues – in the form of the ability of the Strategy to provide ‘flexibility’ for the highest growth levels proposed in the then emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (a Telford led issue); and also the requirement for a review of green space with specific reference to the Green Network (again a Telford led issue). There was however, an element of reasoning cited by the Inspector towards Newport:

“*The recommended reduction in the timespan of the Core Strategy to 2016 would enable the basis of the housing strategy in Newport and the rural areas to be reviewed in line with its success in the early years, and to be strengthened, or otherwise amended, if necessary. But the change [explicit requirement 35% affordable housing in Newport] is necessary from the outset.”* Also that *“The recommended reduction in the timespan of the Core*

Strategy to 2016 would allow an early review to include relevant policy on the basis of the forthcoming Strategic Housing Market Assessment together with the results of monitoring of housing development in the early part of the plan period."

Taking forward the Inspector's line in reviewing the position for affordable housing, it is clear from Table 1 above that delivery in the early years has not been strong – there is both a shortfall in the achievement of 60 dwellings per annum, and fundamentally, a significant shortfall in the required level of affordable housing. In preparing housing needs evidence further to the 2005 Housing Needs Survey, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2009 update derived a level of affordable housing need in Newport far higher than the earlier evidence, in part reflecting inclusion of backlog need (quantified as 124 affordable dwellings requirement per annum).

At this stage, the local planning authority is not in a position of identifying a revised policy position on the basis of revised evidence of need in the form of the 2009 SHMA (this evidence needs to be revised to account for forthcoming updated population projections). The mix of up to date quantitative and qualitative evidence provided by the Housing Policy & Enabling Officer does however identify that the level of need for affordable housing in Newport remains high, and indeed has been exacerbated by failure to deliver further provision at the level (35%) required by Policy CS6 (Newport).

The need for the provision of 35% affordable housing on each of the submitted housing sites is paramount. In the absence of a readily available evidenced alternative strategy for Newport, continuation of this target level of development defined by CS1 (Homes) as requiring 60 dwelling per annum is deemed to be the most appropriate option in order to deliver anywhere near the level of affordable housing required locally.

In accepting that the continuation of the target level of development defined by CS1 (Homes) beyond the end of the current Core Strategy can be considered appropriate, the aforementioned housing trajectory shows how the 60 dwellings per annum aggregates beyond 2016. Also shown is the trajectory (Table 2) of the homes that could be delivered by the applications under consideration as they are built out over a number of years. This indicates that by 2028 the number of dwellings being sought by the various permissions would equate to the level of housing of the 60 dwellings per annum by that date.

<u>Conclusion in relation to housing need and supply</u>
The delivery of affordable housing is a fundamental determinant of the development strategy for Newport in the adopted Core Strategy. Monitoring data since adoption has demonstrated that developments both completed and committed proposals have failed to deliver the required number of dwellings and level of affordable housing required by policies CS1(Homes) and CS6(Newport) respectively. When reflecting on the Inspector's judgment regarding the disadvantages of brownfield sites and that large greenfield sites would be required to deliver the level of provision envisaged by the Core

Strategy then use of some greenfield sites as Wellington Road are acceptable and necessary to help ensure delivery of the housing needs for Newport.

The total number of dwellings if granted by the Council would go beyond that required by the current Core Strategy period of 2016. However, with development of the Council's new Local Plan (Shaping Places) in its infancy there are no grounds to consider this or other applications before the Council in relation to prematurity with an emerging Plan. The local planning authority is not yet in a position to identify a revised policy position as the basis of revised evidence, in the form of the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment, needs to be adjusted to account for forthcoming updated population projections.

The Core Strategy as submitted for Examination evidenced the housing needs for Newport to 2021 before the time period was reduced to 2016 by the Inspector, predominately on the basis of Telford centric issues. With regard to the Inspectors reference to monitoring, this has revealed under delivery in dwelling numbers and affordable housing provision which the applications under consideration could address. The 2009 update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment has revealed an increased need for affordable housing.

In light of the above, it is considered that the continuation of the target level of 60 dwellings per year for Newport defined by CS1 (Homes) beyond the end of the current Core Strategy can be considered appropriate in helping meet the affordable housing needs in Newport with a realistic chance of delivery in current market conditions.

The trajectory in Table 2 shows how the 60 dwellings per annum aggregates beyond 2016 together with a trajectory of the homes that could be delivered by the applications under consideration as they are built out over a number of years. This indicates that by 2028 the number of dwellings being sought by the various applications would equate to the aggregated level of housing at 60 dwellings per annum by that date.

The one proviso is that the sites under consideration with the Council should deliver 35% affordable housing as the justification for the continuation of a 60 dwellings per annum approach is far less justifiable, reasonable and evidenced. Without such commitment any consents issued could preclude other sites in Newport coming forward (either by applications or through the adoption of the Shaping Places document) that may be able to provide such a level of affordable housing and be acceptable in planning terms regarding other matters. The Maynards Croft application does deliver 35% affordable housing.

It is considered that the above position is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which outlines what Local Planning Authorities should do *'To boost significantly the supply of housing'* (paragraph 47). The NPPF also states that *"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development."* (paragraph 49).

With regard the three dimensions of sustainable development that give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles, one of the dimensions is a social role, defined as follows:

a social role *– supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being;*

Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development accords with one of the NPPF's Core planning principles that the planning system ought to play, this being:

'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities'

Also with regard to the NPPF, the proposed range of housing size, type and tenure in the application would contribute to the creation of sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities advocated in paragraph 50.

The Council's Housing Policy & Enabling Officer has highlighted that Newport has one of the highest affordable housing needs in the Borough. The developer has agreed to provide 35%. The final mix of tenures, household types and sizes will be secured through a Section 106 agreement.

<u>Other issues raised with regard to housing delivery.</u>
In October 2011 the Plans Board agreed a resolution to grant permission in the east of Newport for a continuing care retirement community of some 209 units (planning application ref W2008/0934). The resolution is subject to conditions and the signing of a Section 106 agreement and it is understood that the signing of this is imminent. Some representations received in relation to the larger residential applications consider that the care development should count against the housing target for Newport. It has also been argued that the care development would free up further housing in Newport for re-letting or sale by local residents who would might move to the care development should it be built.

With respect to the first point, in the determination of the continuing care application it was accepted by the Council that the proposals could be defined as a 'residential institution' under the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended) as opposed to ordinary 'dwelling houses'. Because of the classification as

residential institution the Council was unable to secure any affordable housing provision - with such provision forming the basis of the Core Strategy housing figures for Newport. As a safeguard to ensure the development does not in effect become dwelling houses, the applicant is to enter into a Section 106 agreement to limit the occupants of the proposed units to at least one member of the household being over 65 and in need of care.

With regard to the second point, in relation local residents moving into the care community development and freeing up housing for let or sale, there are no planned restrictions on the occupancy of those who would buy into the facility if permitted and built. Therefore, as the development could attract residents from a wider area than Newport it is not possible to accurately quantify what amount of housing might in Newport become available for sale or let from the existing local population and when this would occur. In any event any released housing would not be affordable and would be bought and let at market rates.

Because of the factors describe it is not considered that the units created by the care development should count towards the housing target for Newport.

Principle of housing development in this particular location:
The Maynard's Croft application site is located outside of the built up area around Newport as defined in the adopted Proposals Map (originating from the Wrekin Local Plan (WLP). Although the adopted Core Strategy provides a Key Diagram, the Core Strategy is not yet accompanied by a spatial plan that identifies how the development strategy is to be accommodated. Whilst policy CS6 (Newport) recognises the function and role of Newport where future development should be concentrated, it neither allocates land for development nor establishes the extent of any revised settlement boundary to accommodate future growth beyond 2006 as shown on the WLP Proposals Map.

In this respect the boundary of the built up area as shown on the WLP Proposals Map is out-of-date. The National Planning Policy Framework states at paragraph 14 that in such circumstances development proposals should be granted permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. This accords with the wider presumption in favour of sustainable development advocated in paragraph 14. Taking into account the policies in the Framework and the policies subsequently adopted in the form of Core Strategy Policies CS1 (Homes and CS6 (Newport), the benefits outweigh any adverse impact of developing beyond the built up defined in the WLP Proposals Map.

In the absence of a spatial plan which allocates land uses for the Core Strategy, it is inappropriate to conclude that development conflicts with Core Strategy Policy CS7 (Rural Area). Policy CS7 specifically seeks to limit development to meet the needs of the Rural Areas (as opposed to Newport) and focus development on three named villages outside of which development in the open countryside will be strictly controlled. This policy

should not be used to prevent development that is necessary to accommodate the growth of Newport, particularly where this would be consistent with Policy CS6.

To reinforce the view that sites outside of the built up area as shown on the WLP Proposals Map can be considered appropriate, it is noted that the WLP Proposals Map identified two sites for future residential development. Both sites have since been developed and there remain only a limited number of small sites that could be developed within the built up area, with most being brownfield in nature.

As discussed above brownfield sites are limited in the number of houses such sites can deliver and have historically resulted in a lower level of affordable housing. Many of the brownfield sites are in alternative uses which may be more appropriate to other forms of development and there is limited certainty that they will come forward and be granted permission in any event.

With regard to the Core Strategy, policy CS6 specifically refers to development also meeting the needs of Newport's rural hinterland as well as needs of the town itself. Furthermore, the Inspector's Report into the Core Strategy acknowledges that Newport is not as well provided with brownfield opportunities (within the built up area) as Telford and a higher proportion of greenfield development may be unavoidable if the proposed number of dwellings (and required level of affordable houses) advocated in policy CS1 (and policy CS6) are to be achieved.

Therefore, in light of the material considerations outlined in the paragraphs above and previous acceptance that there is a clear housing need in Newport to meet the requirements for the Core Strategy policy CS1 (Homes) up to and beyond the current plan period, the principle of whether a housing development in this location is accepted on policy grounds.

Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area:
Policy UD2 provides guidance to assess whether or not proposals are of an appropriate design quality and relate positively to their context. It advises the Council to assess proposed development in relation to its scale, massing, form, density, orientation and layout, proportions, materials, landscape elements, access, parking and spatial quality. Policy CS15, amongst other issues, states that development will assist in creating and sustaining safe places, positively influencing the appearance of the local environment.

Objections have been received concerned about the vista across the canal towards the site and the harm that will be caused. Officers do not share this concern. The site is a discrete parcel of land that does not form part of an open wider area of countryside. The site sits behind the canal embankment and the majority of the trees will be retained to screen the site. In addition the site is at a different level to the adjacent Norbroom Park so does not appear as an exposed site. The taller apartment block, which is closest building to the canal, has been re-sited and the orientation altered. Previously the block was close up to the site boundary with the canal. However, the block has

been moved away from the boundary with the canal and re-orientated so that is it at an oblique angle to the canal. This serves to reduce any visual impact and thus the proposed development will not be overly visible from the opposite side of the canal. Furthermore, existing dwellings in Victoria Park, Fishers Lock and 7-21 Maynard's Croft back onto the canal and so the precedent of having residential development alongside the canal has already been established. In addition a new residential scheme backing onto the canal off Broomfield Place on the western side of Newport was approved by Plans Board and this is in a similar edge-of-settlement location. Thus it is difficult to argue that the proposal will adversely impact upon the views from the canal to a significantly detrimental degree when development already exists along it.

The scale and layout of development for 34 dwellings and flats is similar to existing surrounding development with its relatively low density cul-du-sac and twisting estate road type of development. The proposed scheme is therefore not considered out of character with the prevailing pattern, scale or layout of development.

The design of the dwellings is also appropriate. They are traditional brick and tile properties that are not at odds with the 1970's style dwellings in Maynard's Croft and hence will not appear discordant or detrimental to the character of the area. Being set in a discrete area off Maynards Croft the development will not be very visible form the street scene, apart from views down the newly created access road.

As such officers consider that the scale, design, layout and proposed materials of the scheme accord with the surrounding area and will not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

Residential amenity:
Due to the layout and positioning of the proposed development in relation to existing dwellings in Maynard's Croft there will not be any significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of existing dwellings. The development borders the rear gardens of Nos. 21 – 29 Maynard's Croft and the side garden boundary of No.31, so there are only 6 properties that will be directly affected. However, the above mentioned properties in Maynard's' Croft have good sized gardens (approx 27m in length) and the proposed properties have approx 10m long gardens. This separation distance is sufficient for there not to be any significant overlooking or loss of privacy.

One of the proposed units will be almost adjacent to the rear garden boundary of No. 30, but the garden is 27m long and the new property will be side on and has a blank elevation. A condition can be imposed to ensure that no windows are inserted in this side elevation in the future to preserve the privacy of No 31.

Officers are satisfied that the positioning of the proposed development in relation to existing dwellings in Maynard's Croft will not significantly adversely

affect residential amenity by reason of any mutual overlooking, loss of privacy or any overbearing effect.

Noise and disturbance during construction:
Residents have expressed concerns about noise and disturbance during the construction of the development, and in particular to the noise and vibration arising from the piling of foundations because of the peat that underlies part of the site.

There will always be noise and disturbance from construction of development, even for development that does not require planning permission. Planning conditions can be imposed to limit hours of construction and where construction vehicles park. Piling is a noisy activity and the developer would be expected to be courteous and give residents advance warning of when piling on site will be undertaken. Piling is considered to be a statutory noise nuisance and the developer should be aware of this and under the relevant environmental legislation will be expected to lessen the impact as much as possible. If noise levels during construction exceed statutory noise levels then this would be a matter for Environmental Health to investigate.

Pre-commencement planning conditions can be imposed requiring the developer to submit a construction management plan that indicates where staff and construction traffic will park etc and measures the developer will take to keep the roads free of mud. The developer has however, submitted a Construction Management Plan prior to the determination of the application.

Highway safety:
The proposed development will involve the creation of a new access point off Maynards Croft by demolishing No.25 and making an access road that will then lead into the centre of the development. The Council's Highways officer has no objection to this and advises that there is no technical case to justify any refusal. The increase in traffic that is likely to arise from this development is not a level to be significant and to justify any highway safety concerns or a planning refusal.

Some highway improvements are required, namely installing dropped kerbs in the vicinity of the site and this would be secured via a S106 contribution of £10,000. The highways officer has also advised that whilst there are no concerns with visibility on the bend of Maynards Croft, and that any issues are likely to be the result of poor driving. He did suggest a S106 contribution of £5,000 to be used if there were significant issues but which would be paid back within a time period if no such need of it. However, the developer is not prepared to pay this sum, based on the various other S106 contributions and the Council's insistence on providing 35% affordable housing. Officers are prepared to waive this advisory payment of £5,000 as it is not crucial to the development.

Ground conditions and drainage:
The Council's drainage engineers and Severn Trent have not raised any objections to the proposed development and have advised the imposition of conditions.

By way of additional information, in light of the overall scale of development proposed for Newport a feasibility study by Severn Trent is currently underway to investigate solutions and options for providing capacity to accommodate additional flows from the proposed developments. Possible solutions that are investigated would involve reducing the amount of surface water (rain water) that enters the foul sewers, which would free up capacity for additional foul flows and also replacing parts of the existing sewerage system with larger sewers that have sufficient capacity to accommodate existing and additional flows. The costs and benefits of each of the options would be assessed and the most suitable solution would be selected. The conclusions of the study are expected by late summer 2012 and would identify the timescales for constructing a solution. Severn Trent advise that they will liaise with Telford and Wrekin Council to provide advice on how new development should be managed whilst additional capacity is being constructed.

The development will require foundation piling into peat that lies over parts of the site. The Council's Geotechs engineers have been in discussion with the developer's engineers to clarify some of the effects of the works on the integrity of the canal. Conditions can be imposed to require details of appropriate foundation design as a foundation schedule and any necessary gas mitigation measures.

Ecology, biodiversity and trees**:**
Under Regulation 9(5) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, competent authorities must *have regard to* the Habitats Directive in the exercise of its functions. Initially both Natural England and the Council's ecologist had concerns about the possible impact of the development on European Species i.e. bats and Great Crested Newts). However additional ecology surveys have been submitted that satisfactorily demonstrate that protected species will not be adversely affected as proposed mitigation measures will be appropriate. In addition further information will be conditioned about construction processes close to the canal to ensure its stability and ecological integrity. Hence the Council's ecologist is satisfied and Natural England has withdrawn their objection.

Initially the Council's tree officer had concerns about the impact on adjacent trees and has made a Tree Preservation Order on the Alders. However, additional survey work and measures to address the tree officer's concerns, as well as amending the layout, have now been submitted and the tree officer is satisfied that the proposed development will not have an adverse impact on the existing trees on and surrounding the site.

S106 contributions:
The developer is providing 35% affordable housing which officers consider is paramount in light of the housing supply and demand issues presented earlier

in the report. The tenure mix is not ideal, but is considered to be acceptable in light of the need for 35% affordable provision and the viability assessments provided by the developer.

Highways require £10,000 towards tactile paving improvements between the site and the town centre. However, the additional £5,000 they requested in case the bend in Maynards Croft needed improving has been waived in light of viability assessments and the need to prioritise affordable housing provision.

The Councils Recreation Officer has requested £41,360 for the upgrading of the canal towpath. Again, the viability assessment has shown that this is not possible without sacrificing affordable housing provision. The proposed development does not involve any direct linkage through to the canal, so there is no direct benefit to existing or proposed residents from the towpath improvement in the vicinity of the site.

Education contributions were initially calculated at £72,000 towards primary and secondary education and the developer had factored this into his viability assessment regarding the overall S106 financial contribution package. Since then Education have submitted a revised position statement, which is set out in the consultation section of this report, and sets out a figure of £2,464.55 per dwelling. For this scheme that would mean the developer paying an increased education contribution. Officers consider that as earlier commitment had been based on a lower figure, it is not now appropriate to request additional money for education over and above the £72,000.

Conclusion:
The delivery of affordable housing is a fundamental determinant of the development strategy for Newport in the adopted Core Strategy. Monitoring data since adoption has demonstrated that developments both completed and committed proposals have failed to deliver the required number of dwellings and level of affordable housing required by policies CS1(Homes) and CS6(Newport) respectively. The development proposed would help address both of these deficits. When reflecting on the Inspector's judgment regarding the disadvantages of brownfield sites, and that greenfield sites would be required to deliver the level of provision envisaged by the Core Strategy, then some greenfield sites, such as Maynards Croft, is acceptable and necessary to help ensure delivery of the housing needs for Newport and its rural hinterland.

Granting consent for the major applications under consideration alone would not meet the housing shortfall and Core Strategy target to 2016 because of lead in times and build out rates that would extend beyond 2016, therefore requiring more than one site to deliver the shortfall and Core Strategy target.

Given the number of dwellings being applied for, the total number of dwellings if granted by the Council would go beyond that required by the current Core Strategy period of 2016. However, with development of the Council's new Local Plan (Shaping Places) in its infancy there are no grounds to consider

this or other applications before the Council in relation to prematurity with an emerging Plan. The local planning authority is not yet in a position to identify a revised policy position as the basis of revised evidence, in the form of the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment, needs to be adjusted to account for forthcoming updated population projections.

The Core Strategy as submitted for Examination evidenced the housing needs for Newport to 2021 before the time period was reduced to 2016 by the Inspector, predominately on the basis of Telford centric issues. With regard to the Inspector's reference to monitoring, this has revealed under delivery in dwelling numbers and affordable housing provision which the applications under consideration could address. The 2009 update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment has revealed an increased need for affordable housing.

In light of the above, it is considered that the continuation of the target level of 60 dwellings per year for Newport defined by CS1 (Homes) beyond the end of the current Core Strategy can be considered appropriate in helping meet the affordable housing needs in Newport with a realistic chance of delivery in current market conditions.

It is also considered that the above position is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which outlines what Local Planning Authorities should do *'To boost significantly the supply of housing'* (paragraph 47). The NPPF also states that *"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development."* (paragraph 49). This relates to the social role of sustainable development that seeks to support *'strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being'.*

Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development accords with one of the NPPF's Core planning principles that the planning system ought to play, this being:

'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities'

The erection of houses on this site would not set any precedent for more development outside the town boundary, or along other stretches of the canal, as any further applications would be decided on their merits and the policy framework at the time.

Therefore the principle of the development in this location is acceptable on policy grounds despite the site being outside of the built up area as outlined in the report particularly as the proposal is consistent with Policy CS6 (Newport) in meeting the local need for new homes including affordable housing.

The design, scale and layout of development for 34 dwellings and flats is similar to the existing surrounding development and is therefore not considered out of character with the prevailing pattern, scale or layout of development and will not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the area including the section of Newport Canal; that runs close to the site. There are no technical or highway safety issues and the site can be adequately drained. Nature conservation and tree protection have been ensured and appropriate mitigation measures are possible.

The provision of 35% affordable housing and S106 financial contributions towards highway improvements and education facilities serves to ensure that the impact of the development in Newport is lessened and appropriate facilities are provided.

Overall, it is considered that the development proposed in the application represents sustainable development and there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the conclusions above, the recommendation to Plans Board on this application is that DELEGATED AUTHORITY be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the applicant entering into a s106 agreement for £72,000 towards primary and secondary education provision, £10,000 towards highways improvements and 35% affordable housing and subject to the conditions (to be agreed and determined as appropriate).

The following conditions (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):

1. A04 Time Limit
2. B11 Sample of materials.
3. B12 Sample brick panel
4. B34 Full highway construction details,
5. B57 Land contamination.
6. B121 landscaping design
7. B145 Lighting Strategy (with regard to bats).
8. B150 Site Environmental Management Plan for construction works (includes measures for control and reduction of noise from works and hours of work).
9. B custom Due to proximity to the Newport Canal details of the proposed groundwork's near the canal will be required to prevent any

alteration to the hydrology of the watercourse in order to ensure the integrity of the SSSI of the Newport Canal.

10. B custom Details of foul and surface water drainage including sustainable Surface water drainage including outfall details and an exceedance flood routing plan.
11. B Custom Details of groundwater ingress into proposed SUDS feature due to the highground water in the area,
12. B custom Details of construction processes close to the canal to ensure its stability and ecological integrity
13. C Custom Retention and protection of trees and hedgerows as provided in Tree Survey report.
14. C08 Trees Soil Levels.
15. C11 Access prior to other operations
16. C13 Parking, loading, unloading and turning,
17. C14 Visibility splays stating 2.4m x 43m,
18. Custom Trees restrictions (No burning, material storage etc)
19. C79 Suitable contractor
20. C92 Update Survey for ecology.
21. C38 Development in accordance with deposited plans.
22. D01 removal of pd

Informatives:

23. I106 – Section 106 agreements
24. I35 – Custom - Geotechs: The site is affected by high ground water levels. This must be considered when designing the foundations and BRE Protocol 1 must be followed especially in relation to high ground water.
25. I25m – Nesting Birds Vegetation;
26. I35 – Custom – Bat. Works must take place under a Natural England EPS licence.
27. I25e - Custom - Trenches
28. I35 – Custom Common amphibians precautionary measures
29. I35 – Custom Reptiles precautionary approach during construction
30. I35 – Custom Otters precautionary approach
31. I35 – Custom any new development must not restrict access to the sewerage pumping station
32. I35 – Custom due to the close proximity of the proposed new development the occupant may experience noise/smell pollution for the existing pumping station.
33. I35 – Custom site is near to a popular and busy park with play facilities (play area / ball court / BMX track and trails and the largest skate park in Shropshire) which hold a number of community events throughout the year. Therefore, it is recommended that properties facing the parks car park are protected from potential noise nuisance as much as is possible.
34. I40 – Conditions
35. I44 – Reasons for grant of Approval

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The delivery of affordable housing is a fundamental determinant of the development strategy for Newport in the adopted Core Strategy. Monitoring data since adoption has demonstrated that developments both completed and committed proposals have failed to deliver the required number of dwellings and level of affordable housing required by policies CS1(Homes) and CS6(Newport) respectively. The development proposed would help address both of these deficits. When reflecting on the Inspector's judgment regarding the disadvantages of brownfield sites, and that greenfield sites would be required to deliver the level of provision envisaged by the Core Strategy, then some greenfield sites, such as Maynards Croft, is acceptable and necessary to help ensure delivery of the housing needs for Newport and its rural hinterland.

Granting consent for only the major applications under consideration would not meet the housing shortfall and Core Strategy target to 2016 because of lead in times and build out rates that would extend beyond 2016, therefore requiring more than one site to deliver the shortfall and Core Strategy target.

Given the number of dwellings being applied for, the total number of dwellings if granted by the Council would go beyond that required by the current Core Strategy period of 2016. However, with development of the Council's new Local Plan (Shaping Places) in its infancy there are no grounds to consider this or other applications before the Council in relation to prematurity with an emerging Plan. The local planning authority is not yet in a position to identify a revised policy position as the basis of revised evidence, in the form of the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment, needs to be adjusted to account for forthcoming updated population projections.

The Core Strategy as submitted for Examination evidenced the housing needs for Newport to 2021 before the time period was reduced to 2016 by the Inspector, predominately on the basis of Telford centric issues. With regard to the Inspector's reference to monitoring, this has revealed under delivery in dwelling numbers and affordable housing provision which the applications under consideration could address. The 2009 update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment has revealed an increased need for affordable housing.

In light of the above, it is considered that the continuation of the target level of 60 dwellings per year for Newport defined by CS1 (Homes) beyond the end of the current Core Strategy can be considered appropriate in helping meet the affordable housing needs in Newport with a realistic chance of delivery in current market conditions.

It is also considered that the above position is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which outlines what Local Planning Authorities should do *'To boost significantly the supply of housing'* (paragraph 47). The NPPF also states that *"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development."* (paragraph 49). This relates to the social role of sustainable development that seeks to support *'strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by*

creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being'.

Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development accords with one of the NPPF's Core planning principles that the planning system ought to play, this being:

'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities'

The erection of houses on this site would not set any precedent for more development outside the town boundary, or along other stretches of the canal, as any further applications would be decided on their merits and the policy framework at the time.

Therefore the principle of the development in this location is acceptable on policy grounds despite the site being outside of the built up area as outlined in the report particularly as the proposal is consistent with Policy CS6 (Newport) in meeting the local need for new homes including affordable housing.

The design, scale and layout of development for 34 dwellings and flats is similar to the existing surrounding development and is therefore not considered out of character with the prevailing pattern, scale or layout of development and will not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the area including the section of Newport Canal; that runs close to the site. There are no technical or highway safety issues and the site can be adequately drained. Nature conservation and tree protection have been ensured and appropriate mitigation measures are possible.

The provision of 35% affordable housing and S106 financial contributions towards highway improvements and education facilities serves to ensure that the impact of the development in Newport is lessened and appropriate facilities are provided.

Overall, it is considered that the development proposed in the application represents sustainable development and there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in National Planning Policy Framework.

TWC/2012/0240 Land at, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire
Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 103no. new dwellings (Use class C3) and 50no. extra care housing units (Use class C2), Provision of 2no. new access roads and associated drainage, open space and landscaping ***Amended Parameter Plans***

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Helical (Telford) Limited	26/03/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
Wellington	Arleston

THIS ITEM WAS DEFERRED FROM PLANS BOARD ON 20TH JUNE IN ORDER FOR OFFICERS TO NEGOTIATE WITH AGENTS OVER THE SITING OF THE EXTRA CARE FACILITY.

Objections: YES

During the members debate at the last plans board Members raised concerns about the siting of the Extra Care facility and the impact of this three storey building on existing residents.

The proposed changes:

The applicants have submitted amended plans, including the parameters plan, which sets the zone for the extra care facility to be situated. The primary change is the repositioning of the extra care facility further south into a more central location of the parcel of land which is bounded by Dawley Road to the west and Kingsland to the north. This has lead to the previously proposed zone of housing adjacent to the extra care facility moving from the south of the building to the north of the building. In addition a further strip of open space is proposed along part of the northern boundary with Kingsland, which is approx 10m wide including the existing hedge which is to be retained.

In addition to changing the location of the extra care facility, the zone of building has also been reduced by re-evaluating the internal space requirements and a reduction in circulation space means that the same level of accommodation 50 units can still be accommodated within this reduced zone, with no increase in height.

Further consultation comments:

The following statutory consultees have raised no further comments to those reported in the main report.

Shropshire Fire Service
Drainage
Arboricultural Officer
West Mercia Police
Environment Agency

Conservation
Sustainability
Archaeology
Severn Trent Water
English Heritage

Wellington Town Council : objects to the application on the following grounds: building on the established Green Network and that no exceptional grounds/reasons had been identified that any community benefits accrued to the locality; creeping urbanisation in an area with limited open space; associated traffic problems particularly at peak times; current sewerage and drainage problems which would be increased if the development proceeded; that the proposed development would prejudice the existing wildlife and ecological habitat and that it was questioned as to whether there was an established need for the development when other adjacent developments were considered; that the proposed elements of 2/3 storey development and the care home would adversely dominant both the listed buildings and the locality; concerns in relation to the access through and to the proposed site and that concerns were expressed that all elements of green space in South Wellington had now been lost due to development that has been approved.

There have been 52 additional letters of objection to the proposed scheme; there is reiteration of all the previous reasons for objection (please see main report) and the following new issues

- Footpath alteration would adversely affect the character of the existing route
- Footpath has not been used as a bridleway; there are/were numerous stiles along route, which would have prevented such usage.
- Widening of the existing footpath for the entire length to 2m wide would encroach on properties not in applicant's ownership
- A widened path will encourage use of unlicensed vehicles and other anti-social behaviour
- The proposed amendments to the siting of the extra care does not overcome objections to the undesired development in Arleston, which will be visually intrusive
- Site of the proposed extra care will continue to dominate views
- The new position of the extra care has a greater impact on existing residents then previously as affects more properties, and impact on listed buildings.
- Other sites for the extra care should be considered
- Proposal plans appear to claim land owned by the adjacent owners.
- Requested a further site visit to be undertaken by plans board members
- Loss of natural play spaces to the detriment of children's health and well being.
- NPPF encourages local communities to shape development in their area and put forward plans. The level of opposition to the proposal

clearly demonstrates that locals are not being empowered to shape their surrounds through NPPF.

Planning Considerations:

Re-siting of the extra care facility

Officers consider that the retention of the facility in the northern parcel of land served of Dawley Road is appropriate to ensure that the facility is integrated with existing community and provides links to services and facilities such as bus route and local shops, in accordance with policy CS9 of the core strategy and guidance in NPPF.

The main concern relating to the previous siting of the extra car facility was due to the impact on existing residential properties and the amenities of occupiers. The extra care in the amended position would be a minimum of 39m from the northern boundary of the site and 55m from the nearest residential property in Kingsland. The facility is also in excess of 33m from the eastern boundary. There will be up to two storey dwellings closer to the properties in Kingsland, but these will be at least 10m from the boundary and 26m from nearest property in Kingsland. Officers consider that the amendments to the scheme have improved the site layout and provide sufficient separation to ensure that the amenities of existing occupiers in terms of overlooking and impact on privacy are not affected. Furthermore, the retained hedgerow and trees along the northern boundary will significantly screen the proposed two storey dwellings located closest to properties in Kingsland, therefore limiting the impact on outlook.

A consequence of the amended plans has been a small increase in the open land provision to the retained within the site, which will benefit existing and proposed residents by offering more land for informal recreation.

Footpath issues

At the previous meeting representations had been received which indicated the potential use of the footpath link as a bridleway and appeared to suggest that such usage had occurred for a number of years. During the re-consultation period it is clear that local residents dispute this claim and state that the footway included stiles, which would prevent such usage.

On clarifying with the Rights of Way Officer, there has been no formal application to amend the status of this route and any such application would need to show evidence of usage for at least 20 years, without hindrance or challenge. All evidence would then be investigated as part of this separate process under Highways Legislation.

For the purposes of considering this planning application, it is important to note that whilst the developers are happy to increase the width of the footpath, this would only be for parts of the route within their ownership. This

was not clear in the presentation or proposed wording of condition 33. To undertake such works not for the entire length of the footway would not have the desired affect of creating a link for multiple user groups. However, as the development proposes create a new footway link between Dawley Road and Arleston Lane. This new footway link can be 2m in width for the entire length and therefore be available for multi users in accordance with the rights of way improvement plan and local Access Forum which is actively promoting mixed use routes. This proposal will not impact on land outside of the applicants ownership, which is an issue with improving the existing route and will retain the character and appearance of the existing route which will assist in preserving the semi rural character of this route.
Guidance in NPPF seeks the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and encourages local authorities to seek opportunities to improve facilities for users. Officers consider that the new proposed multi use link accords with this guidance.

Other issues:

There has been a request for a further member site visit, it is not considered necessary as a comprehensive visit was undertaken prior to plans board on the 20th June, where members saw the site from a number of vantage points and the planning officer related the proposed plans to characteristics as seen on the ground.

The issue of the loss of green network and impact on children's health as been raised by a number of residents. NPPF recognises that planning has an important role in creating healthy and inclusive communities. It notes the importance of access to high quality open space and the need to deliver facilities and services for the local community. Officers consider that any official current use of this site for children's play is limited to the public footpath and the proposal will open up more of the site to the local community to promote the benefits of access to high quality semi natural environment, along with an area of more formal equipped play facilities and there will therefore be a net gain and benefit to the community in relation to this proposal, in accordance with guidance in NPPF relating to promoting healthy communities.

CONCLUSIONS:
The site is located approx 1.8km south east of Wellington district centre; it has good accessibility to public transport and local facilities and services at Arleston Local Centre. The site is therefore considered to be in a sustainable location for new development. Therefore in accordance with NPPF there is a presumption in favour of development in sustainable locations.

The proposed development will retain in excess of 50% of the site as open space and undeveloped land and include environmental improvements with enhancements to allow the creation of community uses and access with new footpath and cycleway link, creation of formal recreational facilities, enhancement and protection of ecological habitats and management of

woodlands and other open space. The proposal also offers community benefits with the creation of an extra care facility which includes 30 affordable housing units, highways improvements, contributions for educational purposes, increased accessibility to heritage assets and creation of jobs through construction, operation of the extra care facility and wider landscape and open space management

Officers acknowledge that certain elements of the scheme will have benefits such as the extra care facilities to meet demands of the local area and enhancement to the retained open land through management. Since the previous application there have been amendments to the scheme and additional surveys and information provided with regard to ecology protection and benefits, these assertions have now been sufficiently addressed and appropriate evidence provided. It should be noted that, some of the applicants' considered 'benefits' of the site are actually mitigation for the impact of the development on existing services and facilities, i.e. education and highways. It is the view of your officers that the level of commitment has been improved and now meets policy requirements and on balance it is considered that the community and environmental benefits of the overall proposal are in accordance with the exceptions within Wrekin Local Plan Policy OL4.

It is acknowledged that local residents are opposed to the loss of green network and consider that it is fully protected as is, however it should be noted that policy does allow for some development, following the receipt of amended plans showing in excess of 50% of the site to be retained as open land, including enhancement and the development pockets to the east of the site are sensitive to the existing semi-natural woodland, and will largely retain the external views into the site from the wider area.

The proposed development includes an extra care facility of 50 units, which would assist in meeting the Council's target to provide 500 units. Of these units 30 would be affordable units with a mix of size and tenure. Clearly there is a demand for such facilities. At the previous meeting members were not entirely convinced that the proposed facility was appropriately located. Amended plans have moved the position further into the site and away from existing residents to protect their amenities, this coupled with information about links to the community and provision of facilities within the site has been provided to reassure your officers that this site is in a sustainable location, with links to existing facilities to be accessible and inclusive. Furthermore, officers are satisfied that on the basis of viability with the reduced open market units to a maximum of 103 dwellings, the provision of 30 "affordable" Extra Care units is reasonable, whilst it is below the policy threshold, it is acknowledged that this is specialist housing to meet a local demand, this coupled with a neighbouring site within Arleston over providing 'traditional' affordable family housing is considered reasonable and accords with strategic housing policy and policy CS1 of the core strategy.

The provision of the extra care facility is considered a major community benefit of the proposal and outweighs the total protection of the green network

in this location. Given this, it is important to ensure that extra care facility is provided, as a standard housing development would not offer sufficient benefits to be considered as an exception to green network protection policies. The open market housing is only acceptable in order to make the scheme financially viable to provide the extra care facility. To this end, no more than 20 open market dwellings can be occupied before works start on the facility and no more than 75 occupied before the facility is ready for occupation. Officers consider that these timings are appropriate and realistic in terms of building programmes and cash flows for the development, which is of particular importance in the current economic climate; this is to be secured through the S106 agreement.

Technical issues such as highways, flooding and drainage, heritage, archaeology and ground conditions have been satisfactorily addressed and can be mitigated through conditions and planning obligations. The development will have an impact on services such as play facilities, public art and education which has been acknowledged by the applicant and works have commenced on drafting a S106 agreement to secure the appropriate mitigation for the development.

The previous scheme had outstanding technical issues which had not been satisfactorily addressed in terms of ecology, trees and noise. This application is accompanied by sufficient supporting information to ensure that the proposed development will not adversely impact on protected species through loss of habitat and amenities of future occupiers in relation to noise impacts from the M54 and Dawley Road.

There are good aspects to the proposal as described in this report. On balance the loss of Green Network and open space is outweighed by the community and environmental benefits of the proposal, which also creates and supports jobs and promotes economic growth, in accordance with the principles of NPPF for the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval subject to signing of a Section 106 agreement for 30 affordable housing units within the extra care facility, provision of open space and play facilities, including a contribution of £90,000 for improvements to nearest NEAP at Windsor Road, Arleston. Highways contributions of £10,000 for maintenance of new junction, £600 for commissioning of new traffic signals controlled pedestrian crossing and £5000 for support/monitoring of Travel Plan for the Extra Care facility, an education financial contribution of £208,794, for primary education provision in the local vicinity. Public Art either £10,000 financial contribution for commission and erection on site or in local vicinity or creation of piece of public art outside or within the extra care facility to this same sum. Section 106 financial and conditions monitoring contribution of £3,500 and subject to the following conditions:

1. A01 Time Limit
2. A03 Submission of Reserved Matters
3. B002 Reserved matters outstanding

4. B003 Reserved matters details
5. B008 Appearance details
6. Bcust Highways
7. Bcust Highways
8. B005 Travel Plan
9. B050 Shallow Mining
10. B052 Untreated Mineshafts
11. B057 Land Contamination
12. Bcust Well Investigation
13. Bcust Foundation details
14. B062 Foul and Surface Water drainage
15. B110 Archaeological Investigation
16. C130 Tree Protection
17. C131 Services in root protection areas
18. C133 Details of Trees for removal
19. B145 Lighting Strategy
20. B150 Site Environmental Management Plan
21. C050 Noise Attenuation
22. C071 Soil Levels in Tree root protection zone
23. C072 Burning/storing in tree root protection zones
24. C101 Erection of ecology boxes
25. Ccust Ecological Mitigation Strategy
26. Ccust Retention of trees of ecological value
27. Ccust Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan
28. C113 Extra Care Code for Sustainable Homes
29. C115 Play space details
30. Ccust Open Space details
31. C38 Development in accordance with plans
32. D06 Restriction on use of extra care facility.
33. Ccust The new proposed footpath link between Dawley Road and Arleston Lane shall be a minimum of 2m wide for the entire length of the route.

INFORMATIVES

S106 agreement
Sustainable Urban Drainage
Contaminated Land
Protected Species
Bats
Nesting Birds
Updated survey
Trenches
Fire Authority
Conditions

Reasons for approval

The Local Planning Authority considers that proposed development of an extra care facility, with 30 affordable units, which is supported by a maximum

of 103 open market dwellings for financial viability reasons, is an appropriate community benefit, which when accompanied by the proposed environmental and ecology benefits are considered sufficient to out weigh the loss of approximately 50% of the green network site in this location in accordance with policy OL4 of the Wrekin Local Plan and guidance in NPPF.

The proposal has demonstrated that this is sustainable development with good access to public transport and local facilities and services. The proposal involves positive improvements to the built and natural environment and promotes economic growth and supports job creation, in accordance with the principles of NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development

Technical issues such as highways, flooding and drainage, heritage, archaeology and ground conditions have been satisfactorily addressed and can be mitigated through conditions and planning obligations. The development will have an impact on services such as play facilities, public art and education which can be controlled through a S106 agreement to secure the appropriate mitigation for the development.

----------Original Update Report----------

Two letters of support have been received from the British Driving Society Area commissioner for Rights of Way, Shropshire and the Chair of Telford Bridleways Association regarding the existing right of way. The existing right of way is an ancient lane, and this highway has been used by horses for 60 years, and consent is being sought to upgrade this to a bridleway or restricted by-way. There have been some difficulties with the western part of the route due to adjacent land owners planting narrowing the path and fencing falling on to path. The supporters would welcome this development, if this footpath was upgraded and constructed to at width of at least 2 metres for the whole of its length and could then connect to surrounding bridleways. This ‘creation’ would be of benefit to all non-motorised users. They have asked for this to be secured through a S106 agreement.

Officers welcome the background to the use of this right of way and wish to support the proposed enhancement to the footpath, following discussion with the applicants it has been agreed that the proposed path can be constructed to a width of 2m, this can be secured through a suitable condition and there is no need to include the matter within the S106 agreement.

Additional comments from agents

1. We consider this revised planning application and this recommendation reflects the considerable further discussion and meeting held with you and other Officers of the Council, discussions with statutory consultees (leading to no objections to the application) and further public consultation and engagement carried out since the previous scheme was withdrawn.

2. In relation to Planning Policy on pages 40 to 42 and in particular on the green network, we note the Council's Planning Policy Officer confirms the proposal meets the requirements of policy OL3 and that they are satisfied that the proposed development will deliver significant community and environmental benefits, as required by policy OL4.

3. In respect of the section on Highways (page 42), second paragraph, we have had discussions with Mike Evans and the integration of the existing vehicular access serving Serchem Ltd in to the layout and the internal road layout are capable of being addressed at the reserved matters stage.

4. The applicants confirm they would be willing to plant smaller growing trees adjacent to the boundary fences of the 6 proposed dwellings referred to by the Tree Officer on page 44.

5. In relation to the Parks and Open Space Officers comments towards the end of page 45, our amended LBMS takes these comments into account and has been submitted. The Landscape Biodiversity Management Strategy (LBMS) provides a framework to inform the maintenance practices and the overall ecological, amenity and sustainability considerations, whilst a detailed breakdown of the maintenance tasks is dealt with planning condition.

6. The comments from the sustainability officer are welcomed, and we have confirmed that the extra care facility would be built to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3.

7. In relation to the section on third party representations (page 48) reference is made to an extra care facility in Lawley. Chris Winter, Strategy and Commissioning Officer, confirms that 'to date, less than half of the 500 homes have been completed in Telford & Wrekin, with most of these in the south of the borough. This scheme will increase the provision of homes in the north (where this is a high number of older people) and contribute towards the agreed target. It also has the potential to provide a resource for the wider local community and a hub for the delivery of outreach services'.

The agents have also submitted a copy of an agreement in principle with a company to undertake the landscape which demonstrates that the level of works can be undertaken with a reasonable cost per household of approx £180 plus VAT.

Officers consider that the applicants have addressed some minor outstanding issues and showed willingness to follow the advice of technical officers.
There is no change to the recommendation for approval, subject to an additional condition below:

33. The proposed footpath Link between Dawley Road and Arleston Lane shall be a minimum of 2m wide for the entire length of the route.

----------ORIGINAL REPORT----------

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES:
Principle of Development and green network, highways, trees, ecology, ground conditions and land contamination, drainage and flooding, urban design, landscaping, heritage assets, impacts on neighbouring properties, affordable housing, and noise and air quality.

PROPOSAL:
This is an outline application for residential development on 7.26 hectares of land for up to 103 dwellings (Use Class C3) and 50 extra care units (Use Class C2) with details of two new accesses submitted for consideration at this stage and all other matters reserved for later consideration.

Land use parameters plan is submitted for determination with detailed access drawings. The application is also accompanied by a master plan which illustrates a potential layout of the development.

The plans indicate a mix of uses with an extra care unit, mix of 2, 2.5 & 3 storey residential developments, a LEAP, open space, existing/proposed vegetation and balancing ponds.

There are two vehicular access points to serve the site; the western access is a priority junction to be supplemented by a signalised pedestrian crossing facility. The eastern access is a proposed four arm compact urban roundabout to replace the existing mini roundabout junction between Arleston Lane & Lidgates Green. The design will incorporate pedestrian refuge crossing facilities.

The submission is supplemented by a housing mix plan which demonstrates that the site can accommodate 50 extra care units, 34no. 4 bed dwellings, 53no. 3 bed dwellings and 16no. 2 bed dwellings in a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. The dwelling mix has been informed by principles of creating distinct areas such as the eastern area of land having a lower density ‘village’ character with retained landscaping, and the western area having a high density ‘urban’ character.

The 50 unit extra care facility is the Government’s preferred model for care and support accommodation and can be defined as ‘purpose’ built accommodation in which varying amounts of care and support can be offered and where services are shared. This particular proposal is designed as self contained accommodation for older people, with a mix of rented, shared ownership and leasehold properties which allows for a flexible approach to care and support to respond to occupants’ changing requirements. These facilities contain particular characteristics and concepts to define the provision of extra care, i.e. accommodation with design features and assistive technologies, care packages, catering facilities, 24 hour staff and support, communal facilities and staff facilities.

The proposal is to provide 3.6 hectares of public open space with retained trees, ecology zone, play facilities and drainage attenuation ponds.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The application site is approximately 7.26 hectares of greenfield land, situated in Arleston, north of the M54 between Dawley Road to the west and Arleston to the east. The land is roughly 'U' shaped around the area known as Arleston Village.

The western part of site is unmanaged grassland, with mature hedge boundaries, largely flat, with a number of informal tracks and walkways.
The southern element adjacent to Arleston Manor Grade II* Listed Building is an irregular shape and includes a mature woodland at end of Toll road.

The north eastern element of the site is largely a mound with extensive tree coverage. The south eastern part of the site is an undulating area of land, currently used as a pony paddock with grazing. There is a public footpath which crosses the site from east to west.

The site is predominantly surrounded by residential uses, comprising of detached and semi detached two storey buildings, with the occasional bungalow. There is a factory adjacent to the site, with access road to it and adjacent properties off Dawley Road, which dissects the site. The properties in Arleston Village are generally detached two storey properties set in substantial plots. The dwellings to the south of the development within the setting of Arleston Manor are large detached 'executive' style properties. The Wrekin Retail Park lies beyond that to the east on the opposite side of Arleston Lane. (It should be noted that there is no vehicular access to the retail park from Arleston Lane, but there is a pedestrian link). The M54 is also to the south of the site down an embankment, after the tree lined access road to Arleston Manor. To the east there are two storey detached and semi detached modern properties. To the west is Dawley Road, with wide grass verge and then two storey semi detached dwellings and single storey bungalows. To the north of the site are residential properties largely dominated by semi detached two storey dwellings on long sweeping road and cul-de sac formations.

Within approx 1600m of the site there are numerous community facilities, including schools, community centres, shops, doctor's, dentist, open space, public houses, restaurants and play facilities. Also within this distance is Wellington District Centre with bus and rail links and a wide range of additional community facilities.

PLANNING HISTORY

TWC/2011/0261 – Outline Planning permission for up to 125 dwellings (Use Class C3) a 50. bed extra care facility (Use Class C2) and 2no. new accesses and associated open space and landscaping. Withdrawn 1st June 2011

W79/567 – Outline planning permission residential development – Refused

W90/0031 – Outline planning permission for 257 dwellings – Refused 11th April 90.

W91/1137 – Residential development for about 95 dwellings – Withdrawn June 1992

W91/1138 – Outline planning permission for up to 95 dwellings – Refused January 1993

W91/1161 – Outline planning permission for up to 142 dwellings – refused January 1993.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Policy
National Planning Policy Framework

LDF Core Strategy
CS1 Homes
CS3 Telford
CS9 Accessibility and Social Inclusion
CS11 Open Space
CS12 Natural Environment
CS13 Environmental resources
CS14 Cultural, Historic and Built Environment
CS15 Urban Design

'Saved' policies Wrekin Local Plan

EH7 Contaminated Land
EH8 Remedial action on Contaminated Land
EH14 Land stability
UD2 Design Criteria
UD4 Landscape Design
UD5 Public Art
T4 Development Principles
T22 Planning Obligations
OL3 Green Networks
OL4 Development in green network
OL11 Woodland and trees
OL12 Open land and landscape contributions from new development
OL13 Maintenance of open space
LR4 Outdoor recreational open space

LR6 Developers contributions to outdoor recreational open space with new residential development
H22 Community facilities
H23 Affordable Housing

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Wellington Town Council: Strongly objects to the application on the following grounds: building on the established Green Network; creeping urbanisation in an area with limited space; associated traffic problems particularly at peak times; current sewerage and drainage problems which would be increased if the development proceeded; that the proposed development would adversely prejudice the existing wildlife and ecological habitat; and, it is questioned as to whether there is an established need for the development when other adjacent developments were considered.

Strategic Housing: There is a significant older population in Telford & Wrekin, which will grow considerably in the future. Telford & Wrekin Council's *Housing, Care & Support Strategy* (2006) seeks to provide at least 500 additional homes in extra care housing between 2006 and 2021. Extra care housing provides independent living for older people in their own home, with access to care and support services twenty four hours a day. Schemes typically also provide a range of communal facilities, some of which may also be available for use by others in the local community.

To date, less than half of the 500 homes have been completed in Telford & Wrekin, with most of these in the south of the borough. This scheme will increase the provision of homes in the north (where this is a high number of older people) and contribute towards the agreed target. It also has the potential to provide a resource for the wider local community and a hub for the delivery of outreach services.

The applicant and agents have discussed the Extra care housing element of this application with Housing and Social Care officers from the Council. The scheme will provide 50 one and two bedroom apartments, together with a range of communal facilities.

Of the 50 Extra care housing units, it is proposed that 30 would be affordable, with 20 units for private sale. The Council's preference is for the majority of the affordable units to be for social rent. It is also proposed that there would be 35 two bed apartments ($68m^2$- $86m^2$) and 15 one bed apartments ($54\ m^2$). These space standards are consistent with national good practice guidelines (Care Services Improvement Partnership). The Council's expectation is that this mix of dwelling sizes should be reflected in both tenures and also that the different tenures should be fully integrated within the overall development. In addition to the residential accommodation, there will a range of communal and ancillary facilities, including a communal lounge, dining room and seating areas.

Discussions have also taken place with Social Care colleagues on the arrangements for the procurement and funding of care and support services for residents. It will be important to link the completion and occupation of the Extra care housing scheme with a suitable project milestone in the construction of the overall housing development. A separate nominations agreement will also be required to ensure that the Extra care housing units are allocated to individuals with an appropriate housing and social care need.

The preference is for the Extra care housing units to be owned and managed by one of the Council's existing Registered Provider (housing association) partners, if possible. There is potential for the scheme to be included in their respective housing development programmes.

Overall, the Extra care housing proposals in this application are welcomed and, in principle, considered to be broadly acceptable.

Planning Policy: In terms of Telford & Wrekin Borough, there is currently a five year supply of housing land to meet the RSS phase 2 panel report target and this is demonstrated through the 2011 Annual Monitoring Report. The RSS target is the delivery of 5850 houses over the next five years. Currently there is permission granted for a total of 8604 dwellings within Telford. It noted that whilst there are a high proportion of properties with consent, only 412 are currently under construction. There was an increase in completions last year with 551 for the borough. Since 2006/7 2311 dwellings have been constructed which leaves a shortfall of 1564 from the target for completions.

This is an outline application for up to 103 dwellings on a 7.26 hectare site in Arleston, north west Telford. The vast majority of this site is within the Green Network. Wrekin Local Plan polices OL3 and OL4 and policy CS11 of the Core Strategy will therefore apply in considering this development proposal.

Policy OL3 – Green Network
This policy states that the Council will protect the Green Network in order to achieve the six aims set out in paragraph 8.2.12 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

The applicants have set out in paragraph 8.11 of their planning statement how the existing site and the proposed development perform against these six aims of the Green Network. This assessment utilises evidence from the Council's Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study, the Assessment of Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities (PPG17 Assessment), their own Landscape and Visual Appraisal and comments from the Council's Landscape Architect.

Owing to the breadth of evidence and the through examination undertaken by the applicants, it is considered that the applicant's assessment of the site and the proposal against the Green Network aims is sufficient to meet the requirements of this policy.

Policy OL4 – Development in the Green Network

This policy states that development will be permitted in the Green Network where it meets the six aims in paragraph 8.2.12, where significant community and environmental benefits are integral to the proposal or where there are exceptional circumstances. The supporting text for this policy explains that exceptional circumstances should be predominantly open land uses and that community and environmental benefits may include measures such as the creation and/or improvement of habitats, recreational facilities, footpaths and bridleways for example.

The proposed built development on the site will take up approximately 50% of the site area. The remaining half is proposed to be retained as woodland and other open space which will be subject to long term management and maintenance via a S106 agreement.

Furthermore, the applicants propose to address many of the deficiencies and recommendations identified in the Council's Assessment of Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities. Specifically these include:

- Retention of large areas of the existing woodland on the site – although the PPG17 Assessment did not assess the existing Natural & Semi Natural green space on the site it did recommend protecting all such areas from development (NSN1). The retention of the woodland areas will help to meet this recommendation, and the long term management and maintenance agreement will help to meet recommendation NSN2 which suggests improving the quality of such sites.
- Recommendations NSN4 of the PPG17 Assessment suggests maximising the biodiversity of Natural & Semi Natural green space. The ecological officer's comments on this development proposal indicate that they are satisfied with the submitted ecological surveys and reports and that implementation of the Ecological Mitigation Strategy and the Landscape and Biodiversity Management Strategy will ensure that no protected species are adversely affected.
- Recommendation NSN5 suggests that access to Natural & Semi Natural sites should be improved. The improved and formalised footpath running through the proposed site will help to meet this recommendation.
- The assessment also identified a deficiency of 1.63 hectares of provision for children in north west Telford. The provision of a Locally Equipped Area of Play as within the development site should contribute towards meeting this deficiency.

Taking all of these measures in to account I am satisfied that the proposed development will deliver significant community and environmental benefits, as required by policy OL4.

Policy CS11 – Open Space
This policy reiterates policy OL4 in that it requires development to only to take place on open space where the proposal will deliver significant community and environmental benefits. It also states that development on open space will be permitted where the land does not contribute to the open space standards set to meet the requirements of the local population.

These two elements are interlinked and although there is currently no open space standards set within local planning policy, the PPG17 Assessment does provide the evidence to support this aspect of policy CS11.

The relationship between the PPG17 Assessment's standards and recommendations is explained in my comments in relation to policy OL4. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development will also meet the requirements of policy CS11.

Highways: There are no objections on Highway grounds to the above development subject to the following conditions being included on any approval:

1. Access details
2. Layout details
3. Travel Plan
4. Environmental management plan

The above recommendation does not give or imply any approval to the site layout submitted as this is considered to be "illustrative" and does not address concerns relating to integration of the existing vehicular access serving Serchem Ltd into the layout, nor does it fully comply with Manual for Streets guidance in terms of the internal road layout. In addition, no approval should be assumed in respect of the proposed use of porous surfaces and underground storage indicated in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment for areas proposed for adoption as Highway. The works required to create the accesses will need to be secured under a Section 278 agreement (Highways Act 1980) which will also incorporate a £10,000 commuted maintenance sum and a £600 commissioning fee for the new traffic signal controlled pedestrian crossing. A contribution of up to £5,000 is required for the provision of support and monitoring of the Travel Plan. The Environmental Management Plan condition is essential to ensure that construction traffic is restricted to the most appropriate routes and times of day, particularly in relation to the section of Arleston Lane south of the proposed access/roundabout. Depending on the final site layout it may be necessary for a formal diversion of the Public Right of Way to be completed. The Transport Assessment junction capacity studies, based on the illustrative site-split, have demonstrated no significant

development traffic impact on the “Bucks Head” junction at peak periods in the future assessment year 2020. I am advised that this junction is relatively up to date in terms of equipment although there are suspected issues of vehicles abusing the southbound bus-gate restriction to avoid Ketley roundabout. The eastern proportion of the site indicated on the illustrative site-split is expected to generate only a small number of additional peak hour trips to/from the south along Arleston Lane and these are not significant enough to justify any concerns. ATC data from 2009 shows average daily two-way flows of around 1200 vehicles along Arleston Lane and, whilst it would be unreasonable to expect existing maintenance issues on Arleston Lane to be addressed by the development, it is considered that the improved site access roundabout should address any vehicle speed concerns on the approaches.

Drainage: The proposals in the Flood Risk Assessment are acceptable in principle however, the following issues should be addressed at reserved matters stage; full drainage details including calculations required once layout finalised. Exceedance flow routing plans, these can be covered by conditions.

Severn Trent Water: No objections to the proposals subject to the inclusion of the condition for foul and surface water drainage details

Environment Agency: no objection to the outline planning application.
We note that it follows withdrawal of a similar outline planning application ref TWC/2011/0261. The comments below are provided for your additional information to assist in determining the planning application.

The site is in flood zone 1 (low probability of fluvial risk) and the highest risk of flooding would be from surface water run off. The applicant has addressed the 1 in 100 flood event with climate change. The Sequential approach to minimizing flood risk has been utilized within the site with the lower more saturated areas being proposed for ponds and landscaping.

Your internal Drainage Team should advise you on the detailed attenuation measures supplied by the developer in the FRA and consequently recommend any suitable conditions for flood risk mitigation if they deem it necessary

Conservation: No objection to the scheme in principle, the new development does not encroach too closely on the Grade II* Listed Building Arleston Manor. The scheme takes advantage of natural existing screening to create some separation. The future design of the properties should reflect the historic interest and be of a high standard.

English Heritage: No comments the application should be determined in accordance with policy.

Shropshire Council Archaeology: Archaeological remains relating to the medieval settlement of Arleston may survive within the application site. In

mitigation of any archaeological impact it is recommended that a programme of archaeological work is conditioned.

Tree Officer: The impact to the TPO'd woodland adjacent to Arleston Lane has been severely reduced with a reduction from 16 to 6 houses within the woodland. However the problem of wind thrown trees may still exist once trees have started to be removed leaving adjacent trees exposed. It may be prudent to plant smaller growing trees adjacent to the boundary fences of the 6 proposed dwellings to abate the chance the wind thrown trees and the conflicts which arise from newly built houses, tall mature trees and new home owners.

With regard to the southern area of the site, which is situated adjacent to the M54, Tree Group 15 consists of a mix Leyland Cypress & Norway Maple at an estimated height of around 20metres (at the time of the survey), a number of Cypress trees have started to fail causing stems to collapse into the application site, which if consent is granted will either be the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings or their garages. There will also be issues with regard to sun & daylight, given that 14 of the proposed dwellings have south facing gardens directly opposite a 20metre evergreen hedge. Since the last application the Cypress trees have been reduced in height, which may cause the tree to produce lateral growth, in turn making the trees broader.

If permission is afforded to the application recommend the following conditions;
Landscaping design and implementation, trees Protective fencing. Services & Roots details; B134 & TPO'd trees; C70 No Burning, C71 Soil Levels, C72 Materials Storage, C73 Hedge Protection.

Ecology: There has been a lot of pre-application advice and discussion for this site. With the submission of this application, all outstanding issues with the surveys and reports have been addressed. The implementation of the Ecological Mitigation Strategy and the Landscape and Biodiversity Management Strategy will ensure that no protected species are adversely affected by the development and that the site is enhanced for wildlife.

'The most habitat interest has been identified within the central woodland. Here the presence of a number of veteran trees suggests some antiquity to parts of this woodland block' although there is an 'absence of any significant assemblage of ancient woodland indicator species.'

All hedgerows on site are species-poor, but are important for commuting, foraging and nesting.

The following conditions are recommended:

1. Ecological Mitigation Strategy
2. Landscape and Biodiversity Management Strategy
3. Erection of nest boxes
4. Lighting Strategy
5. Retention of trees

Landscape Architect: Concurs with the statements in the Telford & Wrekin Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity study, which states that the area has medium/low landscape sensitivity and high/medium housing capacity. Despite the area having been designated in the green network, sensitively located housing and landscape proposals, shown in landscape strategy plan would lead to a better quality open space. The area currently has a neglected unmanaged feel. The proposals will lead to a LEAP, a green lung with wetland, reinforced managed woodland and tree lined avenues through housing. From a landscape perspective appropriately managed open space will be an improvement and could be controlled through suitable conditions.

Parks and Open Space Officer: It is essential that all new developments make full provision for the infrastructure/amenities and services which they create. New residents to the area will increase demand upon the existing recreational resource. The development will contain a number of properties which will contribute to the need of recreational facilities for the area. The proposed development will reach the trigger level that would require on-site play provision in the form of a NEAP (Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play). The current layout proposes the provision of a LEAP (Local Equipped Area of Play) which is a significantly smaller facility and does not cater for older children arising from the development. The proposed play facilities are inadequate to meet the recreational / play needs arising out of the development and are not to be confused with the need to provide general open space. A larger equipped play area needs to be provided as well as a ball court and wheeled sports provision as highlighted in the councils approved Play Strategy.

Initial discussions between the developer and P & OS were made in regards to the potential to provide a contribution towards off-site improvements to existing areas in order to maximise existing facilities in order to meet the need arising out of the development instead of providing an on-site NEAP. This was provisionally agreed in principle by P &OS.

As a NEAP is likely to be over 1000m2 and will require additional land to provide an extended activity area and buffer zone than the proposed LEAP there are benefits to the developer of providing an off-site sum. A NEAP will require significantly more land than that proposed in the illustrative layout, cost more to construct and cost more to maintain than the proposed LEAP area. An off-site contribution will benefit the developer through requiring less land for play provision and therefore maintaining the current ‘illustrative’ layout potential, as well as requiring less management costs.

Although usual for Full application comments I would ask for you to consider whether it would be appropriate to include a requirement of a condition to require developers not to sell any overlooking properties to the proposed play provision (whether this be a LEAP or a NEAP) until the play provision has been built. This is to ensure prospective purchasers are fully aware of the play provision in proximity to these properties at the time of purchase.

The Landscape and biodiversity management strategy provides some detail on the management of some of the proposed open spaces but not all (i.e. play area). It is not clear who is to carry out these duties (and also misses some basic operations such as litter), and who is to maintain those features which are missing from the strategy (water features / Play Area etc). As such the future management of the proposed open space is not clear and cannot be found to be sustainable without this additional information.

Shropshire Wildlife Trust: Comments awaited.

Sustainability: There are some very positive sustainability aspects of the residential development, therefore the development should be 'conditioned' upon the following as stated within the Energy Strategy and Design and Access Statement:

- Energy efficiency and passive design measures as described in Section 4 of the Energy Strategy;
- High efficiency LTHW heating system and small-scale CHP plant in the extra care facility; and
- High efficiency LTHW heating system and PV modules for the residential units;
- 25% improvement in CO_2 emissions over the *Approved Document Part L* (*ADL*) of the Building Regulations, 2010.
- All housing will be a minimum level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

However, greater clarity is required by the developer on whether the level 3 Code for Sustainable Homes also applies to the extra care housing units? If not, then the developer should look to explain how they believe they have developed a valid and sustainable design solution for the extra care housing units. One of the most effective ways of securing a more sustainable development, and reducing climate change emissions, is to develop care home buildings to achieve BREEAM standards.

Education: Given the number of type of dwellings the Council will seek a contribution of £208,794 towards primary education facilities in the vicinity of the development.

Shropshire Fire Service: No objection subject to informatives relating to Access for Emergency Fire Service Vehicles, Water Supplies for Fire fighting, and Sprinkler Systems - Residential Premises

West Mercia Constabulary: I have reviewed the plans for this proposal and I comment as follows.

Extra Care Facility: It is important with any care facility that the security of residents is considered from the outset. The perimeter will play an important part in reducing the opportunity for crimes to occur. Where possible consider barriers between public and private space. This is particularly important where footpaths parallel the building lines. Access control into the private area is

extremely important to reduce the opportunity to those who commit burglary and bogus caller type offences. Any vulnerable external access doors should be alarmed. The installation of CCTV is also an option to cover vulnerable doors and approaches. Natural Surveillance throughout the proposal is extremely important. Shrubs should be maintained to a low height to allow for this to happen.

Residential Development: The proposal allows for a number of residential units to be built including courtyard developments with accommodation above entrance points. Any such vehicle / pedestrian access point into a courtyard development should be gated and have suitable access control. This will prevent unauthorised access by persons who may wish to commit crime and will reduce the opportunity for offences such as burglary and vehicle related crime. Boundaries With any new development it is important that the boundary is secure to prevent intrusion by offenders. Any boundary should be to a height of 1.8m. Trees It is important to have natural surveillance throughout the development so that it is difficult for offenders to hide. Existing trees should be undercut to a height of 2m to allow this to happen. The future growth height of any new planting should be carefully considered so that natural surveillance is not impeded. Natural surveillance should be maintained throughout the development. Security lighting the provision for suitable external lighting will discourage burglars and bogus callers and will help to reduce the fear of crime. Any street lighting should be carefully designed to cover all vulnerable areas and must not create shadows. It is recommended that that a burglar alarm be fitted to each property. I am encouraged that the Design and Access statement refers to the Secured by Design initiative. Finally may I draw your attention to Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 which clearly states it shall be the duty of each authority to which this section applies to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions of, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area

Geotechnical: The site lies in an area potentially affected by shallow mining; therefore shallow mining condition B50 and B27 untreated shafts are required. Condition B57 contaminated land is also required. Several ponds were identified on the historical maps that are no longer in situ, there is no detail available on how these features were infilled, a near surface ground investigation should be undertaken to determine these areas and foundation designs should be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to work commencing on site.

Environmental Health (Land contamination): Site investigation report has identifies elevated hydrocarbons in a former pond area on the west of the site; further investigation of these ponds is required and can be secured through the standard land contamination condition.

Environmental Health (Pollution control): I have been through the noise and air quality reports for the application site and have the following comments.

Noise:
The noise assessment dated March 2012 shows that the residential properties are sited within NEC category B and that noise mitigation (acoustic fence, double glazing) will be incorporated within the development to further meet the “good” standard of 30 Db(A) in habitable rooms. If minded to approve the application a condition should be placed on the development to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully implemented.

Air Quality:
The report details actions that will be taken as part of a dust mitigation plan detailed in section 5 of the report to reduce the impact of dust during the construction phase of the development. If minded to approve the application a condition should be placed on the development to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully implemented. The report details do not determined whether centralised heating or power plant will be incorporated into the proposed development. Again if minded to approve the application a suitable condition should be placed on the development to further assess the impact on air quality if centralised heating or power plant is to be introduced.

THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS:
Cllr Angela McClements (Ward Councillor), I am writing to express my strong opposition to the above application on Green Network land at Arleston. I have also consulted with many residents across the ward, who has expressed their anger and concern about the potential loss of a valued piece of Green Network land in their area. I understand that you have received an overwhelming and unprecedented response from Arleston residents who feel passionate about the potential destruction of what they refer to as “their green lung”

I note that the developers intend to build a three storey Extra Care facility at the top of Kingsland. Residents have raised concerns that the building will be visually dominate as it is on higher ground than all the properties in the Village and also those properties at the top of Kingsland.

I would point out that recent a planning application was granted for an Extra Care facility just up the road in Lawley, with 60 assisted apartments. What does concern me about this application is that the Developers are clearly trying to use the Extra Care facility as a way of trying to get the planning application through stating that it would be of a community benefit. Yet the residents of Arleston do not feel it would be of any benefit to them only an ‘eye sore’ and does not demonstrate ‘exceptional circumstances’.

Green Network Land: Its important to stress that Arleston is one of the most socially deprived wards in the Borough, it has a high percentage of youth unemployment and people on low incomes. There is a lot of work to be done on ensuring that they have a good environment in which to live and improve their quality of life. Green space always provides a sense of well being and this is an important factor for the residents of Arleston. Open space is in very short supply in Wellington, with very limited natural open space and with the

massive new build just up the road at Ironstone in Lawley, this will only urbanise a precious piece of Green Network land.

It is clear that the unique character of Arleston Village would be seriously compromised. Some properties will be overlooked, reducing privacy light and views.

Wildlife and Ecological Factors: I understand that a wildlife survey was carried out in August. I have been told by experts in this field that this was not the ideal time to get a true picture of the bird population and their breeding range. The most appropriate time would have been in the months April through to June. Again we have not had a true picture from the Developers ecological survey on this land. Birdlife in this area includes garden birds, Long Tailed Tits Brambling, Nut Hatch, Field Fare, Partridge, Sparrow, Hawk, Tawny Owl, Buzzards, Pheasants, Tree Creepers, Spotted Woodpeckers, Kestrels, Bull Finch, Swallow, Swift, Song Thrush, House and Tree Sparrow – quite a comprehensive list! Mammals in this area include Foxes, Stoats, Field Mice, Door Mice, Shrews, Badgers, Butterflies and Moths (Elephant Hawk Moths, Holly Blue, and Orange Tips). Reptiles in this area includes newts, frogs, toads and lizards

Traffic Flows: One of the on-going complaints that I have had since being elected as the Borough Councillor for Arleston is residents concern about traffic flows and speeding down Arleston Lane and the build up of traffic at the Cock Hotel lights. Photos will have been made available by residents, which clearly show the congestion already in place. This proposed application will only exacerbate this situation, with inevitably more cars adding to an increasing traffic problem from the Lawley development. Arleston Lane is classified as a country lane, with narrow, blind bends and steep gradients.

Drainage and Sewerage: Arleston has its fair share of drainage problems and with any new development it brings even more problems. The construction of the motorway made matters worse and a number of homes have recently been subject to flooding after the heavy summer storms. The stream running through Arleston Village contributes to the natural and unique character of Arleston Village and should not be interfered with. The proposed development is on elevated land, above surrounding housing and roads and I have real concerns about whether the proposed balancing ponds will be adequate to deal with any future drainage problems. The existing main sewer is prone to failure as a result of storm water and blockage. It appears that the sewer through Arleston Village will be used, but I would stress that this has failed recently with sewerage flowing down the road. Not a pleasant experience for residents in the vicinity!

This outline planning application will mean creeping urbanisation of an area which has limited green space and has strong opposition against it going ahead. I therefore urge that it is rejected by Telford and Wrekin Planning Authority.

CPRE objects to the proposal on grounds that the application site is within the 'green network' defined by the former Wrekin Local Plan 2000. The green network has subsequently been administered by saved policies OL3, OL4 and OL5, and its importance is recognised by the LDF. Development in the green network has been permitted only where there are exceptional circumstances, where environmental or community benefits can be demonstrated. While there is some community benefit arising from the provision of extra care units, the greater part of the proposal involves new dwellings which do not appear to demonstrate any advantage to the community or environment which would justify loss of part of the green network. This is particularly unfortunate when there is very considerable opportunity for providing new dwellings nearby in Ironstone and Lawley. The location of the development will inevitably increase the volume of traffic on Arleston Lane, a road of modest width, particularly southwards towards Lawley village.

There is a 321 signature petition to the development, opposed to the loss of green network land.

There have been 162 letters of representation received objecting to the development from 120 separate addresses and 10 individuals who did not disclose addresses; these objections can be summerised as follows:

Land Use

- Brown land should be used prior to Green land
- Loss of agricultural land
- Loss of buffer between Wellington and Lawley
- Site is buffer with opencast mine in area

Need

- Need for housing - significant surplus being built with consent in the locality, in Lawley, elsewhere in Arleston and consent granted at Ercall Wood.
- Extensive building works in area already, and other properties in Arleston are not selling
- There is no need for an Extra Care facility, as a 60 bed facility recent granted at Lawley, and there are facilities at Ketley and Lightmoor. Also there are other care homes
- The elderly community in this area do not require this type of Extra Care facility

Green Network

- Loss of green network
- Green network and loss of this space would deprive Arleston of a valuable and appreciated aesthetic and environment asset
- Proposal is not compliant with green network policies within the Wrekin local plan
- Greenland helps define Telford as a good and healthy place to live. Less spaces will hamper children’s learning and development and results in the reduction in law standard of green space in vicinity

Ecology

- Impact on wildlife – Bats, buzzards, Blackcap, Goldcrest, woodpecker, owls, pheasants, mammals and reptiles on site.
- Loss of wildlife associated with loss of trees
- In pure ecological terms site may be of little importance, but site important in local context
- Dispute ecological reports assertion that is of little landscape or ecological value; given the significant number of species found on the site
- Dispute that the timing of ecological reports was appropriate

Open space

- Open spaces do not have to be manicured, or fully accessible to be of public benefit to the community.
- Loss of open space for children's play or dog walking
- Development will result in increased urbanisation and loss of open space, changing character of Arleston
- Ward as amended as little open space, no park or allotment and now proposed removal of green network

Trees

- Loss of trees, many of which are covered by Tree Protection Orders
- Loss of natural established woodland, scrub and grassland
- A aesthetic value of site woodland offers an attractive natural skyline

Services

- Impact on local services, Doctors, Hospital, Police, Fire.
- Local amenities can not support this development, i.e. schools, medical centre

Drainage/Flooding

- Safety elements associated with drainage pools
- Overloading of sewage system, increase pressure in a system which has recently failed and resulted in sewerage in streets.
- Highly variable water levels in Arleston stream resulting in flooding of gardens and houses, proposal will worsen this situation
- Flooding creates further cost to the Council
- Potential for flooding issues to impact on pitch at Telford Stadium, there have been recent matches cancelled due to flooding

Highways

- Arleston Lane in poor state of repair
- Increased traffic and infrastructure unable to support increased traffic development
- Arleston Lane currently a 'rat run' and appraisal does not mention poor maintenance and other potential issues caused by future development
- The existing island on Arleston Lane is an area of frequent accidents; this development will increase traffic problems.

- Traffic congestion - create of dangerous junctions and reports under estimate traffic generation by scheme
- Conflict with existing access for factory unit, which has a number of heavy vehicle movements.
- Increased usage of pedestrian link to Wrekin Retail Park will result in use of safe route and increase anti-social issues.
- Impact of development on matches as there are already issues with junctions as area is very busy.

Overlooking and character

- Loss of charm and character of unique Arleston village
- Adverse impact on the character and appearance of the local area
- Over bearing nature of 3 storey extra care facility and will have a detrimental visual impact.
- Overlooking of existing properties and loss of privacy
- Adverse impact on daylight particularly from elevated sections of development site
- Cross sections are misleading as do not accurately reflect adjacent properties; furthermore, existing boundary screening will be removed, so issues of overlooking and privacy will occur.

Noise/Disturbance

- Increase noise pollution from M54 due to loss of natural scenery
- Noise, air and traffic issues relating to any construction phase.

Heritage

- The proposal will have a detrimental impact on the nearby Listed Buildings

Ground Issues

- Soil contamination following mining legacy

Other issues

- Proposal will exacerbate issue of social deprivation
- Community benefits stated in the supporting documents are not wanted or needed by Arleston residents.
- The zones for development have been reduced, but what is there to stop the developers coming back for more area later?
- Retention of 50% of land as open space is misleading as garden land which could be paved over
- Proposal will be for developer profits and good of share holders and not the local community
- Local people should have a greater say and we say no
- Detrimental impact on environmental and local community
- Limited amenities within walking distance of site for elderly occupants
- The provision of care facilities in not sufficient to out weigh harm of loss of this open green land.
- The proposal is surrounding a chemical factory and the application has not taken this into regard.

There are two letters of support from Wrekin Housing Trust and Bromford Group supporting the extra care facility in particular siting this as a good location for a facility to serve wellington.

KEY ISSUES AND PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

Background:
There was a previous planning application submitted last year for this site, which included a 50 bed extra care facility and up to 125 dwellings. A report recommended refusal of the scheme was drafted for plans board, but the applicants withdrew the application from consideration to continue to negotiate with the Local Planning Authority.

The previous report recommended 4 reasons for refusal on the following grounds 1) the green network, loss of natural and semi-natural open space, impact on protected species and noise issues. Another area of concern was the impact on amenities of adjacent occupiers in terms of overlooking and privacy.

Following withdrawal of the previous scheme there has been a reduction is the amount of the site to be developed and now approximately 50% of the site is to remain as open land, and the developed area is to contain a 50 bed extra care facility and up to 103 dwellings. The previous scheme retained only 40% of the site as open land.

Another key change since the drafting of the previous report is the change national planning policy with the Introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework, which has the main principle of a presumption in favour of sustainable development, in terms of social, economic and environmental dimensions. The NPPF is clear that Local Planning Authorities should take a positive approach to foster the delivery of sustainable development, and are tasked with looking for solutions rather than problems to approve sustainable development where possible and work proactively with applicants to secure development that improve social, economic and environmental conditions of the area. Furthermore, the guidance states that housing developments should be considered in the context of presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Principle of development and the Green network:
The site is designated as green network, as defined in the Wrekin Local Plan. This is a system of interlinked green spaces which is afforded a strong level of protection from development. Saved polices OL3 to OL5 of the Wrekin Local Plan protects sites and links within the network from development, which is not predominantly open land , and does not deliver community or environmental benefits.

The background to the policy explains that land is designated as Green Network because it fulfils one or a number of the six aims, including, inter alia, maintaining Telford’s image as an attractive place to live/work, that it

retains/enhances individual identity/sense of local community, that it provides easily accessible ‘green lungs’ that provides variety to densely built up areas, that it provides a supply of open land to meet recreational needs and that it protects ecological /geological heritage. The applicants have assessed the site against the 6 aims of the green network and consider that the site fails to meet these criteria and is unlikely to warrant a protected open space status in any review.

The applicants consider that there is currently only limited use of the site from a public footpath. However, the reality as supported by neighbour comments, is that the site currently has informal open space and recreational uses, particularly for dog walking and children’s play and pony grazing. This level of formal and informal recreational value is to meet one of the aims of the green network, furthermore there are areas within the site which are of high ecological value, and this extensive green area adds to the quality of the environment within Arleston.

Policy OL4 does allow for development in the green network where there are exceptional circumstances, where the proposal contributes or is complementary to the aims of the green network and has environmental and community benefits as an integral part of the proposal. Environmental benefits can include the creation of new habitats, improvement or management of habitats and landscaping/ landscape enhancement. Community benefits can include community/recreational facilities, access/cycle/bridleway improvements, enhancing public transport provision etc. The Local Plan goes on to expand the range of uses that could be treated as exceptions. These would be predominantly open land uses e.g. nurseries, renewable energy, composting schemes.

In relation to the ‘exceptional circumstances’ element identified in Policy OL4 of the Local Plan, the applicants contend that the lack of a five year land supply, the need for extra care and affordable housing and lack of a green network review should reasonably be considered as constituting exceptional circumstances that would allow for development of the site.

The Local Planning Authority does not entirely concur with this view. The Annual Monitoring Review states that the RSS target is for the delivery of 5850 houses over the next five years. Currently there is permission granted for a total of 8604 dwellings within Telford, which more than adequately addresses the supply issue.

Turning to the extra care facility, The Councils Care and Support Strategy (2006) identifies a limited amount of extra care facilities in the Borough, and identifies a need to provide a further 500 additional home up to 2021. Extra care housing provides independent living for older people in their own home, with access to care and support services twenty four hours a day. Schemes typically also provide a range of communal facilities, some of which may also be available for use by others in the local community. To date, less than half of the 500 homes have been completed in Telford & Wrekin, with most of these in the south of the borough. This scheme will increase the provision of

homes in the north (where this is a high number of older people) and contribute towards the agreed target. It also has the potential to provide a resource for the wider local community and a hub for the delivery of outreach services. Officers consider that the need for an extra care facility is evident and are supportive of the principle of an extra care facility in this location to serve Wellington. This need is also evident with two letters of support from registered social landlords, who would be keen to operate such a facility in this location. In addition to the extra care facility meeting a general need. The developers have proposed that 30 of the units will be affordable, whilst the mix of affordable housing has not yet been agreed; to meet housing demand a higher proportion of social rented tenure would be preferable to Officers.

In relation to the second element identified in Policy OL4 that makes allowance for development to be permitted where community and environmental benefits are an integral part of the proposal, the applicants contend that currently enclosed/private land will be brought into community/ recreational use and ecological/biodiversity interest will be enhanced. The applicants propose to set up a private management agreement to ensure that the quality and appearance of the proposed green space after development will be maintained in perpetuity. Officers consider that this will offer some compensation for the loss of Green Network land and with an agreement will ensure that the green space is maintained and accessible for the wider public in perpetuity.

It should be noted that following withdrawal of the previous scheme there has been a reduction is the amount of the site to be developed and now approximately 50% of the site (3.6 ha) is to remain as open land. This will include enhancements in terms of maintenance and species, i.e. trees to compensate for losses in order to create the development pockets.

Whilst the level of accessibility to access and use the site for recreational purposes is an area of disputed between the landowners and local residents, officers consider that the proposal would formally create accessible open space for use of new and existing residents with the added benefit of full management of the area.

Officers consider that if this proposal was just a standard residential scheme, that there would be insufficient community benefits to outweigh the harm of the development to the green network. However, the open market residential development is needed for viability purposes to provide an extra care facility on the site, which is identified in housing strategy as a type of specialist housing, which is in demand, and other approved schemes have not yet provided for sites in the north of the borough and in particular Wellington, which has an aging population and generating this demand. It is therefore considered that the inclusion of the extra care facility is the key factor in providing a community benefit for this proposal, and along with the environmental and ecological benefits of the development is sufficient to outweigh the loss of approx half of the site, and green network in this locality in accordance with Policy OL4 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

Landscape and Visual Amenity:
The applicants contend that the site is of low/medium landscape sensitivity and high/medium housing capacity and is confirmed in the Telford and Wrekin Landscape Sensitivity and capacity study. From a landscape perspective, sensitively located housing, along with landscape proposals which would lead to a better quality retained open space and inclusion of new features such as a LEAP and wet lands, would not be considered to have a detrimental impact on the visual landscape amenity of the area. Officers acknowledge that the proposal offers significant enhancements to parts of the site as retained as an exception to policy OL4, it is considered that this element is sufficient to outweigh and compensate for the loss of 50% of the green network and the loss of 25% of the semi natural and natural land, and the proposal is therefore considered to comply with OL4 and aims of NPPF.

Trees:
There have been a number of objections raised by residents to the development on the grounds of loss of trees and the impact this will have on wildlife and ecology.

The site has a number of trees, there is mature woodland at the centre of the site, where the trees are protected and there is silver birch woodland to the east of the site, which is covered by the group protection order. The Arboricultural Officer has assessed the silver birch woodland and considers that these trees do not fit the criteria for protection and has no objection in principle to the loss of some of these trees, subject to a high level of mitigation planting and future management, which can be secured through conditions. It should be noted that the previous scheme involved a large proportion of this wood proposed for removal to create development pocket and associated drainage attenuation. This has been significantly reduced to now only include a small area of development equivalent to 6 dwellings. The layout identified that the centre woodland is to be retained and managed. The visual appearance and future ecological benefits of all the woodland has been subject to concerns raised by local residents.

Whilst it is considered in isolation that the trees do not meet protection requirements, the wider consideration of the setting, potential for bat roosts and ecological enhancement, also need consideration. On the previous scheme it was considered that the other benefits of this woodland had not been adequately addressed and it was considered and loss of this woodland should be resisted on grounds, that this woodland is intrinsic to the semi-natural and natural character of the land as identified and considered for protected in accordance with PPG17.

Officers now consider that the retention of the majority of the wood, including trees of importance for ecological purposes and trees to the perimeter to retain the green character of the site are the significant difference with this proposal and overcomes issues of loss of some of the semi-natural area of the site. Whilst there will be some tree removal necessary, this is to be mitigated through enhancement planting elsewhere on the site, in accordance

with detail in the ecological and landscape management plan, and this can be adequately controlled through conditions.

Ecology:
On the previous scheme the Councils Ecologist and Shropshire Wildlife Trust raised concerns over the supporting survey work and mitigation strategy in terms of protected species on the site and required further works to be undertaken.

This application is supported by additional survey works and a comprehensive ecological mitigation strategy and landscape management plan. It is noted that neighbours have raised concerns about the level of surveys undertaken and timings of surveys, however Officers are content that the additional information provided is adequate and in accordance with guidance.

The Councils Ecologist has reviewed the reports and has the following comments: Badger activity on the site is concentrated within the central woodland, where three setts have been identified. Their level of use between 2009 and 2011 was seen to fluctuate. Julian Brown Consultancy, who undertook an additional badger survey on the site, concludes that these setts are likely to be part of a territory that has a main
Sett located off-site and that the social group is relatively small.

The horse grazed grassland in the eastern corner of the site has been assessed as 'providing the best quality foraging habitat on the site…due to the maintenance of a short sward by grazing.' Off-site foraging is highly likely, given the relatively poor habitats available on-site. The survey report takes the assessment of Julian Brown Consultancy and maps the most likely commuting routes off-site. The Ecological Mitigation Strategy includes mitigation to maintain badger access routes during construction. Julian Brown Consultancy recommends that 'due to the dense nature of across large parts of the site…a winter sett survey [should be] undertaken, when reduced vegetation cover would ease the location of setts.'

Bioscan, however, said that 'surveys of the site have been extensive and the likelihood of an unidentified sett being present is considered remote at this stage. It would, however, be recommended to resurvey the site for evidence of badger activity
At the detailed design stage and if necessary also at the commencement of on-site works, to ensure that any future changes in badger activity, in particular the creation of any new setts, are identified and a revised mitigation scheme developed if necessary.' This is included in the Ecological Mitigation Strategy.

Officers are content that the mitigation proposed in the accompanying strategy is appropriate at this stage and this is to be controlled through conditions.

Bat activity surveys were carried out in 2009, 2010 and 2011. Common and soprano pipistrelles were the most frequently recorded bat foraging or

commuting on the site
With noctule, brown long eared and unidentified Myotis species also recorded. The most important foraging areas were the 'central east-west path and woodland/grassland interface. Three trees, located within the central woodland block, were identified as having medium or high bat roosting potential. Whilst the woodland is intended for retention, without a condition to retain this specific oak there would be nothing to prevent individual trees (e.g. Tree 2 and Tree 3) being removed for access, woodland management or health and safety etc.

The Bat Conservation Trust Guidelines state that it should be assumed that high potential trees are used by bats at some point during the year. This means if this tree is to be removed then destruction of a bat roost for the purpose of development is likely to occur.

The Ecological Mitigation Strategy states that 'all trees with low roosting potential or higher are also proposed for retention within the parameters plan and can be protected through conditions. Since the trees are to be retained, there will be no impact on roosting bats and any breach of the Habitat Regulations is avoided. Officers consider that the protection of these trees can be adequately controlled through planning conditions.

A full reptile survey was carried out in May 2008 which found no evidence of any reptiles on the site. The report concludes 'there is limited scope for colonisation of the site due to the lack of potential wildlife corridors to the site from suitable reptile habitat in the wider area.'

The trees and hedgerows on site provide lots of opportunities for bird nesting. As well as common bird species, dunnock and bullfinch were recorded on the site during the survey. These are BAP species and Amber list birds of Conversation Concern.

There is a barn owl record to the east of the site, but the report concludes that the site is unsuitable to support a resident pair, is 'largely unsuitable for foraging', 'subject to high levels of recreational disturbance' and 'isolated from other suitable habitat in the wider countryside'.

The invertebrate assessment by Colin Plant Associates concludes that 'based on the habitats present on the site, the site is unlikely to support a notable invertebrate assemblage.' Recommendations are made in the report for further survey to inform future compensation and enhancement measures as part of the detailed development proposals, for example to inform planting schemes and seed mixes such that habitats capable of supporting an equivalent mix of invertebrate species are present post-development.'

The Landscape and Biodiversity Management Strategy, however, doesn't include any wildflower seed planting apart from around the SUDs.

Given the conclusions of the Colin Plant Associates survey and the other enhancements to the site which will benefit invertebrates (e.g. marginal

planting, ornamental planting and retention of standing deadwood), Officers consider that further invertebrate assessment is not necessary.

The site lacks any standing water of the type typically required for amphibians to breed successfully. Flowing water, such as that found within the small stream on the site, is not considered to provide a favourable breeding habitat for amphibians, in particular great crested newts *Triturus cristatus.* On this basis, further amphibian
Survey was 'scoped out'.

Consideration has been given to other mammals, such as brown hare and hedgehog, and the report concludes that these are unlikely to be present.

The three 'key ecological constraints that have influenced the design of the development parameters plan for this site … are: key habitat resources that contain the majority of the floral interest on the site, such as the block of more ecologically notable secondary woodland at the centre of the site; the presence of badgers, and use of the site by bats for foraging and commuting.

The Ecological Mitigation Strategy contains the following mitigation, compensation and enhancements:
-re-survey of the site for evidence of badger activity at the detailed design stage and
If necessary also at the commencement of on-site works, to ensure that any future changes in badger activity, in particular the creation of any new setts, are identified and a revised mitigation scheme developed if necessary
- Retention of the central woodland block (except for a section at the eastern end for access
- Retention of all but one of the hedgerows
- Retention of the majority of the other secondary woodland
- Retention of two of the three areas of primary importance for bat foraging and commuting and all but the very eastern extent of the third area of primary
- Retention of the secondary area of importance for bat foraging associated with the
Small grassland in the north-eastern woodland block
- Timing works outside bird nesting season
-a minimum 30m stand off from the badger setts during the construction phase
- Consideration of the need to maintain badger access routes during the construction
Phase to ensure that access to off-site foraging areas is maintained.
- implementing measures to prevent badgers being trapped in earthworks, e.g. by placing wooden boards in foundations at a shallow angle overnight during construction
- Eradication of Japanese knotweed on the site
- Creation of new hedgerows
- New tree planting
- Creation of areas of short turf in amenity areas such as gardens and public open space

- use of native species, preferably of local provenance for any new tree planting and/or soft landscaping outside of the formal landscaping areas/gardens. Some should be selected on the basis of their provision of nuts and fruit
- planting a row of trees along the new access road
- An updated reptile survey if the site is not cleared before 2013, i.e. five years after the 2008 reptile survey
- A re-survey of the trees proposed for removed if the site has is not cleared before 2016, i.e. five years after the 2011 survey
- Management and enhancement of the new and retained habitats on site, as set out in the Landscape and Biodiversity Management Strategy to improve the structural and floral diversity and quality of the habitats on site

The Ecological Mitigation Strategy recommends the installation of 20 bird boxes/bricks and 20 swift nest boxes. Officers also recommend the installation of 10 sparrow terraces. Twenty bat boxes/bricks are also recommended in the Mitigation Strategy. Officers consider that for a site of this size 30 boxes would be reasonable. In addition, a number of invertebrate boxes should also be erected. The applicants have agreed to this enhanced level of mitigation and this can be controlled through an appropriate condition.

Given all the above, officers consider that the proposed development will result in the loss of some areas of the site used for foraging for ecological purposes, but he main areas of high ecological value are to be retained and through the ecology mitigation strategy this loss will be adequately compensated and enhances. This minimised impact on biodiversity and net gain is in accordance with national guidance in NPPF.
This guidance is clear that planning permission for development should only be refused on grounds of impacting on biodiversity and ecology when significant harm can not be avoid and mitigated or compensated. In this case officers do consider that the proposed mitigation is adequate to compensate for the harm generated by the proposed development.

Open space and play facilities:
A number of residents have raised concerns that the loss of land to development will hamper the enjoyment of this site for children and play. The Council is aware of the benefits of open space and play facilities for the benefit and health of children and the wider community and acknowledge that the proposed development will lead to a loss of informal play space and create an additional demand for formal play facilities. Based on the indicative mix of development, the scheme will generate in excess of 200 child bed spaces. Policy LR6 of the Wrekin Local Plan sets out these requirements for a Neighbourhood Equipped Play Area (NEAP), which incorporates a children's play area with approx 8 pieces of equipment including a youth shelter and other seating, an area of kick about space or hard surfaced area for ball games and wheeled sports facilities, and should incorporate a 30m buffer from the activity zone to adjacent dwellings.

The development layout indicated the provision of a LEAP (Local Equipped Area for Play) and pre-application discussions have considered that a

commuted sum to improve facilities at the nearby Windsor Road NEAP could be sufficient to address the demand created by the proposal. This is to be secured through a Section 106 agreement.

The NPPF states that access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well being of communities. Furthermore, existing open spaces should not be built on unless;

- there is an assessment to show the land is surplus to requirement,
- the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision, or
- The development needs outweigh the loss.

Officers consider that the proposed development will increase formal access to this land, include equipped play facilities and retain areas of the site with informal usage, as well as contributing to improvements of other sports and recreational facilities off site within the Arleston Ward. Officers therefore consider that the loss of land is replaced by better provision both on and off site and therefore conforms to the guidance in NPPF.

Highways:
The application has been supported by a Transport Assessment and a draft travel plan for the extra care facility, in accordance with guidance in NPPF. Third party representations have raised a number of issues with regards to the level of additional traffic the site would generate, concerns with Arleston Lane, traffic speeds, condition of road and congestion at junctions.

The Local Highways Authority is satisfied that the submitted information demonstrates that the development will not have an adverse impact on the local highway network, subject to conditions. The junction capacity studies demonstrate no significant development traffic implication on the 'Bucks Head' junction at peak periods, factoring in a future assessment until 2020. Furthermore, the equipment at this junction is up to date.

The new access on Arleston Lane based on the areas for development is expected to generate only a small number of additional peak hour trips south along Arleston Lane, and these levels are not significant to justify any reason for concern.

Whilst it is reasonable that major developments which have impacts on the highway network compensate for this, it is not the purpose of planning obligations to remedy existing deficiencies. A Section 106 agreement is however required for the maintenance of the new junctions created by the development of £10,000, £600 for a new signal controlled pedestrian crossing and £5,000 for the support and monitoring of the travel plan in association with the extra care, as a direct impact of the development.

Officers consider that the site is well served by public transport. The indicative design of the proposal demonstrates a wide range of pedestrian and cycle links, with connections to Wellington, Telford Town Centre and Wellington Retail Park to access shops and services, and there are other facilities

available at Arleston local Centre within short walking distance of the development. Furthermore, the proposed extra care will have integrated facilities available to the new and existing community. The development has exploited opportunities for sustainable transport modes in accordance with NPPF guidance.

It should be noted that whist the access points into the site are acceptable there are concerns relating to the internal highway networks as shown on the indicative master plan, as it does not fully comply with Manual for Streets guidance and relating to integration of the existing vehicular access serving Serchem Ltd into the layout. Should outline planning permission be granted these issues will need to be fully considered and resolved at the reserved matters stage. There are no officer concerns in relation to the highway considerations detailed in this report.

Drainage and Flooding:
The application has been supported by a Flood Risk Assessment, which confirms that the site is in Flood Zone 1 with low risk of flooding as confirmed by the Environment Agency and the Council's Drainage Engineer. The risk of flooding is from pluvial events and surface water runoff and is therefore considered acceptable, and in compliance with guidance in NPPF.

The proposal includes the discharge of surface water to a ditch course within Arleston Village this ditch is culverted under numerous driveways and contains silt and debris. Improvement works in the form of de-silting and repairs to pipe crossings would be desirable to ensure the ditch is capable of receiving the flows without any risk of flooding. However, as the developers have the right to discharge into this 'stream' and the supporting information confirms that the rate of discharge will be to green field rates, as per existing. Furthermore, the 'stream' is on third party land therefore the Local Planning Authority can not insist that such works are undertaken.

In response to these issues the applicants have undertaken a basic survey of the 'stream' and consider that improvement works could be undertaken for £5,000. They are therefore offering a bond for £5,000 to be held by the Council by wish owners of the stream call draw down upon to undertake works to de-silt and do repairs. This is to be controlled through the S106 agreement. This bond is not a requirement to mitigate for a drainage implication of the proposal, but is a community benefit to reflect and address concerns raised by local residents.

Heritage and Archaeological issues:
Archaeological remains relating to the medieval settlement of Arleston may survive within the application site. An archaeological assessment has been undertaken and it is considered that there are no remains present, so there are no archaeological constraints to development on site.

Arleston Manor adjacent to the site is Grade II* Listed building, and there are three other Grade II Listed Buildings within Arleston Village. The manor house

is set down and well screened by existing vegetation; the setting of the building has been affected by the development of 14 dwellings within the grounds of the property. This proposal seeks to maintain the significant mature wooded are which maintains a physical separation between the proposal and the Manor building. The Council's Conservation Officer considers that this layout is acceptable to preserve the setting of all the listed buildings; however the quality of the proposed built environment would need to respond to the character of the building with high quality design to accord with guidance in NPPF.

Officers consider that technical issues relating to Conservation and Archaeology have been sufficiently addressed and conditions can adequately control the issues raised.

Geotechnical Issues:
The site has a legacy of mining history which has been investigated. There is still potential of shallow mining issues however this can be mitigated through a condition. There is a historical well on site, which will need identifying and works undertaken to unsure no stability issues. There are two historical ponds on site which have been in filled and have potential for contamination and will require further testing to see if there needs to be further mitigation to protect human health. This issue can be resolved through conditions.

Officers consider that technical issues relating to ground conditions including land contamination have been sufficiently addressed and comply with guidance in NPPF subject to conditions which can adequately control the issues raised.

Air Quality and Noise:
The application is supported by a noise assessment which states that the majority of the site is within NEC category B – Where noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications and where appropriate, conditions impose to ensure an adequate level of protection against noise.

The previous proposal indicated that part of the site zone for housing development, was within NEC category C, where planning permission should normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise. The dominant sources of noise in the area are associated with traffic passing along the M54 to the south of the site and Dawley Road to the west.

The previous supporting noise report stated that the development zone adjacent to Dawley Road can have noise impacts mitigated through sound installation. The Councils Environmental Health Officer concurs that such measures would adequately mitigate noise impacts inside the dwellings; however there was no detail of measure to ensure that garden spaces would have adequate protection from these noise sources.

This planning application has been supported by further information within the noise report; the parameters plan has been amended to move the residential development away from the Dawley Road and will include the use of an acoustic barrier. These measures have ensured that the proposed development is all within NEC category B area. Your officers consider that noise issues have been fully resolved in accordance with NPPF, which seeks to preserve amenity for future residents.

The issue of noise, air and traffic pollution in relation to the construction phase of the development has been raised as an objection to the proposal. Whilst this is a legitimate concern as construction can be disruptive to amenities, this can be adequately mitigated through conditions to control issues such as hours of operation location of compounds, access routes, road cleaning etc.

Air Quality:
The application is accompanied by an air quality assessment. There are potential impacts from on-site construction plans and equipment, with dust generated through the development construction stage. In addition there will be additional road traffic, both during construction and post occupation. The report concludes that there are negligible impacts. Your officers consider that air quality issues have been fully resolved in accordance with NPPF, which seeks to preserve amenity for future and existing residents.

Mix of development and Affordable Housing:
Although this is outline consent and details of housing layout numbers and locations have not been submitted for consideration, the supporting information does include indicative plans that demonstrate that the development is capable of including a mix of residential development with varying sized accommodation to reflect the housing need for the locality. The proposal also includes a 50 bed extra care facility. Which is a housing scheme to assist older people to remain active and have independent living; it offers a range of facilities and services to assist in this aim.

This element of the proposal would include a mix of 1 and 2 bed self contained units of accommodation with a mix of rented, shared ownership and leasehold occupation. The additional facilities particular to this kind of development includes communal lounge and kitchen/catering facilities, pampering facilities, treatment and changing facilities and staff facilities. All residents would be required to have some level of care package of a minimum of an hour and a half, to support living, which will be determined on individual needs of occupants. The communal facilities of such development would be available for use by the wider community, i.e. the restaurant.

The provision of an extra care housing scheme, with a significant affordable housing element, is supported in principle by the Strategic Housing Officer, as there is an identified need for this form of provision in Wellington/North Telford. The proposed location of the scheme meets a number of the essential requirements for Extra Care housing. The affordable housing element of the extra care should largely be for social rent as opposed to a

50/50 split between social rent and shared ownership to meet local requirements.

Design Principles:
As the application is outline, with only access matters submitted for consideration, only the issue of the principles of design can be considered at this stage.

The master plan submitted with the application demonstrates that the site can adequately accommodate 103 dwellings. There is a mix of development proposed, ranging from 2 to 4 bedroomed dwellings and a 50 bed extra care facility to a maximum of three storey height.

The dwellings are grouped in character areas responding to the movement and landscape strategies. The first two character areas are located to the north west of the site, which is higher density to respond to the adjacent context of properties adjacent to the site in Kingsland etc. and will have terraces and small frontage to ensure continuity and enclosure of public spaces.

The south west of the site is lower density and the character changes for semi formal, suburban form which responds to the topography and shape of land. The north east area of the site has a similar density to the south west however, given the changing topography the character changes to informal rural form to reflect Arleston village.

It is considered that the proposed development as defined in the master plan and design and access statement generally respects and responds positively to the context and could depending on details provide a high quality and distinctive area. The development has a mix of build form and hard and soft landscaping elements which respects and integrates with the topography of the site whilst preserving local historical features.

Numerous neighbour objections have been received concerns about the issues of building heights, and proximities to existing buildings and the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy therefore associated. The applicant to assist on reflecting these relationships have produced a selection of cross sections relating to the indicative layout. It should be noted that the applicants do not have a full topographical survey of the existing properties and there are some inaccuracies with ground levels within plots and neighbours have produced other cross sections.

Officers consider that having regard to all the indicative cross sections and given that at this stage siting of buildings is not a matter for consideration, there is adequate information to ensure that the zones of land to be developed can be done so to provide adequate separation, in conjunction with the screen planting to protect the amenities of existing occupiers in terms of loss of light and privacy and that subsequent detailed reserved matters applications will need to carefully consider that individual relationships once siting of buildings is proposed.

Whilst the Highways Engineer has reservation with regards to the internal layout in terms of complying with Manual for Streets the proposal will exploit permeability of the site and maximises links thought the site to the surrounding area. It is therefore considered that the design principles accord with policies UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan, CS15 Urban Design and principles in NPPF. Accordingly, it is considered that sufficient attention has been given to the development proposal from a design perspective

The proposed development includes positive sustainable aspects in terms of Level 3 of the code for sustainable homes and BREEAM very good for the extra care facility. This level of commitment to sustainable development can be secured through conditions and officers consider this would be beneficial to achieve.

Planning obligations:
The development as proposed would have a direct impact on local services in the vicinity; these can be mitigated and compensated through planning obligations. The scale and nature of this development requires the following contributions:

Highways - £10,000 maintenance of new junction
- £600 new traffic signal controlled pedestrian crossing
- £5000 support/monitoring of Travel Plan for Extra Care facility
-

Education - £208,794 for primary education provision in local vicinity

Public Art - £10,000 for commission and erection either on site or in local vicinity or creation of piece of public art outside or within the extra care facility to this same sum.

Section 106 and conditions monitoring - £3,500

Open space and play facilities - provision of an on site LEAP and commuted sum of £90,000 for improvements to nearest NEAP at Windsor Road, Arleston. Open space is to be maintained by a private company funded by new residents, in accordance with the landscape and biodiversity management plan which accompanies the proposal.

Affordable Housing – 30 extra care units mix to be agreed. This equates to 29% provision, which although below the policy of 38% due to the specialist nature of extra care and demand for affordable units within such use is considered by officers as acceptable to meet housing needs demand.

In addition to meeting the needs generated by the development the developers are offering a £5000 bond to be administered by the Council for drainage works to the stream in Arleston Village.

Other issues:
Third party representations have raised concerns relating to the need for such development given the large number of sites with planning permission in the local vicinity. The Local Planning Authority can not consider the need for development or suggest alternative locations for development other than in zoning within the Local Plan but must consider each application on its own merits with regards to the relevant planning policies and other material considerations.

The proposed development will also have economic benefits through the creation of 30 new and permanent jobs in relation to the extra care facility. The development will also support a number of other jobs within the construction industry.

CONCLUSIONS:
The site is located approx 1.8km south east of Wellington district centre; it has good accessibility to public transport and local facilities and services at Arleston Local Centre. The site is therefore considered to be in a sustainable location for new development. Therefore in accordance with NPPF there is a presumption in favour of in sustainable locations.

The proposed development will retain 50% of the site as open space and undeveloped land and include environmental improvements with enhancements to allow the creation of community uses and access with new footpath and cycleway link, creation of formal recreational facilities, enhancement and protection of ecological habitats and management of woodlands and other open space. The proposal also offers community benefits with the creation of an extra care facility which includes 30 affordable housing units, highways improvements, contributions for educational purposes, accessibility to heritage assets and creation of jobs through construction, operation of the extra care facility and wider landscape and open space management

Officers acknowledge that certain elements of the scheme will have benefits such as the extra care facilities to meet demands of the local area and enhancement to the retained open land through management. Since the previous application there have been amendments to the scheme and additional surveys and information provided with regard to ecology protection and benefits, these assertions have now been sufficiently addressed and appropriate evidence provided. It should be noted that, some of the applicants' considered 'benefits' of the site are actually mitigation for the impact of the development on existing services and facilities, i.e. education and highways. It is the view of your officers that the level of commitment has been improved and now meets policy requirements and on balance it is considered that the community and environmental benefits of the overall

proposal are in accordance with the exceptions within Wrekin Local Plan Policy OL4.

It is acknowledged that local residents are opposed to the loss of green network and consider that it is fully protected as is, however it should be noted that policy does allow for some development, 50% of the site is to be retained as open land, including enhancement and the development pockets to the east of the site are sensitive to the existing semi-natural woodland, and will largely retain the external views into the site from the wider area.

The proposed development includes an extra care facility of 50 units, which would assist in meeting the Council's target to provide 500 units. Of these units 30 would be affordable units with a mix of size and tenure. Clearly there is a demand for such facilities. On the previous proposal your officers were not entirely convinced that the proposal is located in a sustainable location. Further information about links to the community and provision of facilities within the site has been provided to reassure your officers that this site is in a sustainable location. Furthermore, officers are satisfied that on the basis of viability with the reduced open market units to a maximum of 103 dwellings, the provision of seven 30 "affordable" Extra Care units is reasonable.

The provision of the extra care facility is considered a major community benefit of the proposal and outweighs the total protection of the green network in this location. Given this, it is important to ensure that extra care facility is provided, as a standard housing development would not offer sufficient benefits to be considered an exception to green network protection policies. The open market housing is only acceptable in order to make the scheme financially viable to prove the extra care facility. To this end, no more than 20 open market dwellings can be occupied before works start on the facility and no more than 75 occupied before the facility is ready for occupation. Officers consider that these timings are appropriate and realistic in terms of building programmes and cash flows for the development, which is of particular importance in the current economic climate.

Technical issues such as highways, flooding and drainage, heritage, archaeology and ground conditions have been satisfactorily addressed and can be mitigated through conditions and planning obligations. The development will have an impact on services such as play facilities, public art and education which has been acknowledged by the applicant and works have commenced on drafting a S106 agreement to secure the appropriate mitigation for the development.

The previous scheme had outstanding technical issues which had not been satisfactorily addressed in terms of ecology, trees and noise. This application is accompanied by sufficient supporting information to ensure that the proposed development will not adversely impact on protected species through loss of habitat and amenities of future occupiers in relation to noise impacts from the M54 and Dawley Road.

There are good aspects to the proposal as described in this report. On balance the loss of Green Network and open space is balanced by the community and environmental benefits of the proposal and promotes growth and creates and supports jobs and economic growth, in accordance with the principles of NPPF for the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approval subject to signing of a Section 106 agreement for 30 affordable housing units within the extra care facility, provision of open space and play facilities, including a contribution of £90,000 for improvements to nearest NEAP at Windsor Road, Arleston. Highways contributions of £10,000 for maintenance of new junction, £600 for new traffic signals controlled pedestrian crossing and £5000 for support/monitoring of Travel Plan for the Extra Care facility. Education financial contribution of £208,794 for primary education provision in the local vicinity. Public Art either £10,000 financial contribution for commission and erection either on site or in local vicinity or creation of piece of public art outside or within the extra care facility to this same sum. Section 106 and conditions monitoring contribution of £3,500 and subject to the following conditions:

1. A01 Time Limit
2. A03 Submission of Reserved Matters
3. B002 Reserved matters outstanding
4. B003 Reserved matters details
5. B008 Appearance details
6. Bcust Highways
7. Bcust Highways
8. B005 Travel Plan
9. B050 Shallow Mining
10. B052 Untreated Mineshafts
11. B057 Land Contamination
12. Bcust Well Investigation
13. Bcust Foundation details
14. B062 Foul and Surface Water drainage
15. B110 Archaeological Investigation
16. C130 Tree Protection
17. C131 Services in root protection areas
18. C133 Details of Trees for removal
19. B145 Lighting Strategy
20. B150 Site Environmental Management Plan
21. C050 Noise Attenuation
22. C071 Soil Levels in Tree root protection zone
23. C072 Burning/storing in tree root protection zones
24. C101 Erection of ecology boxes
25. Ccust Ecological Mitigation Strategy
26. Ccust Retention of trees of ecological value
27. Ccust Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan
28. C113 Extra Care BREEAM
29. C115 Play space details
30. Ccust Open Space details

31. C38 Development in accordance with plans
32. D06 Restriction on use of extra care facility.

INFORMATIVES:

S106 agreement
Sustainable Urban Drainage
Contaminated Land
Protected Species
Bats
Nesting Birds
Updated survey
Trenches
Fire Authority
Conditions

REASONS FOR APPROVAL:
The Local Planning Authority considers that proposed development of an extra care facility, which is supported by a maximum of 103 open market dwellings for financial viability reasons is an appropriate community benefit, which when accompanied by the proposed environmental and ecology benefits are considered sufficient to out weigh the loss of approximately 50% of the green network site in this location in accordance with policy OL4 of the Wrekin Local Plan and guidance in NPPF.

The proposal has demonstrated that this is sustainable development with good access to public transport and local facilities and services. The proposal involves positive improvements to the built and natural environment and promotes economic growth and supports job creation, in accordance with the principles of NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development

Technical issues such as highways, flooding and drainage, heritage, archaeology and ground conditions have been satisfactorily addressed and can be mitigated through conditions and planning obligations. The development will have an impact on services such as play facilities, public art and education which can be controlled through a S106 agreement to secure the appropriate mitigation for the development.

TWC/2012/0355 W Davies & Sons, Mill Lane, Kynnersley, Newport, Shropshire, TF6 6DY
Demolition of existing factory and redevelopment of 3no. detached houses with detached double garages *****Amended plans received*****

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Gordon and Brian Davies	01/06/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
Kynnersley	Ercall Magna

KYNNERSLEY PARISH COUNCIL HAS REQUESTED THAT THE APPLICATION BE DETERMINED BY PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: YES

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of development in the rural area, rural housing numbers, impact on the character and appearance of the area, design, highway safety, material considerations.

PROPOSAL:
This is an outline planning application for residential development to include access, layout and scale included. Matters of appearance and landscaping are reserved matters for later consideration. Permission is sought for three new dwellings with detached double garages at land to the south of Kynnersley in the rural area. It is proposed to cease the existing B2 general industrial use, demolish the existing industrial buildings and clear the site of all structures and open storage.

Although appearance of the dwellings is a reserved matter, a design and access statement and indicative elevation plans have been submitted that show the proposed dwellings are to be two-storey with a Duke of Sutherland style. The layout will be in linear form, set back from the road, compatible with the existing pattern of development. The dwellings would provide a kitchen and dining room, living room, office/snug and utility at ground floor and 4 bedrooms, 2 ensuites and a bathroom at first floor. The properties would measure approximately 4.7m to the eaves and 8.4m to the ridge.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The site is accessed off Mill lane, 170m away from the centre of Kynnersley, a small rural settlement. The site is designated countryside in the Wrekin Local Plan Proposals map and is situated approximately 8 miles north of Telford Town Centre and approximately 5 miles south east of Waters Upton.

The application site relates to the premises of W Davies and Sons which has operated from the site initially as wheel wrights; commercial vehicle body – builders and then as joiners and pattern makers on site for over 100 years. This long established business involves the operation of very noisy machinery and it can be regarded as a Class B2 industrial use. The site is accessed off Mill Lane.

Mill Lane is a private track that continues north of the application site until it bends in a westerly direction and eventually joins with Crudgington Moot Lane. Immediately south of the application site situates a car parking area and a bungalow (number 28). To the north, east and west are open rural fields.

The application site is a roughly rectangular shaped parcel of generally flat land measuring approximately 2544m2. The site comprises of several buildings, structures and storage containers. The building adjacent to the site frontage is constructed from brick with corrugates asbestos pitched roof. The building has an eaves of 3.5m and a ridge height of 5m. Attached to the rear of the brick building is a larger industrial building covered with grey corrugated cladding with a corrugated asbestos roof to an eaves height of 5.5m and a ridge height of 6.5m. Adjacent the road is a timber lean-to structure with a ridge height of 4m.

East of the buildings is a grassy area and beyond that horse paddocks with post and rail fencing.

Immediately south of the site locates a modern bungalow which is occupied by Brian Davies and his wife and to the south of the bungalow is a Duke of Sutherland estate cottage.

PLANNING HISTORY:
W93/1016, erection of two non-illuminated directional signs, land opposite, granted 6th January 1994.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National guidance:
National Planning Policy Framework

Core Strategy:
CS1 Homes
CS7 Rural Area
CS9 Accessibility and Social Inclusion
CS12 Natural Environment
CS13 Environmental Resources
CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan:
UD2 Design Criteria
H9 Location of New Housing
H24 Affordable Housing Rural Exceptions Policy

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Kynnersley Parish Council: objects to the application for the following reasons:-

- The application is contrary to CS7, CS1, CS2 and UD2
- Consideration must be given to live/ work developments as seen in other villages locally which would support the council's policies regarding rural employment.
- Density, councillors believe that the construction of 3 large houses is inappropriate given the size of site and the infringement on the open countryside
- Precedent, councillors believe that the development would set a very dangerous precedent and would give rise to a large number of other applications both new and the resubmission of previously refused applications including TWC/2011/0862 and W2007/0797.
- Access, Mill Lane is a single track unmade lane which is not suitable for the levels of traffic three large family home would generate.
- The applicants Design Access Statement states that this application constitutes an exception to the current development plan as a result of the potential for nuisance to be created resulting from the continuing Class B2 use and the potential for a new occupier of the site to operate less sympathetically than the applicants.
- By reason of the existing access, do not believe a nuisance use would materialise, and any new use would be subject to restrictions under the Environmental Protection Act should any nuisance occur.
- Kynnersley is a settlement deemed to be unsustainable in terms of residential development.
- The housing stock in the village will have been increased by 30% when all barns with consent for conversion have been developed since the year 2000.
- Councillors agreed that development within the village should not be unnecessarily objected to.
- An overall plan for the development of the village should be agreed before any new build development is granted.
- The Parish Council understand the desire to secure their futures and those of their families and appreciate the longstanding residence of the Davies family in the village and the contribution both the family and the business have made to the village, however on the grounds stated above which are in line with the response made by the council to other applications for new build development in the village the council has no alternative but to object to the application in its current form.
- It was also the opinion of several of those present that a source of employment other than agriculture in the village was of considerable benefit. However opinion was mixed on the suitability of the site as an appropriate location for a site with a general industrial use class.
- The number of proposed dwellings and the impact that they would have on the skyline and also the resulting increase in vehicle movements on such a narrow lane.
- Encroachment of the development into the open countryside and loss of diversity of habitat.

- In allowing this application the ‘floodgates’ would be opened for a large number of other applications for residential development in the village.
- Lack of affordable housing element to the development
- Parishioners have also commented that section 1.5 and 5.5 of the Design Access Statement imply that during the pre-application discussions held with the planning department the application has been given the tacit approval of the planning department before their opinions have been heard. The Parish Council sought to assure the parishioners concerned that the views of all parishioners would be represented to the best of the ability of the Parish Council.
- The question of who legally owns Mill Lane has been raised.

Council’s Drainage Engineer:
Supports subject to conditions B62 and B74

Aboricultural Officer: Supports subject to replacement trees condition.

> Within the curtilage of the site the applicants have very recently removed a mature Silver birch, so that it would not interfere with the proposed construction of the garage. In mitigation for its loss the LPA would ask to condition replacement trees in each of the 3 proposed gardens as the current plans do not show any. There appears to be ample space within these north east facing gardens.

Highways Officer:
Confirms no objection to the application as the proposed residential units will not cause any intensification of use of the access onto the adopted highway. The officer asks for following condition: C12 - Parking

Neighbour Consultation:
11 Neighbours were consulted.

2 letters of objection have been received concerned with the following:-

- Contrary to local and national policy
- Unsustainable
- The development does not accord with planning policy, as established for Kynnersley in two recent planning applications and one appeal for new residential development.
- The site does not have any affordable homes.
- Kynnersley as a location is not classed as sustainable for new residential use, as established for Kynnersley in two recent planning applications and one appeal.
- The business site use and site area should be confirmed either by providing existing planning approval consents or a lawful use consent.
- The threat of a business should be kept in context when assessed against the Environmental Protection Act
- 1990.
- The precedent set if approved will result in most rural businesses seeking consent for the more lucrative residential use.

- The designs are not sympathetic.
- The proposal is an overdevelopment.
- The site should be retained as an employment use, or converted to a live work unit, or at the extreme only one dwelling granted approval.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

National and local planning policy outline new development should be focussed in sustainable locations which have the benefit of a range of services and facilities. Kynnersley does not constitute a sustainable location, as it has limited services and facilities and is not one of the three key rural settlements in the Borough where development will be focussed to meet local needs, as set out in policy CS7 of the Council's Core Strategy. Housing will only be considered acceptable in Kynnersley where a proposal constitutes an exception, such as affordable housing where there is evidence of local need or dwellings for agricultural/forestry workers.

Core Strategy policy CS1 requires that the spatial distribution of new homes be consistent with the spatial development strategy stating that housing needs in the rural area will be met by approximately 170 new dwellings. This figure is derived from evidence provided by the Telford & Wrekin Housing Needs Study, with its inclusion in local policy also reflecting national planning policy framework requirements to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and limit the number of new dwellings in rural areas. This threshold has already been met from dwellings already built or having received planning permission. The proposed development would therefore exceed the need identified for the rural area contrary to CS1 in terms of the scale of development proposed.

In addition to the above, guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework states that development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay – a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision. Furthermore, to promote sustainable development, housing in rural areas should not be located in places distant from local services. However it also states that isolated homes in the countryside can be looked upon favourably if special circumstances have been demonstrated, these include for a rural worker to live at or near their place of work; and where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting.

Officers accept that residential development of this kind would not normally be supported in Kynnersley, unless there are special circumstances to justify a departure from local and national planning polices. Although the residential dwellings put forward are not required for a rural worker, do not secure the future of a heritage asset, or provide affordable housing the development would enhance the setting of the area by removing a General Industrial use with the potential to intensify and expand.

The business has existed for well over 50 years and pre-dates the 1947/8 Planning Act. For several years it has been used for wheel-wright; commercial

vehicle body-builders and most recently as joiners and pattern makers. For many years it has been the applicant's intention to retire and cease the existing use and sell the business on. The applicant is now nearer retirement age therefore the likelihood of this business changing hands is soon approaching.

According to the councils planning records the site has never gained planning permission. The use has operated for over 50yrs years without any planning restrictions. There are no conditions that would control opening times and together with existing permitted development rights would allow the use to open 24 hrs a day, 7 days a week as well as extend and expand. Works over the years have involved noisy machinery, traffic comings and goings and the emission of dust.

Therefore the principle issue for consideration is whether sufficient weight can still be given to these material matters which would outweigh planning policy and therefore justify a departure from policy.

Officers acknowledge concerns that an approval could set a precedent in the rural area for the residential development of other brownfield sites. The site retains a B2 class use; it comprises of several large buildings with high eaves and ridge heights that can easily accommodate large commercial vehicles. It has no restricted opening hours and could therefore operate 24hrs a day 7 days a week and disturb residents on a regular basis. Officers acknowledge that Mill Lane is somewhat narrow but do not consider its width would deter potential vehicle movements.

If the applicants were to retire and sell, the site could be replaced with any of the following uses, which are examples of other class B2 industrial uses:-

- Animal carcase incineration place
- Blood boiling
- Chicken meat production place
- Fish curing or smoking place
- Explosives Manufacturing Place
- Forging bar manufacturing place
- Glue Manufacturing
- Hide animal fleshing/drying place
- Machine Tool manufacturing place
- Repair and Testing Garage
- Rubber goods manufacturing petroleum and natural gas processing/handling place
- Scrap metal furnace
- Sewage Waste Incinerator
- Scrap metal storage place
- Turbine testing place

Not only could the site accommodate a new type of industrial use that would likely bring an increase of noise, dust and potential heavy vehicle movements,

it would not have to conform to any planning restrictions, parking numbers or hours of operation.

The site is somewhat limited in terms of its size and location, although officers must emphasise that the site retains full permitted development rights that would allow it to extend buildings and expand subject to criteria set out within Part 8 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2010. Therefore it can be said that this use could one day significantly intensify without planning control and have an unduly adverse impact on the immediate area and in particular neighbouring properties.

It addition to the above the site could operate within the B8 class use without the need for planning consent (within a limit of 235s.sqm) which could proliferate any increased traffic movements by reason of employees, customers and deliveries. A change in ownership could create an increase of noise and smells and well as a hindrance to the existing rural pleasant landscape.

The removal of an industrial business with its unsightly buildings and potential uses in the centre of the village would improve the amenities and living conditions of local residents and enhance the setting of the village itself. In addition the removal of the industrial buildings would significantly enhance the setting of the rural landscape.

Therefore in allowing residential development, future intensification and the associated potential negative environmental impacts of noise, congestion and odours would be prevented. Replacement with small scale residential development would reduce the risk of contaminated land to the environment and human health in accordance with policy CS13. Residential development would somewhat protect this existing landscape from further industrial use and additional structures.

In light of the above, officers consider the cessation of this use and demolition of existing buildings and replacement with three modest dwellings would therefore constitute overriding material of significant weight to justify the grant of planning permission as an exception in this instance. Officers therefore consider the special reasons advanced to be an exceptional case that justifies a departure from these policies.

The proposal has been designed to have a careful sympathetic design and layout. The proposal includes dwellings with the appearance of Duke and Sutherland Style. Although some details have been reserved, matters of scale, access and layout are sought for approval. Officers consider the submitted scale to be in keeping with some of the houses within the local area such number 26 Mill Lane and The Mill Yard and therefore acceptable. Further to this the highways officer has not raised any objections.

The properties would have active frontages on to the existing lane, reflecting the character of established development within the village. The layout will be

in linear form, set back from the road, compatible with the existing pattern of development. The proposed dwellings would provide adequate parking provision as well as sufficient rear garden areas. A sufficient separation distance would remain between number 28 and the nearest new dwelling to ensure neighbouring amenity is protected.

Officers note that the proposal does not accord with H24 of the Wrekin Plan in its failure to provide any affordable homes, however it is understood the reason for 3 private dwellings is so the applicants can generate a sum reasonable to equate to that of selling the business.

Officers acknowledge a need for these types of houses in this locality has not been identified and would exceed the identified housing needs for the rural area, falling contrary to policy CS7. However despite such policy objection the council consider the benefits this proposal would bring to the area would outweigh the lack of need for housing.

The Council acknowledge that there are ownership issues over Mill Lane. This was bought to the applicant's attention during the application process, therefore the applicant signed certificate C of the application form and placed a public notice in the Shropshire Star on 7th June 2012. Officers acknowledge that ownership may be an issue at a later date; however this is a civil/legal issue and not a planning reason to warrant a refusal.

Officers consider that there are material considerations in this instance that serve to justify the development even with some conflict with policy CS7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy H24 of the Wrekin Local Plan. The proposal is considered acceptable as the development of the site would remove the commercial use of the existing buildings and the potentially harmful impact on the surrounding area that could arise from any uncontrolled intensification or worsening of uses and operations that could occupy the site without the need for planning permission. The scale, layout and access of the proposed development is appropriate for the site in this rural area close to the village of Kynnersley. The proposal will improve the character and appearance of the area as well as enhance the amenities and living conditions of local residents. Based on the above, on balance the three replacement dwellings would be acceptable as a rural exception to policy and justify a departure.

RECOMMENDATION: to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION, subject to the following conditions:

A01 Time Limit
B002 Standard Outline
B003 General Details
B011 Samples of materials
B121 Landscaping Design
B012 Sample of Brick Panel
B133 Replacement Tree

B062 Surface Water Drainage
B074 Brownfield Run Off Rates
C007 Windows/Doors set 75mm
C012 Car Parking
C38 Development in accordance
D04 Domestic Garage Restriction
I32 Fire Informative
I40 Conditions
I44 Reason for Outline
RACustom Reason for Approval

REASON FOR APPROVAL
There are material considerations in this instance that serve to justify the development even with some conflict with policy CS7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy H24 of the Wrekin Local Plan. The proposal is considered acceptable as the development of the site would remove the commercial use of the existing buildings and the potentially harmful impact on the surrounding area that could arise from any uncontrolled intensification or worsening of uses and operations that could occupy the site without the need for planning permission. The scale, layout and access of the proposed development is appropriate for the site in this rural area close to the village of Kynnersley. The proposal will improve the character and appearance of the area as well as enhance the amenities and living conditions of local residents. On balance three replacement dwellings would be acceptable as a rural exception to policy and justify a departure.

TWC/2012/0358 Land between 44 & 45 Sandbrook, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire
Erection of 2no. bungalows

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Mr Seth Amartey	23/04/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
Ketley	Ketley and Oakengates

COUNCILLOR HILDA RHODES HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS PLANNING APPLICATION IS CONSIDERED AT PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES:
Loss of parking and garages, the impact upon the existing footpath and sewers running through the site, residential amenity, scale and design of the proposed dwellings.

THE PROPOSAL:
The proposal comprises the erection of a pair of semi-detached bungalows on a former garage site on land between 44 & 45 Sandbrook, Ketley.

They layout of this application has been altered to that of the original proposal (TWC/2011/0969) which was withdrawn as it was not supported by officers. The proposal in respect of application TWC/2011/0969 showed 2 detached bungalows one each side of the footpath very close to the existing boundary fencing. It was considered that this layout did not provide an acceptable level of amenity for the future occupiers of the bungalows in respect of outlook, day lighting and private amenity space and site looked cramped.

This current proposal differs in that the bungalows have been made semi-detached and sited in the centre of the plot with parking placed at an angle to the front or side of the units. This serves to pull the bungalows away from the boundaries with the neighbouring properties and gives each dwelling a bigger garden. The result is a better use of the site and creation of a better form of development.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The site is located on an ex-local authority housing estate and is roughly octagonal in shape and is situated between Sandbrook and Victoria Avenue; pedestrian access is off Victorian Avenue between no's 8 & 9 and vehicular access is off Sandbrook between no's 44 & 45. The site is a slightly run down former hard standing garage site including 4 timber and corrugated metal garages which was sold at auction in October 2008 by the Council's Asset and Property department.

The boundaries of the site comprise various fencing (1.8m timber panel, concrete gravel boards, 1m chain link, picket fencing and Privet hedging)

belonging to the side/rear gardens of the surrounding houses. There is a tarmacadam footpath running through the middle of the site and 300mm mains surface water and foul water sewers with inspection covers; there is also a street light.

The surrounding area comprises fairly densely populated traditional single and two storey housing; some properties have off street parking and detached garaging whist others park on the highway.

PLANNING HISTORY:
W82/0397 Erection of a private garage for domestic use - approved 10.08.82

W83/0628 Erection of a garage – approved 10.09.83

W87/0766 Erection of a garage – approved 25.11.87

TWC/2011/0969 Erection of 2no. 2 bedroomed bungalows – withdrawn 17.01.12

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
National Planning Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF)

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
Policy H6 – Windfall sites in Telford & Newport
Policy UD2 – Design Criteria

LDF Core Strategy
Policy CS1 – Homes
Policy CS5 – District and Local Centres in Telford
Policy CS12 – Natural Environment
Policy CS13 - Environmental Resources.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:
The Parish Council objects and is firmly against this application. They consider that the public right away must not be removed or diverted and there were access issues as the approach was very narrow. Councillors have received many complaints, as the right-of-way is a well-used shortcut to the shops.

The Council’s Highways Engineer has no objection to the proposal.

The Council’s Drainage Engineer supports subject standard conditions B62 in respect of surface water drainage and B74 to ensure brownfield run-off rates.

The Council’s Ecologist supports subject to the erection of nest boxes

The Environmental Engineer recommends approval subject to a shallow mine working condition B50 and informatives I17 & I20 to exercise caution during development due to former mineral workings and potential contaminated land.

The Council's Right of Way officer no objections.

The Fire Authority recommends that Access for Emergency Fire Service Vehicles is considered & Sprinkler Systems are installed.

Eighteen direct neighbour letters have advertised the application.
5 letters of objection have been received from four nearby properties. The issues raised are summarised below:-

- I am a regular user of the footpath between Sandbrook and Victoria Avenue and am disappointed that the new plans will now divert the path along the perimeter of the new bungalows.
- The narrow path will be a haven for youths to hang around in and gain access to break into properties, path will be enclosed with poor visibility and, it will be used as a toilet, no one will want to use it,
- A lot of neighbours are pensioners and live on their own,
- Loss of parking, garaging and access,
- Possible damage to property and Privet hedge,
- Poor access for builder's and delivery vehicles and fire engines,
- Applicant has not approached owners of the garages on site regarding the relocation,
- Loss of privacy and over-looking,
- Poor outlook for proposed dwellings,
- Possible problems with new drainage system,
- Increased noise and smell and disruption from path being closer to the existing houses,
- The proposal is ill thought out and only reason is to make a quick profit.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:
The proposal comprises the erection of a semi detached pair of two modest 2 bedroomed bungalows located centrally on an area of existing parking/ garages with 2 parking spaces each. The existing vehicular access off Sandbrook would be utilised and the drawings indicate that the existing footpath and mains sewerage system will be diverted around the eastern edge the site.

Principle of Development:
NPPF gives Government advice on new housing developments, amongst other issues it states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The mix, type size and tenure of housing should reflect local demand.

Policy H6 states that housing development will be permitted on land under 0.4 hectare that is within the Telford built up area when the site can be adequately accessed and parking provided, when the site can be adequately drained, and where the proposal does not have an adverse impact on the local environment, especially in its relationship with adjacent land uses and where the proposal shows a high quality of design.

Policy CS1 states that housing development will seek to provide every household in the Borough with an affordable, decent and appropriate home. Policy CS5 requires all new residential development to be situated in highly accessible locations, creating vibrant, safe and attractive places, with designs which respect and respond to the locality.

The location is a brownfield site within the built up area of Telford where new development is acceptable in principle. The site is close to employment opportunities, various amenities and public transport facilities, and therefore, considered a relatively sustainable location. It is therefore deemed that the proposed development is acceptable in principle and compliant with policy H6 of the Wrekin Local Plan, policies CS1 & CS5 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained within NPPF.

Design, appearance and amenity:
National guidance contained in NPPF, asserts that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute to making places better for people. Policy CS15, amongst other issues, states that development will assist in creating and sustaining safe places, positively influencing the appearance of the local environment. Policy UD2 provides guidance to assess whether or not proposals are of an appropriate design quality and relate positively to their context. It advises the Council to assess proposed development in relation to its scale, massing, form, density, orientation and layout, proportions, materials, landscape elements, access, parking and spatial quality.

This revised application, which makes the bungalows semi-detached and places them in the centre of the plot, makes a better use of the site. The two bungalows on the site is therefore deemed appropriate and compliant with previous officer advice and is an improvement to the previous layout, which was withdrawn earlier this year. The scale and design of the proposed dwellings are acceptable and will not adversely impact upon the locality and will barely be visible within the street scene.

The proposed development will result in 2 modest dwellings on the site; there are no statutory stated garden sizes for residential development and the usable private amenity space, although modest, is considered adequate for this type of property.

The orientation, siting, single storey design, boundary treatment and separation distances of the existing dwellings and proposed bungalows will ensure that residential amenity of neighbouring properties is not compromised by way of overlooking and mutual privacy is preserved. Issues relating to drainage will be addressed by way of conditions. The proposal is therefore considered compliant with policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan, policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained in NPPF.

Highway safety, loss of parking, garaging and footpath:.
With regards to parking provision and manoeuvring for the proposed bungalows, the Councils Highways Engineer has no objections. The

displacement of the 2 or 3 vehicles which are currently parked on the site will not have a significant impact upon on-street parking especially given that the properties owned/occupied by the drivers who use the land have sufficient space within their own curtilage to accommodate their vehicles. Therefore, the proposed development is deemed compliant with policy UD2 of the WLP, policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained NPPF.

Comments from the owners of the garages on the site are noted. However, the land has been in the ownership of the applicant for over 4 years and during this time it is understood that no rent has been paid by residents to the landowner to continue to use his land. The landowner could serve notice on the residents at any time asking them to remove their garages and refrain from parking on his land. Furthermore, this is a private matter which cannot result in the refusal of this application which could then be successfully substantiated at any subsequent appeal.

The Design & Access statement and drawings indicate that the developer is willing to arrange for dropped kerbs to be installed to some of the neighbouring front gardens and garages moved. However, these gardens do not form part of this application. It is not possible to impose a condition requiring the developer to move the garages, drop the kerb and provide alternative parking. This is because the neighbours' gardens are outside the development boundary, the residents have no right to use the application site to park their vehicles, and they have adequate space on their own land to create off street parking and potentially erect garages under permitted development (PD). In addition the Council's highway engineer has no objections.

It is essential that the operation of the planning system should command public confidence. The sensitive use of conditions can improve development control and enhance that confidence. The use of conditions in an unreasonable way, however, so that it proves impracticable or inexpedient to enforce them could damage such confidence and should be avoided.

Similarly, issues in respect of the footpath are noted. However, the footpath is not a definitive right of way and the landowner could block the access at any time. Thus neither the Council's Right of Way officer or the Council has any jurisdiction over the matter. That said, the drawings indicate that a pedestrian access is being provided around the north western edge of the site although there is no legal requirement to do so. Therefore, this is considered a bonus to what the landowner is legally required to do. The maintenance of the path will fall to the owner of the land whether it is the current owner or future occupiers of the proposed dwellings. However, this is not a material planning consideration which can unduly influence the decision to approve or refuse this application. Comments in respect of anti-social behaviour are also noted however, it is considered that natural surveillance will be improved as a result of the proposed development. Relocating the path a few metres closer to neighbours' boundaries will not significantly adversely impact upon residential amenity especially given that users of the current path can already access the land adjacent the boundary fences.

Other Matters:
The Council's Ecologist has suggested that bird boxes should be erected to enhance the biodiversity of the site and provide nesting opportunities. Accordingly, the proposal is compliant with policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained within NPPF which aim to protect and enhance the natural environment.

The Council's Geotechnical Engineer has suggested conditions and informatives in respect of shallow mining and contamination given the previous use of the site and mining history in the area. Accordingly, the proposal is compliant with policy CS13 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained within NPPF which require that risks to human health and detrimental impacts to the environment need to be mitigated.

The Council's Drainage Engineer has suggested conditions in respect of surface water drainage and surface run-off rates and an informative in advise the developer to obtain the necessary consents to divert the public sewers. Accordingly, the proposal is compliant with policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan and national guidance contained within NPPF which require that sites can be adequately drained to prevent flooding.

Conclusion:
In conclusion, the principle of residential development is acceptable on this brownfield site. It is in the built up area of Telford and in a sustainable location. The scale and design of the dwellings is considered appropriate and relate positively to their context. The development of this site will enhance the character of the immediate area although it will not be overly visible within the street scene. The site is of sufficient size to accommodate the two bungalows and provide adequate private amenity space and parking. The orientation, siting and separation distances of the existing and proposed dwellings will ensure that residential amenity is not compromised by way of overlooking and mutual privacy is preserved. The loss of the off street parking and footpath do not justify the refusal of this application as the footpath is not a definitive right of way and land is in private ownership and the facilities could be removed or denied at any time. Accordingly the proposal is considered compliant with both local and national policy stated above and is therefore, recommended for approval with conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. A04 time limit
2. B11 samples of materials
3. B37 Access in a bound material
4. B46 on site construction
5. B47 mud on highway
6. B50 shallow mineworking
7. B62 surface water drainage
8. B74 brownfield run-off rates

9. B121 landscaping design
10. C38 development in accordance with approved plans
11. C100 erection of bird boxes
12. D01 removal of PD
13. I12 drainage – public sewer
14. I13 working access to sewer
15. Icustom contact Severn Trent Water regarding sewer diversion
16. I17 minerals area
17. I20 contaminated land
18. I32 Access for Emergency Fire Service Vehicles & Sprinkler Systems - Residential Premises
19. I33 PD is removed
20. I40 conditions
21. I41 reasons for grant
22. Racuston – reason.

REASON FOR APPROVAL:
The principle of residential development is acceptable on this brownfield site. It is in the built up area of Telford and in a sustainable location. The scale and design of the dwellings is considered appropriate and relate positively to their context. The development of this site will enhance the character of the immediate area although it will not be overly visible within the street scene. The site is of sufficient size to accommodate the two bungalows and provide adequate private amenity space and parking. The orientation, siting and separation distances of the existing and proposed dwellings will ensure that residential amenity is not compromised by way of overlooking and mutual privacy is preserved. The loss of the off street parking and footpath do not justify the refusal of this application as the footpath is not a definitive right of way and land is in private ownership and the facilities could be removed or denied at any time.

TWC/2012/0395 The Acorns, Donnerville Gardens, Admaston, Telford, Shropshire, TF5 0DE
Erection of 7 no. new houses with garages and construction of a new access off Sweet Chariot Way following the demolition of The Acorns

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Broome	04/05/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
Wellington	Park

WELLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS APPLICATION IS DETERMINED BY MEMBERS AT PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of development, Access, Layout of development, Highways issues, Impact on protected trees, Impact on residential amenities

THE PROPOSAL: The application seeks outline planning permission with some matters reserved for the erection of 7 detached dwellings with garages and construction of a new access off Sweet Chariot Way following the demolition of The Acorns. Access and layout of development are to be agreed at the outline stage, with scale, landscaping and appearance reserved for a further application.

The layout indicates that 2 dwellings would be accessed off Donnerville Gardens and 5 dwellings would be accessed from a new vehicular access point on to Sweet Chariot Way.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The application site is currently occupied by a single large modern detached red brick property constructed in the 1980s. The front garden and driveway rise up from Donnerville Gardens to the existing property with the remainder of the site largely level. There is an avenue of mature trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders along the northeastern boundary with the former Montrachet site which now comprises 8 dwellings, 3 of which are accessed off Donnerville Gardens and the other 5 dwellings off Sweet Chariot Way. The boundary to the site comprises substantial hedging.

The adjacent property Richmond House is located to the west of The Acorns and planning permission has been granted for 4 dwellings within the northern part of the site with access on to Donnerville Gardens.

To the south of the site is the Sweet Chariot Way development of 14 dwellings. The cul-de-sac has a narrow pinchpoint and no pavement between the application site and the Montrachet development. To the east of Sweet Chariot Way, a further 5 dwellings have been granted in the grounds of 69 Admaston Road.

The application site is located in an established residential area in Admaston and is located close to local services and facilities in Wellington and is within the built-up area of Telford.

PLANNING HISTORY:
W2005/0576 Demolition of 3 dwellings and erection of 66 dwellings and associated works, Refused June 2005 on grounds of context, design, density and layout being inappropriate and not reflecting the character of the area

W2007/1723 Erection of 6 no. detached dwellings, Granted February 2008

TWC/2010/0554 Renewal of extant planning permission W2007/1723 for the erection of 6no. detached dwellings, Granted November 2010

Land at Montrachet:
W2007/0630 Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Erection of 8no. Detached Houses with Detached Garages, Granted July 2007

TWC/2010/0289 Substitution of house types and associated works (Amended plans received), Granted September 2010

Land at Richmond House:
TWC/2011/0347 Renewal of extant planning permission W2008/0707 for the erection of 4no. detached dwellings and detached garages, Granted April 2011

Land at 69 Admaston Road, Wellington:
TWC/2011/0245 Erection of 5no. dwellings with alterations to existing access and formation of access drive, Granted May 2011

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
National Planning Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework

Core Strategy:
CS5 District and Local Centres in Telford
CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan:
UD2 Design Criteria
H6 Windfall Sites in Telford and Newport
OL11 Woodland and Trees

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:
Wellington Town Council: no objection but wish to see the retention of as many trees surrounding the site as recommended by the Arboricultural Officer. One of the Town Councillors has since requested that the application is determined by Members at Plans Board.

Highways: no objection in principle subject to conditions B32 Road Design B42 Parking/Turning/Loading and that Before the proposed development is brought into use the visibility splays indicated on approved plan no. 003 rev D shall be provided; and Standard highways informative I11 and informative to state Any highway adoption agreement will secure the strip of land between the proposed turning head and the western site boundary as public highway in order to avoid a potential ransom strip situation in the future.

Arboricultural Officer: no objection to revised layout subject to conditions: B121 Landscaping Design, B125 Details of Earthworks, B130 Tree Protective Fencing, B131 Trees Services, B132 Trees 'No dig' method, B134 TPO trees pruning, B136 TPO tree – planting scheme, C70 No Burning, C71 Soil Levels, C72 Material Storage, C76 Landscaping Implementation Hard & Soft, C79 TPO Tree Suitable Contractor

Ecology: Support subject to conditions and informatives. As the ecological survey was undertaken in October 2010, if works do not commence before October 2012, an updated survey will be required. Recommends condition regarding Erection of next boxes and informatives: Update survey, Lighting strategy, Protected and priority species, Timing of works for bats and birds, Nesting birds (vegetation) and Retention of habitat features.

Drainage: Support subject to conditions regarding details on the proposed method of surface water disposal, details of foul and surface water drainage, surface water runoff rate, and if any surface water connection to Beanhill Brook consent from the Land Drainage Authority (Telford and Wrekin Council) may be required.

West Mercia Police: no formal objection to the proposal; however there are opportunities to design out crime and/or the fear of crime and to promote community safety. Therefore if the development is recommended for approval, it should be subject to a condition that the Applicant aims to achieve Secured by Design award status for the development.

Shropshire Fire Service: no objection subject to informatives regarding access, water supplies and sprinkler systems.

30 letters of objection have been received from 21 local residents and a petition containing 21 signatures have been received with the following comments summarised below:

- Does proposal accord with National Planning Policy Framework?
- No need to demolish The Acorns property as still inhabited and not derelict
- Number of new dwellings constructed in the area – overdevelopment and impact on character
- Is site large enough to accommodate additional dwellings?
- Residential development should be limited to 5 dwellings, with 3 units off Sweet Chariot Way
- Highway safety – narrow nature of Sweet Chariot Way – unsuitable for number of units proposed

- Is visibility splay sufficient?
- Lack of footpath
- Exiting from Sweet Chariot Way on to Admaston Road is already difficult
- Proximity of access driveway on adjoining properties
- Layout of private access drive could enable a through road on to land at Richmond House and further development to take place
- Additional 2 dwellings with access on to Donnerville Gardens inappropriate due to nature of access road
- Increase in traffic will exacerbate existing problems on highway and impact on pedestrian safety particularly children
- Is parking provision for new dwellings sufficient?
- Are there sufficient services for new development? Impact on flooding
- Overlooking of properties in Donnerville Drive
- Loss of hedgerow and impact on avenue of Lime trees and green space
- Detrimental impact on wildlife
- Repositioning of Plots 5 and 6 is improvement to scheme as now further from mature trees
- Damage to boundary treatment
- Proximity to watercourse
- Impact of noise and light pollution
- Impact on quality of life
- Impact on house price
- Disturbance from construction traffic and damage to highway verge/footpaths as in case of Montrachet development
- Parking of construction vehicles
- Lack of consultation on 2010 planning application

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:
The application comprises the erection of 7 detached dwellings on The Acorns site following the demolition of the existing property. The principle of residential development on the site has been established by the previous full planning permissions W2007/1723 for 6 dwellings (4 units off Sweet Chariot Way and 2 off Donnerville Gardens) and TWC/2010/0554 to extend the time limit for the implementation of the 2007 permission. The current proposal seeks planning permission for the principle of 7 rather than 6 dwellings on the site, with an additional dwelling (5 rather than 4 units) accessed off Sweet Chariot Way.

With regard to planning policy since the 2010 application was approved, the local policies have not been revised; however the National Planning Policy Framework has been published and replaces previous national PPS and PPG guidance. The NPPF states that there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that proposals will be considered against the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The site is in a relatively sustainable location close to local services and facilities in Wellington. The proposal was considered to be in conformity with national and local planning policies in 2007 and 2010. Officers would assert that in

considering this current application, there must be regard to the fallback position that there is extant planning permission for 6 dwellings on the site and this development could be implemented. This is a material consideration.

The principle of a new vehicular access on to Sweet Chariot Way was approved under the previous planning permissions (W2007/1723 and TWC/2010/0554). The position of the access has been slightly revised and has been designed to meet Highways requirements in terms of visibility splays. The access is slightly further to the west and closer to No.14 Sweet Chariot Way and opposite the drive access to No.2 Sweet Chariot Way. Concerns have been raised by local residents that the number of additional units on to Sweet Chariot Way and resulting increase in traffic movements and the position of the access will cause highway safety issues. However the scheme has been designed to address Highways comments, and there are no highway objections to the proposal based on technical or highway safety grounds, subject to conditions and Informatives.

Officers would reiterate that planning permission has previously been granted for a new access on to Sweet Chariot Way to serve 4 dwellings; therefore it is considered that one additional dwelling would not have a significant impact on the residential amenities of existing properties on Sweet Chariot Way. The position of the access will not impact on protected trees, although it will require the removal of some of the hedgerow bounding the site.

The amended plan also indicates the possibility of constructing a footpath to improve the pedestrian links along Sweet Chariot Way. This is outside the site area; therefore it would be subject to a separate Highways agreement (Section 38).

The layout of the site and indicative housetypes have been revised from the 2007 scheme. The main revision is the position of the access drive which previously ran along the boundary adjacent to 9 and 14 Sweet Chariot Way. The plans now indicate the access road moved away from this boundary into the centre of the site and instead 3 dwellings with detached garages back on to this boundary. The access drive would be more centrally located with 2 dwellings to the north and a turning area. Concerns have been raised by local residents that the access drive could enable further development on the adjoining site at Richmond House to the west. These concerns are noted and officers would assert that the layout of the proposal could potentially enable further residential development on the adjacent site. However officers have not received any such proposal at Richmond House. If an application were to be submitted, statutory consultees and local residents would be consulted and the proposal would be considered on its merits.

The vehicular access on to Donnerville Gardens and erection of 2 dwellings at the north of the site was approved in 2007 and again in 2010, thus the principle of access for 2 dwellings from Donnerville Gardens is acceptable. The dwellings have been repositioned, and now comprise attached garages. The development has been positioned further from the protected trees. The separation distance of more than 30 metres between the existing dwellings at

Donnerville Drive and the proposed dwellings at Plots 5 and 6 is considered to be sufficient that the development will not have a detrimental impact on privacy and overlooking.

The layout of the development is considered acceptable. The dwellings are of a similar size to the existing properties on the adjoining sites. They are positioned and orientated so that there will be sufficient amenity space and parking provision for each unit and the proposal will maintain privacy and outlook for existing and proposed dwellings. Furthermore, the retention of the avenue of trees along the northeast and east boundary of the site will ensure the significant level of amenity this provides to the local area is maintained and will help to preserve the character and appearance of the area. Officers would assert that the proposal is in keeping with the prevailing character of the area which is residential.

With regard to other matters, it is considered that drainage issues such as mains service can be dealt with sufficiently by appropriate conditions. The issue of construction traffic and noise and disturbance is noted and officers consider that a condition could be imposed to control the construction phase. Property value is not a material planning consideration. The comments made by West Mercia Police and Shropshire Fire Service can be added as informatives.

In conclusion, the principle of residential development has been established by previous planning permissions in 2007 and 2010. Indeed the 2010 planning permission for 6 dwellings on this site is still extant and could still be implemented and this is a relevant material consideration. The site is within a sustainable location, within close proximity to the district centre of Wellington. The layout of the site and the access arrangements are considered acceptable and in keeping with the context of existing surrounding residential development. The design of the dwellings at Reserved Matters stage can ensure the careful consideration of window positions to ensure no overlooking or loss of privacy. Hence the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties and will not be harmful to existing trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders. The proposal is in accordance with national and local planning policy.

RECOMMENDATION: to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1.	A01	Time limit - outline
2.	A03	Time limit – submission of reserved matters
3.	B02	Standard outline – some matters reserved
4.	B03	General details required
5.	B11	Samples of materials
6.	B12	Sample panel
7.	B32	Road Design
8.	B42	Parking/Turning/Loading
9.	B61	Foul and surface water drainage
10.	B62	Surface water drainage

11. Bcustom Surface water runoff rate
12. B121 Landscaping Design
13. B125 Details of Earthworks
14. B130 Tree Protective Fencing
15. B131 Trees Services
16. B132 Trees 'No dig' method
17. B134 TPO trees pruning
18. B136 TPO tree – planting scheme
19. B150 Site Environmental Management Plan
20. C70 No Burning
21. C71 Soil Levels
22. C72 Material Storage
23. C76 Landscaping Implementation Hard & Soft
24. C79 TPO Tree Suitable Contractor
25. Ccustom Visibility splays
26. Ccustom Nest boxes
27. C38 Development in accordance with plans

REASON FOR APPROVAL:
The principle of residential development has been established by previous planning permissions in 2007 and 2010. Indeed the 2010 planning permission for 6 dwellings on this site is still extant and could still be implemented and this is a relevant material consideration. The site is within a sustainable location, within close proximity to the district centre of Wellington. The layout of the site and the access arrangements are considered acceptable and in keeping with the context of existing surrounding residential development. The design of the dwellings at Reserved Matters stage can ensure the careful consideration of window positions to ensure no overlooking or loss of privacy. Hence the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties and will not be harmful to existing trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders.

TWC/2012/0420 80 Wombridge Road, Wrockwardine Wood, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 6QG
Change of use from garage to dog grooming business (retrospective)

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Mrs Helen Wilcox	22/05/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
Oakengates	Wrockwardine Wood and Trench

THIS APPLICATION WAS RESOLVED TO BE GRANTED BY MEMBERS AT PLANS BOARD 11TH JULY 2012.

The applicant now wishes to amend the hours' condition. As the decision notice had not been issued officers are able to bring the application back before members to consider an alteration to the hour's condition.

Condition 2 of the application currently states the following hours of work: 0930 – 1630 hours Monday to Saturday with no work on Sundays / Bank Holidays.

The applicant now wishes to amend the hours to:
1000 – 1730 hours Monday to Saturday with no work on Sundays / Bank Holidays.

Officers consider that this change in hours, by opening half an hour later in the morning and an extra hour in the evening, represents a minor change that would not have any significant impact and therefore is considered acceptable.

Therefore officers consider that the proposal, with the amended hours, is still acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1.	C38	Development in accordance with submitted plans
2.	D11	Hours of work: 1000 – 1730 hours Monday to Saturday No work on Sundays / Bank Holidays
3.	Custom	Personal Permission – restricted to applicant only
4.	Custom	Work experience – restricted to 1 student at any one time

**********ORIGINAL REPORT **********

WROCKWARDINE WOOD & TRENCH PARISH COUNCIL HAS REQUESTED THIS APPLICATION BE DETERMINED BY PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Impact on residential amenities, highway matters relating to car parking, Noise, business operating from a residential area.

THE PROPOSAL:
This full planning application seeks permission for the retention of a previous change of use of a domestic garage (Use class C3) to a dog grooming business (Sui Generis). A 1 year temporary permission was granted on 5th March 2008 however the business has continued to operate ever since. This application was submitted following the applicant receiving advice from the Council's Enforcement Officer and a permanent permission is now being sought.

The dog grooming business operates from a single detached garage which is located in the rear garden of No.80 Wombridge Road, Wrockwardine Wood. The flat roof structure constructed from masonry measures 2.8m x 5.2m x 2.4m in height and is finished in brickwork, felted roof and white upvc windows and doors and sits alongside the neighbouring boundary No.78.

The business is a relatively small scale operation operating from 0930 hours to 1630 hours daily with a single person operating the business and only one animal being groomed at any one time. There is sufficient on site parking for up to three vehicles and there is also off site parking available should it be needed at the end of the cul-de-sac which could be used for visitors, without having a detrimental impact to other highway users.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The application site, No.80 Wombridge Road, is situated towards the end of a cul-de-sac which forms part of a larger, well established residential estate. The property is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling finished in pale facing bricks, tile rendering, concrete interlocking roof tiles and white upvc windows and doors.

The property sits on a sizeable plot with spacious gardens to both front and rear enclosed by a mix of concrete block walling and 1.8m high close boarded timber fencing. To the side of the property is a long concrete driveway which provides on site parking for up to three vehicles and leads to the detached garage which is located in the rear garden, close to the neighbouring boundary with No.78. It is this flat roof structure, constructed from masonry, which forms the application site.

Neighbouring properties are of similar age but differ in size and design, being predominantly semi-detached properties or semi-detached dormer bungalows.
This part of Wombridge Road, being at the head of the cul-de-sac, is rather quiet with no apparent parking problems. Indeed the properties have generous on site parking and off site parking is also available at the end of the road should this be required, near to the pedestrian footbridge which crosses the A442 linking to the rest of Wombridge Road.

PLANNING HISTORY:
W2008/0025 - Change of use of domestic garage (C3 use) to dog grooming business (sui generis) - 1 year temporary permission granted (05/03/2008)

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
Local Development Framework – Core Strategy
CS2 Jobs
CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan
UD2 Design Criteria

National Planning Policy Frameworks (NPPF)

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:
Oakengates Town Council: No consultation response received

Highways:
No Objections

Geotechs:
Add Informative - I17 (Minerals Area)

A site notice and 15 direct neighbour letters have publicised this application.

7 anonymous objection letters have been received raising concerns regarding:

- Car Parking problems – Residents/family/friends experiencing difficulties finding car parking spaces, general increase in volumes of traffic.

- Noise – coming from vehicles, car radios, car doors being shut, dogs barking

- Unsuitable business for a residential area – a unit on an industrial estate would be better suited

- De-valuation of properties/less desirable

- Dog fouling – footpaths, alleyways and adjacent fields

4 letters of support have been received from No's 61, 65 and 82 Wombridge Road:

- No previous experience of traffic problems/driveways being blocked or difficulty in finding car parking spaces

- No previous experience of any significant undue noises associated with the business

- Business is low-key and discreet

In addition; a petition in favour of the business has been received which has been signed by 15 people from 12 of the immediate neighbouring properties.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:
This full planning application seeks permission for the retention of a previous change of use of a domestic garage (Use class C3) to a dog grooming business (Sui Generis). A 1 year temporary permission was granted on 5th March 2008 however the business has continued to operate ever since. This application was submitted following the applicant receiving advice from the Council's Enforcement Officer and a permanent permission is now being sought.

The dog grooming business operates from a single detached garage which is located in the rear garden of No.80 Wombridge Road, Wrockwardine Wood, alongside the neighbouring boundary with No.78. The flat roof structure constructed from masonry measures 2.8m x 5.2m x 2.4m in height providing approximately 14.5sq.m of floor space and is finished in brickwork, felted roofing and white upvc windows and doors.

The business is a relatively small scale operation operating from a small premise between 0930 hours to 1630 hours daily, with a single person operating and only one animal being groomed at any one time. The business is appointment based only and the comings and goings of customers are therefore monitored. There is sufficient parking both on site and off site for visitors without having a detrimental impact to other highway users.

The originally approved application granted the change of use for a 1 year period in order to assess the impact the business had on the immediate environment. Despite the business continuing to operate without planning permission since March 2009 for over 3 years, during this time neither the Planning Department nor Environmental Health have received any complaints relating to the business up until this new application was submitted. This would therefore suggest that the business has not had an adverse impact on residential amenity during the past four years. Whilst anonymous letters have been received objecting to this application, a petition has also been submitted in favour of the application with 12 of the immediate neighbouring properties having signed the form. This would again suggest that the majority of nearby neighbours have no objections to the business continuing to operate.

The Planning Case Officer has visited the site on several occasions during the processing of this application and on each occasion, it has been noted that there had not been any sign of highway related problems. Indeed it is considered that there is more than adequate on site and off site parking provisions without causing obstruction to highway users. Furthermore, the Council's Highways Officer has not raised any objections to this application.

In addition, Officers noted that there had not been any significant noise coming from the vicinity of the site and as the business only serves one customer at a time, it is unlikely for there to be any undue noise being created from the business and any noise which is created as a result of the business would not be significantly greater than any other property in this area.

Officers have taken the anonymous objection letters into consideration but are satisfied that the business does not have a significantly adverse impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, there are 15 neighbouring properties situated in the immediate area, towards the end of this cul-de-sac, all of which have been consulted on this application. Officer note that 12 of these properties have supported the application by signing the petition.

Policy CS2 of the LDF Core Strategy states that *"provision should be made to meet the needs of existing businesses"* and whilst this business is relatively modest the principle should still be applied.

The applicant has also expressed an interest to accommodate work experience students, who would like to receive such experience. Whilst officers do not object to this provision, a condition will be applied to ensure that only 1 student is offered work experience at any one time and are not to be employed by the business, in order to assist monitor the business and its potential expansion. Similarly, a condition will be attached reiterating the condition applied on the previous temporary approval, stating that the permission is for the benefit of the applicant only and when the applicant ceases the use, the building will be reinstated to its former use as a domestic garage.

The Local Planning Authority considers that the continued operations of the business will not significantly affect the amenities of nearby residential properties or the immediate area. There is sufficient on site and off site parking towards the end of the cul-de-sac without causing disruption to users of the highway. Due to the relatively small nature of the business and the restrictions it has for expansion, there will not be any significant undue noise and this established residential area will not be significantly affected. During the past four years since the business was established, neither the Planning Department nor Environmental Health have received any complaints relating to the business and therefore it is recommended that full, permanent permission is granted.

RECOMMENDATION : GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1.	C38	Development in accordance with submitted plans
2.	D11	Hours of work: 0930 – 1630 Monday to Saturday No work on Sundays / Bank Holidays
3.	Custom	Personal Permission – restricted to applicant only

4. Custom Work experience – restricted to 1 student at any one time

TWC/2012/0423 9 Bayswater Close, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9GY
Proposed two storey front extension and the conversion of the loft in to habitable space

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Metro Home Ltd	24/05/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
St. Georges and Priorslee	Priorslee

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: YES

MAIN ISSUES: Impact on residential amenity, street scene and on site parking provision

THE PROPOSAL:
This full planning application relates to the erection of a two storey front extension and the conversion of the attic to habitable space by creating a dormer in the west facing roof pitch. The proposed extensions would provide the dwelling with an extended lounge at ground floor level, a new master bedroom with en-suite at first floor level and a further two new rooms at second floor. All external materials for the proposed extension would match the existing ones.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
This is a two storey detached dwelling situated on a sizeable plot at the head of a cul-de-sac which forms part of a larger established residential area in Priorslee. The property sits on the largest plot of Bayswater Close and enjoys spacious amenity to the front and rear.

This is a modern four bed property finished in red facing bricks, painted render at first floor, concrete interlocking roof tiles and white upvc windows. An attached double garage sits to the side of the property with two car parking spaces available in front of the garage, providing a total of four on site car parking spaces.

Access to the property consists of a shared driveway which leads off Bayswater Close. This driveway is shared by No's 7, 8, 9 and 10 to provide access to the properties.

To the West of the property is a mature tree belt which provides privacy, amenity and acts as a buffer to the highway beyond. Neighbouring properties are of similar age, size and design with several properties having various forms of extensions. No.8, opposite has a detached double garage with a pitched roof which is situated alongside the applicant's front boundary.

PLANNING HISTORY:
W2003/1380 - Erection of a first floor extension over existing garage and erection of a single storey rear extension - Full Refused (12/01/2004)

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
National Planning Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
Policy UD2 – Design Criteria

LDF Core Strategy
Policy CS15 – Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

St Georges & Priorslee :
Object
The proposal would create over development of the site

Geotechs :
Support, Add I17 (Minerals Area)

Ecology :
Add Wildlife Informative I25k (Bats & Birds)

A site notice and 13 direct neighbour letters have publicised this application.

10 letters of objections have been received by the following neighbours at No's 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 14 Bayswater Close:

- Insufficient parking available / Impact on shared driveway access
- Overlooking/Loss of privacy (No.8)
- Out of character with neighbouring properties
- Concerns of impact on existing drainage provisions
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Setting a precedent for other neighbouring properties
- Devaluation of property values
- Disruption during construction – noise, dust, construction vehicles
- Requests for members to carry out a site visit

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:
This full planning application relates to the erection of a two storey front extension and the conversion of the attic to habitable space by creating a dormer in the west facing roof pitch. The proposed extensions would provide the dwelling with an extended lounge at ground floor level, a new master bedroom with en-suite at first floor level and a further two new rooms at second floor. All external materials for the proposed extension would match the existing ones.

The proposed two storey extension extends approximately 5m from the existing front elevation and will create a new gable end which will look out on to Bayswater Close. The proposed development will alter the existing access

in to the property, with the removal of the existing porch currently at the front of the property, with a new doorway in the new extension. The existing bay window serving the study room will be removed and relocated to serve the new extension which will provide views out on to the close.

Whilst the two storey element will provide greater floor space, the property sits on a spacious plot which can readily accommodate an extension of this size without a significant adverse impact on the existing amenity space. Neighbouring properties on this cul-de-sac are relatively spread out and the extension will be a minimum of 20.5m away from the nearest neighbouring property, No.8. This neighbouring dwelling is set at an angle to the application site and in between these two dwellings is a detached double garage with a pitched roof. Officers therefore consider that over the distance of 20.5m and with the neighbours' detached garage being positioned in this location, there will be no significant loss of privacy or light to either property as a result of the development. Other neighbouring properties will not be detrimentally affected as a result of this development as they are not facing the extension and are all located over 20m away.

The proposed loft conversion will require the installation of a dormer in the west facing roof pitch. Under permitted development it is possible to install a dormer in a detached property with a total floor space of 50m³ providing the materials match. Whilst the proposals will create a floor space of approximately 100m³, the dormer will look directly out on to the mature tree belt which lies between the residential area and the highway. No side windows are proposed and neighbouring properties will not be affected and similarly neither will the street scene be affected as this part of the development will not be readily visible.

Officers appreciate that the proposed development will turn the dwelling from a four bedroom property into a six bedroom property however, given the size of the existing property and the plot on which it stands; the proposals do not amount to overdevelopment.

The applicant intends to create a new parking space in front of the property, adjacent to the existing spaces and with the attached double garage. This in turn will provide a total of 5 on site parking spaces which is considered more than adequate for the dwelling. Officers therefore consider that the applicant will be able to comfortably park their vehicles on their own land without blocking the shared driveway or causing other highway related problems.

Officers have taken in to account the objections received from both the Parish Council and neighbouring properties. For reasons already explained, the Local Planning Authority disagrees with the Parish Council that the proposed development constitutes overdevelopment of the site. Officers have assessed the potential overlooking but are satisfied that mutual privacy can be achieved given the proposed two extension will be a minimum of over 20m away from neighbouring properties. Similarly, despite the creation of an additional three bedrooms, it is considered that the provision of five parking spaces is more than adequate for a seven bedroom property. The Council's drainage

engineers are not usually consulted on householder applications however if they consider proposals have the potential to affect the existing drainage provisions, this is brought to the attention of the planning officer. No objections have been raised by the drainage engineers relating to this application.

Having assessed other neighbouring properties in this residential area of Priorslee, it is clear that the precedent for such extensions has already been set and this is not therefore a cause for concern.

Finally, matters relating to any potential impact on property values or disruption caused during the construction of the proposed works are civil matters and should not be considered as part of this application. Most development causes some degree of disruption and possible inconvenience to those living nearby. Had the development constituted permitted development (and hence not required planning permission and no contact with the planning department) the delivery of materials, construction vehicles and so on would still be delivered to the site. Because of this, it is not considered necessary in this instance to condition the management of the site, however an informative will be applied to advise the applicant to be considerate of neighbours' need to access their properties without undue difficulty. However, officers note that irrespective of who owns what section of the shared driveway, the applicant has a right of access leading directly from Bayswater Close to the front of their property which would allow for deliveries of materials, parking of construction vehicles. However, as previously stated these are civil matters between the neighbours of the cul-de-sac and are not matters for the determination of this planning application.

The design of the overall development is considered to be acceptable and compliant with policies UD2 of the Wrekin Local plan and CS7 of the Core Strategy. Whilst the aspect of the dwelling will differ to its existing form, the design is in keeping with the existing dwelling as well as the neighbouring properties on this cul-de-sac. The use of matching materials and similar roof pitch will allow the development to be in character with the immediate area and although the street scene will alter, officers consider this will not be to its detriment.

Officers consider this application to be acceptable. The design of the extension is in keeping with the character of this residential area and will not have a significantly adverse impact on immediate neighbouring properties in terms of any undue overlooking, loss of light or any overbearing impact. Sufficient amenity space will be retained as well as ample on site parking provisions. The street scene will alter however this will not be to its detriment. Accordingly, the application complies with policies UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan and CS7 of the Core Strategy and should therefore be approved with conditions.

RECOMMENDATION : GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

A03	Time Limit
C01	Matching Materials
C39	Development in accordance to submitted plans
Informative I17	Minerals Area
Informative I25k	Bats & Birds
Custom Informative	Site Management

TWC/2012/0472 Southwater Square, Southwater Way, Telford Town Centre, Telford, Shropshire
Erection of a mixed use building incorporating First Point (A2), Library (D1), restaurants and cafes (A3) and flexible office space (A2 & B1) for a range of community, voluntary or public sector uses and associated public realm (Reserved Matters Application)

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Telford & Wrekin Council	18/06/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
Great Dawley	Malinslee

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: No.

MAIN ISSUES:
Regeneration, impacts on Town Centre, scale, mass and design, and public realm and landscape.

THE PROPOSAL:
The application is for Reserved Matters Approval for the erection of the Council's new Community Hub building and associated public realm enhancements at Southwater Square, Telford Town Centre. The proposal comprising 4965 sq m of gross floorspace will provide:

- Development Use Classes Order D1 comprising a library and the Borough of Telford & Wrekin Council's first point services – 3910 sq m
- Classes A3/4 units at ground floor to house food and drink – 625 sq m
- Landscaping and associated works

The Reserved Matters submitted relate to Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale. The building comprises a five storey structure located on the south side of Southwater Square with active frontages to both Southwater Square and the reformed Southwater Lake. A multi-purpose entrance foyer, two cafés/restaurants and general services will be located at ground floor.

The main entrance foyer will accommodate quick library services, quick First Point services, tourist information and informal seating area that could possibly link into the café area that adjoins this area.

The first floor is completely given over to the provision of library services and various IT terminals and display areas.

The second floor is the location for the main Council First Point services including a number of dedicated meeting and interview rooms and will provide customer services, benefits, housing, planning, public protection, CAB, economy and skills, PCT, Family Connect and adult services.

At third floor, an open plan area will house the Council's Contact Centre. The top floor will house the building's plant.

A temporary library is to be provided for the period between demolition of the existing library and the expected opening of the Community Hub and library facility in 2014.

The public realm works extend from Southwater Way and the start of the route to the shopping centre across the Southwater Lake to the east of the lake. All external public space is designed to be publicly accessible with vehicular access being restricted within the main square to disabled drop off, emergency vehicles and delivery access.

Planning permission has now been obtained for a cinema (Cineworld Operator) and four class A3/A4 retail units that will be located in a five storey block to the northwest of the site and which will also front Southwater Square on its western side. Permission has also been obtained for the erection of a hotel (Premier Inn operator) and three Class A3/A4 units which will be located on the eastern side of Southwater Square, again a five storey building. These developments are proposing to connect to a district heating system (Combined Heat and power energy centre) to provide a sustainable source of heating and hot water. This energy centre is being undertaken by Telford and Wrekin Council and forms part of the proposals to refurbish the Ice rink and subject to a separate application.

A shared surface 'Main Street' is proposed to run through from the TIC to the east through to Southwater Square. This is accessible to service and emergency vehicles only, although the route is designed to accommodated bus services on a one way basis, east to west with access of St Quentin's Gate and egress onto Southwater Way. This 'Main Street' will provide servicing access to the hotel, cinema. Servicing to the Hub will be from Southwater Way

Planning permission has also already been granted for the erection of an 8 level Multi Storey Car Park located to the north of the Square with access from Coach Central. The facility is to provide a total of 604 spaces, including 25 disabled spaces and 12 parent/child spaces, 10 motor cycle spaces and 26 cycle spaces. The structure also includes one/two flexible use units which fronts Southwater Square, and management office space within the building. This aspect of the proposal takes account of the proposed infrastructure changes to the Box Road. In addition, a replacement surface car park is to be located between the MSCP and Meeting Point House comprising of 27 spaces including 2 disabled spaces to service Meeting Point House.

BACKGROUND:
Outline planning permission was granted for a mixed use development on the wider Southwater Master plan Area in June 2010. The application site is located within the north-western area of the wider Southwater area. The master plan agreed on the outline application split the area into 12 Development Zones with a specified mix of uses within each zone and parameters for maximum building sizes in terms of footprint and height. Minor

revisions to some of these parameters were subsequently approved as non-material amendments.

The application site includes land within zones 1, 2 and 5 of the masterplan, although the Hub itself will be located within zone 1. As the design of the scheme has progressed, there have been a number of modifications made to the layout, land use and design principles from that detailed and approved at outline stage, due to policy changes with the adoption of CTAAP and following market testing to ensure deliverability of the scheme. These changes (which have now been agreed as part of subsequent applications above) include subtle changes to The Square at Southwater, modification of access arrangements to reflect changes to building forms and changes to the lake. However the design and land uses proposed at The Hub are broadly in accordance with the overall master plan.

This application is the third of three to be submitted this year for the Southwater scheme. The first involved the cinema and hotel (TWC/2012/0008 and the second involved the extension and refurbishment of the ice rink, new play barn and new restaurant at frontage of the bingo hall (TWC/2012/0085).

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
The application site is just over 2 hectares and is located in central Telford, south of Telford shopping centre. The site is designated as the Town Centre Character Area within the Central Telford Area Action Plan (CTAAP). The site is currently vacant having been prepared for development in relation to the engineering application, which included the draining of Southwater Lake.

The site lies within the Town Centre core. To the north of the site lie is the main shopping area, which is accessed through an enclosed bridge link, and also forms part of the shopping centre. The bus station is located to the North West of the site, further along Coach Central. Immediately to the east of the site is the existing Meeting Point House, bingo and bowling and ice rink facilities, beyond that is the recently extended Telford International Centre, (works undertaken in accordance with the outline master plan). To the south of the site is the former Southwater lake which has been drained and engineering works have been undertaken, along with part of the site in preparation of development within Southwater; beyond that is Telford Town Park, with more formal garden, play facilities and new visitor centre as the closest facilities to the site. To the west are two substantial retail units, and the former Toybox crèche, (which was subject to an application for a new retail unit approved recently at Plans Board). Beyond these retail units is the Brown Elm surface car park.

Vehicle access to the site is gained from Coach Central and Southwater Way, via Malinslee roundabout. In addition there is pedestrian access along an east/west axis between TIC and Brown Elm Car Park. On the north/south

axis, a pedestrian route follows between the shopping centre and Town Park, and is currently diverted around the engineering area.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
W2009/0914 - Outline planning application with means of access (part) for a mixed use development comprising Offices and Civic offices (B1a/sui generis); Residential (C3) (up to 330 units); Retail, Cafes/Restaurants, Financial and Professional Services, Drinking Establishments (A1,A2,A3,A4); Learning and Media Centre (to include the replacement of Meeting Point House), Leisure Pool, Cinema, Hotels, Energy Centres, Conference and Event facilities including outdoor events space and a Medical Centre (C1, D1, D2 and sui generis); associated landscape improvements to the public realm, replacement and construction of Southwater Lake, boundary treatment and new and reconfigured access; construction of basement, undercroft, surface and multi storey car parking; and all associated and ancillary works. Retention, refurbishment and extension of the existing ice rink building and extension to bowling and bingo building. Retention of existing hotels (the Holiday Inn and International Hotel) and Event Centre, Outline Granted, 17/06/2010.

TWC/2010/0446 - Engineering operations comprising foul and surface water drainage works and the draining of Southwater lake, earthworks to facilitate a Main Street and new Southwater lake, demolition of Spout Farm House and the Town Park Ranger Base, Highways improvements to existing and reconfigured accesses, replacement and creation of surface car parking, landscaping, retaining structures and all associated and ancillary works, Full Granted, 28/10/2010.

TWC/2011/0037 - Provision of public realm improvements to facilitate a new main street, new public squares and access to include street furniture, CCTV, lighting, flagpoles, boundary treatments, landscape improvements and water features and associated and ancillary works, Full Granted, 10/03/2011.

TWC/2012/0008 – 11 screen cinema, 82 bed hotel, Three class A3/4 units of 372. sq.m. Four class A3/A4 units of 325 sq.m., Multi storey car park (MSCP) providing 604 spaces and class A1/A2/A3/B1 of 186 sq.m. within the MSCP, Replacement surface level car park, Public realm improvements, and Associated highway works. Full Granted 8/3/2012

TWC/2012/0085 - Refurbishment of Telford Ice Rink including extensions to front and side to accommodate a new soft play area, rear extension for the future energy centre and new front entrance to the Ice Rink restaurant. Full Granted 2/4/2012

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
National Planning Policy Guidance March 2012
Paragraphs 17,18, 19, 23, 35, 56,57, 61 63, 69, 70, 95 and 96.

Importantly, the NPPF has introduced a “presumption in favour of sustainable development”. Developments that accord with an up-to-date Development Plan should be approved.

Joint Shropshire and Telford and Wrekin Structure Plan 1996-2011 represents the strategic planning framework pending replacement by the LDF; it is however dated, but contains “saved” policies that are considered relevant to the consideration of this proposal. The Plan outlines a strategy that seeks to:

- Conserve resources and the environment by reducing reliance on car travel and length of journey, fostering bio-diversity and the conservation of natural resources
- Improve the quality of life by: protecting the natural and cultural assets of the area; improve employment prospects; and tackle levels of deprivation
- Achieve a sustainable environment by careful location of development; improve access and maximise use of previously developed land and existing infrastructure; and
- Foster a prosperous economy, support for the rural economy and encourage inward investment

The saved policy of relevance to this proposal includes:

- Policy 31 Sustainable Transport Strategy

The Wrekin Local Plan (1995-2006) – This Plan together with the above Structure Plan form part of the ‘Development Plan’ (along with the Core Strategy) The Structure and Local Plans however are becoming increasingly dated and they are currently being superseded by LDF documents. However the “saved” policies of the Local Plan (some 88 in total) will continue to have weight in the determination of planning applications for the time being.

Relevant Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
EH7 – Land Contamination
EH8 – Remedial Action on Contaminated Land
EH14 – Land Stability
UD2 – Design Criteria
UD4 – Landscape Design
UD5 – Public Art

Local Development Framework Core Strategy (CS)
Telford Core Strategy -The Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) was adopted in December 2007 and is the key strategic LDF document that sets out the vision and spatial development strategy for the area and for subsequent DPDs to follow.

CS4 – Central Telford
CS8 – Regeneration
CS9 – Accessibility and Social Inclusion
CS10 – Community Facilities
CS12 – Natural Environment
CS13 – Environmental Resources

CS14 – Cultural, Historic and Built Environment
CS15 – Urban Design

LDF Central Telford Area Action Plan:
TC1 – Town Centre Core
SA2 – Southwater
CT1 – Mixed Use
CT2 – Retail
CT3 – Employment
CT6a – Leisure, Culture and Tourism
CT6b – Establishing the Evening and Night time economy
CT6c – Managing the Evening and Night-time Economy
CT7 – Greyhound Link
CT8 – Box Road
CT9 – Other Highway Network Improvements
CT10 – Parking
CT12 – Public Transport
CT14 – Environmentally sustainable buildings
CT15 - Design
CT17 – Public Realm
CT18 – Storey Heights and Tall Buildings
CT19 – Biodiversity
CT20 – Landscaping
CT23 – Developer Contributions for Delivering Infrastructure

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Greater Dawley Parish Council:
No comment (no objections)

Drainage Section (TWC):
Recommend conditions of drainage.

Sustainability Section (TWC):
It is disappointing to note that the Hub has been downgraded from BREEAM 'Excellent' to BREEAM 'Very Good'. However, the Hub's revised sustainability credentials adhere to CTAAP Policy stipulations of:

CT14 - Environmentally sustainable buildings
Development proposals within Central Telford will be required to demonstrate their environmental sustainability as part of planning applications.
At minimum, residential development proposals of 15 dwellings or more should achieve Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) Level 3, and non-residential development greater than 1000sqm should achieve BREEAM 'Very Good' standard. Mixed use proposals
that include residential and non-residential uses should exceed these minimum standards where they fall above these thresholds. As Building Regulation standards increase towards achieving zero carbon development, residential proposals will be expected to meet the corresponding higher CSH levels.

Proposals that include non-residential uses and fall above the 1000sqm threshold (including mixed use development), should incorporate on-site renewable energy generation to meet at least 10% of the development's anticipated energy demand. Such proposals should be accompanied by a statement that demonstrates that the viability of incorporating decentralised renewable energy systems has been considered. This should include consideration of connection of the development to off-site renewable energy systems.
Innovative examples of environmental sustainability will be encouraged, supported, and expected of development proposals, particularly within the Town Centre Character Area.

Based upon CTAAP policy the application meets requirements.

Severn Trent Water Ltd:
No objection subject to condition. This requires approval of drainage proposals – this is covered by the outline permission.

West Mercia Police:
I advise on this application as Crime Prevention Design Advisor for West Mercia Police. From previous meetings and discussions it has been agreed that The Hub building will be built to the standard of Secured By Design a crime prevention initiative owned by The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). I look forward to receiving a Secured By Design Application in respect of The Hub building in due course.

Shropshire Fire Service:
No objections subject to informatives

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

Principle of redevelopment:
The Core Strategy's long term development vision will see the transformation of Telford's centre into an 18 hour, seven days a week focal point for recreation, leisure, and cultural services and facilities. It will provide new jobs, new opportunities and new wealth, to transform the image and perceptions of Telford. This is supported by policy CS 4, which states that Central Telford area will be the main focus for major housing, employment, retail, recreation, leisure service and mixed development by creating more shops, offices, cafes and restaurants, sports, recreation and leisure. Accommodating a mix of uses to encourage people into the town at different times of night and day, making the area an easier, safer and more pleasant place to walk and reduce impact of the car and enhance the role of the Town Park is a key feature of this scheme and is fully compliant with Core Strategy policies.

The Central Telford Area Action Plan expands this vision and policies of the Core Strategy for the Town Centre, where the vision has been refined and bolstered so that the town centre and notably the Southwater area provides a vibrant, sustainable, commercial and cultural heart for the town that looks, feels and functions like an identifiable Town Centre, rather than the present indoor shopping centre focus.

The application site is a vital component to delivering this vision as it is located within the Town Centre core. Any scheme here is important to establishing a heart to the town – in terms of ambitions, it is clear that development is expected to be characterised by more intense, mixed use activity.

The proposal is for a vital community hub building that will replace the Council's Civic building in terms of the Council's front facing First Point service provision as well as the town centre Library. It will contain ancillary café/restaurant facilities. It is viewed as entirely complementary to the recently approved, cinema, hotel, shops, bars and restaurants all of which are supported by a proposed multi storey car park. The proposal is in accordance with the uses allocated within Policy SA2 of CTAAP. Specifically, developments at Central Southwater are expected to demonstrate that they will create an area of vibrant mixed uses, establish a high quality public square and improve visual and physical connections with the Town Park, Telford International Centre and existing shopping centre. The proposal includes part of the proposed Southwater Square and incorporates clear pedestrian links to the Town Park, Shopping Centre and Main Street leisure and recreational facilities.

The scale and quantum of development proposed is in accordance with the outline masterplan (as amended) for the large Southwater development which secured outline planning permission in June 2010. Members will recall that the Highways Agency supported the scheme at the outline stage provided development had an upper cap on quantum of development being discharged onto the local highway network. This proposal complies with these requirements fully.

This proposal represents the redevelopment of a predominantly brownfield site, within an urban area, with good access to public transportation. The land is currently under utilised and the proposal provides the opportunity to create a vibrant mixed used scheme in accordance with NPPF ambitions to ensure the vitality of the town centre, building a strong and competitive economy, promoting sustainable transport, requiring good design and promoting healthy communities.

In terms of local policy, the town centre location of the development site meets the aspirations of both the Development Plan (including the Wrekin Local Plan and Core Strategy) and CTAAP.

In terms of accessibility the town centre location is ideal for this type of development providing the design of the scheme contributes to the creation of

the strategic linkages as set out in CTAAP. In terms of uses, the proposal is predominantly community/civic focused in line with the allocation (Policy SA2) for the site within CTAAP. The proposed uses support Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy which identifies the need to develop a 'cultural quarter' within Telford town centre. In addition, the supporting text to Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy recognises that key services and other infrastructure should be located within town centres not only because this is the most sustainable location but also because it helps maximise opportunities for social inclusion.

CTAAP aims to improve the town centre leisure, cultural and tourism offer, through Policy CT6a. The Southwater location is suitable for such development, as long as they are located in central Southwater and contribute to improving linkages between Southwater, the existing shopping area and Telford Town Park. This development will also contribute to improving connections and increase activity between areas of the town centre thus contributing in turn to further enhance town centre vibrancy. Members will note the Police's views on this site. It is considered that the scheme has sought to design out the potential for crime. There is good surveillance from buildings and there is a well integrated footway network with a well lit environment and protected by CCTV measures.

It is considered that the principle of redevelopment of this site for a mixed use centre is in accordance with planning policies and guidance in NPPF, the Wrekin Local Plan, Core Strategy and CTAAP.

Layout, scale and design:
The layout of the Hub is influenced by a number of factors including its function within the heart of this new Southwater Core community, the need to respond to the newly formed Southwater Square, Main Street, Southwater Lake, the Town Park and the Shopping Centre. Importantly, the building has to respond to the site's positioning at an intersection of a number of disparate streets that converge on to Southwater Square at this point. The design comprises four interlinked floor plates linked by a large central atrium that provides the opportunity to create large open plan internal spaces with all services (lifts, welfare facilities, services etc) located on two flanks within the building. Escalators transport people to the various floors and has been designed within the central atrium. The external elevational treatment is contemporary comprising a brick base and a lighter metal cladding to the upper floors. A softening of the edges to the building is achieved through the curving of the corners to the structure. The design is unique in that the floor plates at each level pivots to provide a series of 'building lines' at the upper levels which helps create differing overhangs.

In an effort to bleed the building into the Town Park, the design utilises the slope in the land and the building appears to extend into the Town Park. The architects explain that the choice of brickwork colouring (predominantly blue) and the non-standard size helps root the building into the landscape. The non-standard brickwork also includes curved "specials" to help achieve the curved design. The upper floors are clad in a lighter coloured metal cladding, punctured with deep recessed windows and vertical louvers. At ground floor

there is a large expanse of glazed curtain walling that provides the transparency necessary to fulfil the building's function as a public space.

Interestingly, there is a direct access from the Town Park into the Library. The fourth top floor which contains the building's plant has been designed to be consistent with the remainder of the building, with the use of metal cladding and louvers – the plant is set back from the façade in order to reduce its mass and to allow the sky to be seen.

Clearly Southwater Square is the key public space within Southwater and will represent the arrival point from the convergence of Main Street, Southwater Way, and routes from the Shopping Centre to the north and Town Park to the south. The Square is the central node of the entire development and will be constructed using the highest specification and quality of hard and soft materials to ensure durability. The Square includes seating areas and tree planting whilst leaving a larger flexible space for general occasional events.

Southwater Lake has been redesigned from its original concept. This occupies a prominent position at the transition from the Town to the Town Park thereby providing the opportunity for blurring the boundaries and introducing an area of semi-natural green space hard up against the urban edge. An "urban beach" is provided at the Lake's northern edge, which is intended to be a visitor destination and will also function both as a circulation space and to provide a softened southern edge. The Lake itself incorporates a curved edge and provides a green corridor pedestrian link along its western edge that leads back into Southwater Square to the north and to the proposed Pocket Park and Town Park proper to the south-east.

The hard landscaping materials, street furniture and lighting will be important components in the scheme. The palette of materials for the square, the urban beach and associated access approach routes are viewed as important and will be expressed through the use of high quality natural stone, clay or concrete materials. Lighting will include functional lighting (columns, bollards, along the streets and paths) but also will include feature low level lighting – edges to steps, retaining walls and to emphasise materials transition and hard edges, tree up lights etc. Throughout, the attention to detail has been paramount

It is considered that the scale, mass and design of the proposed hub will provide the necessary focal point for Southwater. The design of the hub is contemporary and applies exciting contemporary and high quality architecture with the use of the highest specification of materials; its appearance is informed by the form and function of the building and the interaction with the adjacent public realm and is acceptable. In terms of its impact and contribution to the functioning of the new Southwater Square, it will assist in creating an attractive and distinctive place with well connected spaces. The building will be well integrated and will preserve active frontages to the important square and lake fronting elevations.

In conclusion, the development alongside other recent permissions for the hotel and multi-screen cinema will create a vibrant mixed use area. The design and appearance of the development is in keeping with Policy CT15 of CTAAP, as it creates an attractive, distinctive and recognisable place within the Town Centre. The use of high quality and contemporary materials and architecture, is fit for purpose and officers consider that they are attractive and create attractive and well connected streets and squares. Moreover, the increase in the height of the building will help create a very distinctive and unique appearance and skyline, which in turn will help create a clear and recognisable Town Centre, in accordance with policy CT18 of CTAAP. The proposed development will help support the Council's ambitions to create a "rich cultural fabric" through the creation of a vibrant quarter and night time economy in Telford Town Centre. In addition, the design assists in creating and sustaining safe places, which strengthen local identity and is likely to have a positive influence on the local environment in accordance with policies CS14 and CS15 of the Core Strategy and UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

Public realm and landscaping:
Development must conform to the principles set out in the CT17 Public Realm. Following the grant of outline planning permission for the Southwater Master plan, there was a full application submitted for the public realm works to create Southwater Square, and Lake together with the introduction of a 'Main Street'. A part of the ongoing review of the proposals, and given the changes to the locations of building and associated uses, it was considered appropriate to review the design of the public realm and landscaping. A design guide was drafted to accord with the Council's vision to create a contemporary, flexible and functional urban space at the heart of Southwater, with accessibility for all users and robust palette of materials which are contemporary, high quality and low maintenance, to create a suitable transition to the Town Park.

The principles associated with the creation of the Southwater Square were approved as part of the hotel and cinema proposals. This proposal seeks to retain and build upon the design principles stated in the supporting documents for the previous applications.

The new proposed space creates a clear street and square relationship, provides a more usable events space. 'Market Street' will provide a clear link from the existing shopping centre and new MSCP to the new Southwater Square. The ground levels restaurants and bars in both the cinema and hotel and the Hub itself will create an active frontage and lively square. The overhanging nature of the Hub building also creates a covered terrace to part of the street with the materials seeming to flow into the building from the Square.

Southwater Square itself is a square within a square, which will create a flexible space with a shared surface that can accommodate one-way vehicular traffic, which is restricted to public transport, taxis and servicing requirements, but also capable of accommodating small local events and major gatherings

on special occasion. This differential in uses of spaces is to be defined through the use of materials.

The scheme has been designed around pedestrian movements, to ensure safe and easy access, with clearly defined links to surrounding uses and to the Lake and Town Park.

A landscape management plan is being prepared for the wider Southwater area, to ensure effective management; the applicants are preparing to submit this with the Southwater community hub application. A condition on this application is considered sufficient to ensure that long term management is undertaken and the scheme accords with policy CT20 of CTAAP.

In conclusion it is considered that the design of the public realm conforms with policies CT17, CT19, CT6c of CTAAP, policy CS9 of the core strategy and policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan by supporting pedestrian priority streets, providing attractive streets and spaces which are integral of the development design, of good high quality, with good lighting and public art.

Highways:
Members will be aware that planning permission exists for the creation of a 604 space multi storey car park. A parking accumulation exercise has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed multi storey car park will meet the needs required by the scale of the proposed development. The Council's Highways Engineer is satisfied that this level of parking provision is acceptable for the amount of development proposed by this scheme and others

Access for servicing is proposed via Southwater Way and this is considered acceptable. A traffic impact assessment has been undertaken, the results show that the junctions will operate within acceptable levels for the first year and some improvement schemes may be necessary to enable the highway network to operate with the planned committed development traffic. The development will only have a slight impact on the highway network. This development is well within the quantum of development envisaged for Southwater in the outline permission.

The application site clearly has good links to the existing bus station and long term access to public transport will be further improved, with bus routes proposed to use Main Street, which runs through Southwater Square. The proposal is therefore considered to conform with policy CT12 as the scheme includes measures to improve bus journey times and additional bus stops.

The site also has good pedestrian access east-west and improved north-south access with a new proposed link to Coach Central. The proposal is therefore considered to conform to CT13 of CTAAP, with improved access to and form the Town Centre and a high quality pedestrian and cycle network are to be created. The hotel, cinema and multi storey car park included the creation of secure cycle parking.

Sustainability:
It was anticipated at outline stage that BREEAM “Excellent” standard would be achieved for the then proposed Media and Learning Centre. The application is supported by a Sustainable Energy Strategy; however the Council’s Sustainability Officer has reminded that Excellent standard was originally intended but is satisfied that the proposals meet CTAAP Policy CT14 The building has been designed with an emphasis on orientation and passive control of the building fabric to minimise the need for mechanical and electrical systems. Enhanced thermal insulation, larger reveals or setbacks in areas of high solar gain, passive shading and the use of the natural stack effect all contribute to moderate energy consumption. The high atrium within the building’s central core will provide natural lighting. The building uses a mixed-mode ventilation strategy in addition to mechanical ventilation utilising windows to deliver fresh air that then rises through the building by means of the natural buoyancy effect of the atrium, before being exhausted out via the louvers at fourth floor. Highly efficient plant is utilised with efficient heat recovery systems. For hot water requirements, the building will tap in to the district heating system. The building incorporates areas of green roof.

Officers are satisfied that the development proposal demonstrates environmental sustainability as per the requirements of Policy CT14.

Members are reminded that the outline conditions were imposed to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Some of these conditions have already been discharged and yet further conditions are discharged by virtue of this application. In particular the following Conditions have been discharged either previously by way of submissions or through this application: 3 (Access); 4 (Parametersas amended by non-material amendment) (change of height parameters); 5 (Reserved Matters); 6. (Size); 7. (Use); 15. (Ecology – already discharged); 19. (Site Wide Energy Strategy) (already discharged); 20. (Energy Efficiency) (Condition is discharged by virtue of the scheme proposals). 24. (Design & Access Statement) 36 (Phasing) (already discharged).

Conclusion:
The principle of development of this site was established by the outline master plan for the wider Southwater area, which was granted in June 2010 for mixed use development, including leisure uses and public realm. The proposals as submitted meet the aspirations and vision for Southwater.

The proposal will assist in delivering leisure, cultural and tourism uses, which are currently lacking within the Town Centre and will contribute to achieving a vibrant mixed use town centre, in line with policies within CTAAP. In addition to meeting policy requirements the development will bring regeneration benefits through the redevelopment of this underutilised brownfield site, employment benefits, sustainability benefits and community benefits.

As an application to approve Reserved Matters, the proposals have been fully considered and assessed to be in accordance with guidance in NPPF, the

RSS, the Core Strategy policies, including the Area Action Plan and Wrekin Local Plan policies.

The proposed building is of suitable scale, mass and design, which respects and responds positively to the site context and surrounding environment and meets the Urban Design policies contained within the adopted Wrekin Local Plan, Core Strategy and CTAAP. The site layout creates and reinforces pedestrian linkages to produce a safe and secure environment in accordance with the urban design policies in CTAAP and the Wrekin Local Plan. The traffic movements generated by the development can be accommodated without detriment to the highway safety. The layout also benefits from adequate car parking provision and bike storage provision, granted previously.

The development includes the creation of new public realm to complement the new building and create links. This includes tree planting and landscaping and the provision of a new small park.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT RESERVED MATTERS APPROVAL subject to the following conditions:

1. A02 Time Limit Full
2. C38 Development in accordance with plan numbers

Informatives

I06 This Approval is linked to the outline Section 106 agreement
I32 Fire Authority
I40 Conditions
I43 Reason for grant of permission

REASON FOR GRANT OF PERMISSION:
The proposed redevelopment has been fully considered and assessed to be in accordance with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Core Strategy policies and Wrekin Local Plan policies.

The proposed building is of suitable scale, mass and design, which respects and responds positively to the site context and surrounding environment and meets the Urban Design policies contained within the adopted Wrekin Local Plan and Core Strategy. The site layout creates and reinforces pedestrian linkages to produce a safe and secure environment in accordance with the urban design policies in the Core Strategy and Wrekin Local Plan. The traffic movements generated by the development can be accommodated without detriment to the highway safety.
The development includes the creation of new public realm to complement the new building and create links. This includes tree planting and landscaping.

TWC/2012/0362 4 Little Meadow Close, Admaston, Telford, Shropshire, TF5 0DN
Erection of a 2no. storey side extension and garage conversion

APPLICANT	**RECEIVED**
Mr Ali Mahomed	04/05/2012

PARISH	**WARD**
Wrockwardine	Wrockwardine

THIS APPLICATION WAS CONSIDERED BY MEMBERS OF PLANS BOARD ON THE 11TH JULY AND DEFFERED FOR A SITE VISIT.

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Parking, scale and impact on amenity

THE PROPOSAL: This application seeks consent to extend a two-storey detached, hipped roof dwelling with a two storey side extension, conversion and alterations of garage to a study and extension to porch. The extension will provide the dwelling with a bedroom and ensuite at ground floor and bedroom and ensuite at first floor.

Consent is sought to enclose and extend the existing canopy area to create a porch. It would measure by 0.8m by 4.25m. The porch will be extended to meet with the width of the main entrance door by construction of a flat roof, two roof lights and glass screening.

The two-storey side extension will measure 4.6m wide and 6.8m deep. It will measure 5.2m to the eaves and 8.16m to the existing ridgeline.

The conversion of the garage into the study will include the replacement of an existing garage door with a second entrance door.

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS
This property is a 1990's detached dwelling, located within the urban area of Telford. Little Meadow Close is accessed off Meadow Dale Drive in Admaston. The area is predominantly residential surrounded with houses of a similar style and scale.

The application property is orientated in its position so that its front elevation faces south west, whereas the neighbouring bungalow (number 6) faces directly North West.

The two-storey dwelling provides a front driveway, a double garage to the side and parking provision for 5 cars as well as a conservatory at the rear. External materials consist of red facing bricks, concrete roof tiles and white upvc windows.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES
Wrockwardine Parish Council: object: We consider that the impact of this extension would be particularly injurious to the immediate neighbouring property and there are concerns that the loss of a garage combined with the fact that the applicant is using the property to carry on a business from this property with the potential of visiting clients along with the number of occupants who will have the potential to be car owners will inevitably lead to increased on street parking. This property was originally designed as a five bed roomed property making it the largest of its type on this small development. The proposals would greatly increase its visual impact to the detriment of the development as a whole.
Although not a planning consideration, the Borough Council needs to be aware that there is a covenant on this property which prevents it being used for commercial purposes. Any enforcement of this covenant would not be a matter of the planning authority but we believe that the planning authority should not grant any permission which would invite litigation.
Geotechs

Ecology: No objection subject to Informatives

11 Neighbours have objected on the following grounds:

- Property being used as a business
- On street parking
- Existing covenant on the property that prevents it being used as a commercial property
- Overdevelopment
- Highway danger
- 3 families live in the house instead of 1 contrary to the covenant
- Out keeping
- Lack of site notice/consultation

PLANNING HISTORY
C96/0025, residential development , granted under New Towns Act 25th March 1997.

POLICY CONTEXT;
National Policy
Planning Policy Framework

Core Strategy:
CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan:
UD2 Design Criteria

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
This application relates to the erection of a two storey side extension, porch extension and the conversion of garage into a study.

It is considered that the size of the overall two-storey side extension is not disproportionate in relation to the existing dwelling nor is it out of scale with the existing plot. Although houses located within Little Meadow Close have not extended in a similar way, officers do not consider the proposed extension would visually harm the street scene. In regards to the porch extension officers have considered the flat roof element and deem such a design could be improved, but not sufficient to warrant a refusal. Having said that the proposed extensions will be built using matching materials, plans show that the extension has incorporated existing features such a hipped roof, cills and lintels in accordance with policies UD2 and CS15. In addition officers must emphasise that majority of the porch area (3sq.m) could be built under permitted development which would not require the need for planning permission.

The north elevation will feature a side facing window; however views into the rear of number 6 will be avoided by 1.8m high existing boundary treatment. To ensure no overlooking is created the LPA recommend the decision is conditioned with a no additional windows condition.

By reason of the sites orientation and layout as well as a 12m separation distance between number 4 and principle windows that serve number 6, the extension is not believed to be overbearing. Officers note that the extension may create a loss of light when the sun reaches its southern point, however officers do not consider the loss to be significant. To the rear of number 6 situates a conservatory, officers are aware that the conservatory may experience a modest loss of light however having said this, the room is not a principle room that can be protected. The Council acknowledge the conservatory links with the existing dining and living room, although this room is served by three principle north facing windows and therefore receives a sufficient degree of natural daylight.

The LPA have acknowledged that the extension may affect the amount of light entering properties located in north east. However the LPA consider the loss would occur early to late evening for a short period of time prior to the sun setting. Therefore officers deem the loss to be modest that would not have an adverse affect on occupier’s right to light.

Further to above, it is worth pointing out that the property retains its full permitted development rights. Therefore, the applicant could erect a single or two-storey rear extension and create the same number of bedrooms without the need for planning consent, albeit not adjacent the road or forward of the front of the house. By virtue of the existing ground levels and limited control over the appearance of a PD extension, the LPA believe a extension built under PD could appear more prominent and harmful to the extension than is being proposed.

Given the PD fall back position, on balance the application is considered acceptable. The design of the overall development is considered to be acceptable, being in-keeping with the existing property and the neighbouring

dwellings. Officers have considered neighbouring objections in regards to parking however the dwelling will continue to provide 3 spaces on the drive and 1 in the garage therefore officers do not consider the development will have a detrimental impact on existing parking provisions. The LPA note that this dwelling will become a 7 bedroom house however must also stress that Parking Standards contained in the Wrekin Plan were not saved. However having said this, those standards required 3 parking spaces to be allocated for a four bedroom house or more. Therefore officers do not consider this reason would justify a refusal.

Officers acknowledge neighbouring concerns with cars parking on the street however this is a civil matter which cannot have any bearing when making a planning decision. Neighbours have also said that they suspect a business is being run from 4 Little Meadow; the agent has stated that the applicant is an accountant who intends to use the study as an office. The study would allow the applicant to continue to work form home more comfortably. In light of this use there does not appear to be any evidence to suggest that this use is a use that would require planning permission, however an enforcement officer will be asked to investigate further.

Neighbours state that prior to occupation of the dwellings at Little Meadow the signing of a covenant was required. Although the convent is a legal agreement, it is one that is separate to a planning that cannot be given any material weight when considering a planning application. Therefore the Council advise those concerned seek legal advice in order to conclude this matter.

Neighbours have raised concerns with the Councils failure to put up a site notice and consult all properties within Little Meadow Close. In light of these comments the LPA emphasise that the LPA consulted adjoining neighbours completely in accordance with Part 2 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010.

The proposed extensions are acceptable. The design is relatively simple and in-keeping with the character of the property and adjacent dwellings. The proposed materials will match existing and therefore the character of the dwelling and immediate area will not be significantly affected. Furthermore, the extension will not lead to any significant loss of privacy or light and as it is proportionate in size to the existing dwelling, there will not be any significant overbearing impact. However in light of neighbouring concerns the decision will be condition to ensure the property is used solely ancillary to the dwelling and not for commercial or business purposes.

For the above reasons, it is considered that this application is acceptable and it is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

A04 Time Limit

B011 Samples of materials
C38 Development in accordance with plans
D03 Restriction use of garage
D09 No additional windows in North facing elevation
I40 Conditions
I41 Grant of planning permission
RACUSTOM

REASON FOR APPROVAL:
The proposed extensions are acceptable. The design is relatively simple and in-keeping with the character of the property and adjacent dwellings. The proposed materials will match existing and therefore the character of the dwelling and immediate area will not be significantly affected. Furthermore, the extension will not lead to any significant loss of privacy or light and as it is proportionate in size to the existing dwelling, there will not be any significant overbearing impact.