

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 21 May 2014 at 6.00pm in the Haybridge Refectory, Telford College of Arts & Technology, Haybridge Road, Wellington, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, E J Greenaway, A S Jhavar, C N Mason (as substitute for S A W Reynolds) and C R Turley.

ALSO PRESENT:

PC-106 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 30 April 2014 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC-107 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors J Loveridge, G C W Reynolds and S A W Reynolds

PC-108 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr C R Turley commented on his position regarding planning application TWC/2013/1033 but stated that, in the circumstances he would not be withdrawing from the meeting for that item.

PC-109 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

PC-110 SITE VISITS

None.

PC-111 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning application TWC/2013/1033.

- (a) TWC/2013/0809 - The Former Swan Centre, Grange Avenue, Stirchley, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 1UP

This was an outline application made by the Council with all matters reserved for a residential development of up to 21 dwellings together with associated open space, landscaping and infrastructure.

Members were disappointed that there were no additional comments from Highways or the Arboricultural Officer and that the proposals lacked affordable housing.

The Planning Officer explained that the primary issue for the Highway Officer was the relocation of the existing footway/cycleway that presently ran through the site and whilst it had been hoped this could be resolved prior to the Committee the Planning Officer was confident that the issues could be dealt with by condition. He also noted that the trees in question were protected, although clearly if the trees had an impact on visibility splays they would need to be lost.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist also explained that the wider community benefit associated with the Building Schools for the Future Programme and the provision of the Lakeside Co-Operative Campus was considered sufficient justification to allow a policy exception regarding the normal application of affordable housing.

The recommendation was proposed and seconded and, following a vote, it was:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0809 the Development Management Service Delivery Manager be authorised to grant outline planning permission subject to:-

- (a) confirmation from TWC Highways that they do not object to the planning application.
- (b) receiving a satisfactory memo from the Assistant Director: Development, Business and Housing dealing with financial contributions in respect of the provision of a sum of monies comprising a contributions of (i), (ii) and (iii) below either upon the sale of any of the development land or upon commencement of the development whichever is the sooner (precise terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager).
 - (i) That commuted sums of money for the maintenance of the open space and any surface water attenuation feature on site to be agreed prior to development.
 - (ii) That funds raised from the sale of the land are directed to the delivery of the new Lakeside Academy in Stirchley.
 - (iii) Any contribution as requested by TWC Highways.
- (c) the conditions set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).
- (b) TWC/2013/1033 - Land to the North of Haygate Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application seeking outline planning permission for up to 330 dwellings, of which 25% would be affordable with an agreement that an element of affordable housing could be provided off-site should the Council wish to pursue such an option. The proposal included the provision of highway and infrastructure works, formal and informal open space, including a Neighbourhood Area Equipped for Play (NEAP)

and a Local Area Equipped for Play (LEAP) and associated landscaping. Other than access, all other matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) were reserved for subsequent approval. Full details of the application and numerous consultation responses were set out in the comprehensive report.

Members were presented with a lengthy update report which set out additional matters raised since publication of the main report and took some time to read this prior to receiving public speakers and the comments of the Planning Officer.

Councillor D Roberts, representing Wellington Town Council, spoke against the application on the grounds of educational sustainability, the Council's lack of 5 year housing land supply and noted that the site did not appear in any previous local plans or the Shaping Places plan currently under consultation.

Councillor J M Seymour, one of the Ward Members for Wrockwardine, also spoke to oppose the proposals; noting the level of local objections, she considered that this was the "wrong development, in the wrong place, at the wrong time". She commented on what she considered to be a lack of progress in developing a new local plan which had left the Authority at the mercy of the National Planning Policy Framework's (NPPF) presumption in favour of sustainable development and urged the Committee to fight the proposals in accordance with existing local policy.

Councillor M B Hosken, Ward Member for Ercall, spoke to oppose the proposals, citing the Council's co-operative values and strength of local opposition to the application. He believed that the proposals did not provide any community benefit and would put a strain on local utilities, transport system and result in the loss of valuable trees.

Mr J Pattinson, representing Haygate View Residents Group, addressed the Committee regarding residents' disappointment in the lack of an up to date local plan, lack of a 5 year housing land supply and noted the site's absence from the emerging Shaping Places local plan. He objected to the proposals based upon landscape quality, Wrekin Local Plan policy HE23 (Historic Parks) and Urban Design. He considered that these objections were sufficient to outweigh the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and referred to recent case law where an appeal against Herefordshire Council was dismissed.

Mr C Still addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant to support the application in terms of compliance with the NPPF, particularly the lack of a 5 year housing land supply and presumption in favour of sustainable development. He noted community benefits in the form of education and highways contributions, socio-economic benefits in terms of investment and employment and housing need.

Referring to the report before Members, the Planning Officer highlighted the Council's position with regard to the NPPF and 5 year housing land supply and sought to identify whether the proposals would cause significant harm that would outweigh the benefits of housing delivery. He referred to aspects of the report relating to the sustainability of the location, building on Greenfield land, local heritage assets, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Wrekin Site of Special Scientific Interest. He drew attention to the consultation with English Heritage which

concluded that the proposals would not result in significant harm to the registered park. He further drew attention to the comments of the Urban Design Officer and the illustrated masterplan submitted which could be conditioned as a parameter plan, ecology, highways, flood risk, NEAP/LEAP, upgrade to sports pitches, noise and air quality, addressed the impact on residential amenity during construction via a management agreement and planning obligations in terms of the proposed Section 106 Agreement.

During the robust debate which took place, Members made a number of comments and raised questions regarding land ownership, central government drive for economic recovery through housing delivery, Shaping Places, Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), Building for Life 12, access to public transport and planned reduction of local bus services, increased use of existing highways and the proposed junction improvements, loss of visual amenity, interpretation of the NPPF, development of Greenfield land before Brownfield, sustainability, lack of surplus of primary and secondary school places, significant adverse impact upon the historic park, urban design and loss of agricultural land.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist advised the Committee that the site had not been included in the Shaping Places Local Plan consultation document as this would have been tantamount to predetermination, however, if Members were minded to approve the application, the site would be included in future issues.

In response to questions, the Planning Officer advised that the local bus operator (Arriva) was currently reviewing the profitability of local bus service No55 and that its continuation was a commercial decision to be taken by the private operator. However, with further development being brought forward, this decision could be reviewed later and the service resumed. Notwithstanding, the site was considered to be very near to Wellington shops and services and therefore sustainable. The Planning Officer also explained that the highways improvement costs would be shared by a number of developments coming forward including the recently approved development at Holyhead Road (TWC/2013/0938) and that the Highways Authority would require that financial contributions should be made prior to commencement. He further advised that development at this site would not have a significantly adverse effect upon or lead to the loss of any heritage asset in the local area, a view supported by English Heritage. He explained that the site was separated from the Registered Park by a woodland block with the Cricket Club having been built within the Park and also providing an intervening incursion. Moreover the likely impact on the Grade II* Orleton Hall and the Grade II Old Orleton Hotel were very negligible.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist reiterated the comments of the Planning Officer regarding the involvement of English Heritage, the views of which had been taken on board by the applicant, and there being no objection in this regard, the conclusion reached was that there was no significant harm to heritage assets as the registered park was not part of the application site. He also went on to comment that the Council's education officers had been involved in negotiation for financial contributions and were satisfied with the sums agreed. He noted that numerous Councils across the country were affected by the lack of a deliverable 5 year housing land supply and he argued that the Council was keeping pace with legislation for the

development of a new local plan. Commenting on the number of homes which had been delivered in the last year and the anticipated figures for the next 12 months, he noted that the Planning Minister had written in response to the Cabinet Member for Housing, Development & Borough Towns regarding government initiatives to help stalled sites proceed and congratulated the Council's adoption of a positive approach towards encouraging building on brownfield land. He further advised the Committee that interpretation of the NPPF was an issue for the Courts and not for individual Planning Authorities.

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager also referred to a letter received from the Planning Minister that afternoon following a meeting of the Council and other neighbouring authorities regarding the 5 year land supply issue which set out the circumstances in which the Secretary of State would call in an application, including conflict with national policy, impact on economic growth, effect beyond locality, cross boundary applications, urban design issues and national security.

The recommendation in the report was proposed and seconded from the floor and, upon being put to the vote it was:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/1033 the Development Management Service Delivery Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to:-

- (a) the applicants/landowners entering into a Section 106 Agreement for the provision of 23% affordable housing on-site together with an off-site financial contribution of £300,000 to include a suitable review mechanism; the payment of £576,929 for primary education enhancement and £306,751 for secondary education enhancement (25% of total on commencement of development, 50% on completion of 25% of the dwellings and 25% on completion of 50% of the dwellings; a contribution of £130,000 towards the provision of upgraded sports pitches to be paid upon completion of 25% of the properties; a contribution of £25,000 for public art provision either on site or in Wellington to be paid upon commencement of development; a contribution of £410,720 towards off-site junction improvements to be paid upon commencement of development; contribution of £15,000 towards bus infrastructure improvements to be paid upon commencement of development; a contribution of £20,000 towards off-site traffic calming to be paid upon commencement of development; a contribution of £5,000 for Travel Plan monitoring and £15,000 for planning and financial monitoring to be paid upon commencement of development.
- (b) the conditions set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

(c) TWC/2014/0010 - Land adjacent Chillcott Drive, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire

This was a full planning application which sought permission for the erection of 44 dwellings comprising 100% affordable tenure and associated access and landscaping. This application followed an outline approval for residential development in April 2013.

Mr R Fletcher, addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant, in support of the proposals in terms of affordable housing aspirations and needs.

The Planning Officer drew attention to aspects of her report relating to sustainability, highways comments, noise impact, flooding, design and provision of affordable housing.

Members welcomed the application, particularly the provision of affordable housing although it was noted that some 4-bed or 5-bed homes would have been warmly welcomed. Members were concerned about the impact on the neighbouring care home during construction and were advised that the proposed conditions made provision for a management plan which would control hours of construction, mud on road and hoarding, etc.

The recommendation was proposed and seconded and, following a vote, it was:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0010 the Development Management Service Delivery Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the applicants/landowners entering into a Section 106 Agreement for financial contributions of £47,210 towards the adoption of the woodland; £16,500 towards off site leisure and play facilities; £7,500 for the treatment of infected Ash trees and further subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 7.52pm

Chairman:

Date:

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11/06/2014

Schedule 1 - Planning applications for determination by Planning Committee

TWC/2012/0530 Off, Priorslee East, Gatcombe Way/York Road/Hereford Drive, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, Modification of condition to extend the time limit for implementation of outline planning permission W2002/1421 for residential development (Outline)	2
TWC/2014/0057 Land west of The Cottage, Arleston Village, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire Outline planning permission for the erection of 30 No. bungalows for the elderly, replacing the provision of 50 No. extra care housing units permitted under planning permission TWC/2012/0240.....	10

TWC/2012/0530

Off, Priorslee East, Gatcombe Way/York Road/Hereford Drive, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire,

Modification of condition to extend the time limit for implementation of outline planning permission W2002/1421 for residential development (Outline)

APPLICANT

Homes and Communities Agency

RECEIVED

09/07/2012

PARISH

St. Georges and Priorslee

WARD

Priorslee

OFFICER

Rob Price

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: YES

MAIN ISSUES: Allocated and Committed site for Residential Development

PROPOSAL: Modification of condition to extend the time limit for implementation of outline planning permission W2002/1421 for a phased residential development of land at Priorslee East.

BACKGROUND:

The proposal for residential development on this site is rooted in the designation of Telford as a new town under historic planning powers colloquially known in planning circles as 6(1) and 7(1) permissions that the Government allowed the Commission for New Towns to enjoy under the New Towns Acts of 1965 and 1981. As time has passed by these historic rights to develop have passed and more formal planning permissions for allocated housing sites to be determined by the Local Authority have come in to force.

The first proposal that Telford & Wrekin Council considered as a planning application for this committed housing site was under an outline planning application W2002/1421 that came before planning committee in March 2003. Further to protracted negotiations over the wording of the S106 agreement that planning application was issued in July 2009.

SITE & SURROUNDINGS:

The Priorslee area is located to the north of the M54 accessed from junction 4 of the motorway via Castle Farm Way which dissects the predominantly residential area into east and west segments.

To the west of Castle Farm Way lies the Priorslee balancing lake and the former Celestica employment site that was the subject of recently approved planning applications for 600 no. dwellings and a new secondary school, sixth form and sporting facilities. In addition an existing residential area, local centre, primary school and the RICOH factory are accessed via Priorslee Avenue.

To the east of Castle Farm Way lies Lakeside Garden Centre an existing residential area, shops, a primary school and the applications site which are accessed via Gatcombe Way and Salisbury Avenue.

The application site in Priorslee East is approximately 11.60 hectares of greenfield land some of which is currently used as grazing land for horses although signs clearly state the land is for future residential development and is secured by simple post and wire fencing and hedges. It is located against the eastern urban boundary of Telford. It is bounded by Castle Farm Way to the west and southwest, the A5 to the north, land in the ownership of Lord Stafford to the east.

The area is considered to be highly accessible with good footpath and cycle links a bus service which to the railway station and town centre as well as excellent access to the motorway.

HISTORY:

New Towns Act 1965 (6(1) Submission 125)

New Towns Act 1981 (7(1) Submission 125a)

W2002/1421 – Residential development (outline) – Approved July 2009 subject to planning contributions toward affordable housing, open space and maintenance and play facilities and maintenance (both on and off site).

POLICY:

National Planning Policy Framework

Core Strategy:

- CS1 Homes
- CS9 Accessibility and Social Inclusion
- CS11 Open Space
- CS12 Natural Environment
- CS15 Urban Design

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies:

- UD2 Design Criteria
- UD3 Urban Design Assessments
- UD4 Landscape Design
- H22 Community Facilities
- H23 Affordable Housing
- T22 Planning Obligations
- OL12 Open Land and Landscape – contributions from new development
- OL13 Maintenance of Open Space
- LR4 Outdoor Recreational Open Space
- LR6 Developer contributions to outdoor recreation open space provision within new residential developments

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

St. Georges and Priorslee Parish Council: Comment that the application is out of date and that fields have returned to agricultural use.

Archaeology: No objections.

Affordable Housing: No objections.

Education: If this application was to be submitted now we would be seeking £551,480 for primary school contributions.

Parks & Open Spaces: Comment that MUGA should be replaced by NEAP in S106 and query regarding the design of the NEAP and maintenance of open space.

Highways: No comments received.

Ecology: Originally objected but now comment that further information regarding newt mitigation works and conditions regarding newts, bats, badgers and nesting boxes, as well as lighting, landscaping and buffer zone details are required.

Drainage: A Flood Risk Assessment has been assessed and supported in principle subject to two conditions regarding a scheme for surface water and a scheme for foul drainage.

Local Representations:

The Council have received two letters from local residents, one of objection and one with some comments. The issues/concerns raised in relation to the application are summarised below:

- Loss of privacy through overlooking
- Development should be in keeping with the rest of the estate
- Concerns regarding increase in road traffic
- Secondary school off the end of Salisbury Avenue
- Supporting information out of date

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

Principle:

The 'Greater flexibility for planning permissions' legislation introduced in 2010 was removed in October 2013, however as this application was made at the time the legislation was active and needs to be treated as such. This guidance was introduced by the Government to make it easier for developers and local planning authorities to keep planning permissions alive for longer periods of time during the economic downturn, so that they can be quickly implemented when economic conditions improve.

The renewing of previously approved sites ad infinitum is unlikely to continue unabated as more planning permissions are granted and as houses are built. The key to whether permissions will be granted on previously approved sites will very much depend on housing numbers built and ever changing housing targets supplied by Government.

This application seeks to renew the original proposal which is considered to be a committed housing site through successive development plan documents including the Wrekin Local Plan and the Core Strategy. The National Planning Policy Framework seeks to bring forward development in sustainable locations with good access to facilities and infrastructure.

The golden thread running through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is one of a presumption in favour of sustainable development and notes that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. The NPPF also notes that the Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth and that Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. The thrust of the guidance in the NPPF is that everyone should have the opportunity to live in a high quality, well designed home which is affordable and in a community where they wish to live. In order to achieve this objective it is necessary to significantly increase the supply and choice of homes. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF also requires that local planning authorities should 'identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements' with an additional buffer of 5 per cent, or 20 per cent if there has been a poor record of housing delivery.

Telford & Wrekin Council is required by national planning policy to identify a continuous five-year supply of housing land to meet its housing requirement. Government requires all Councils to do this, forming the basis for determining planning applications for new housing at the present time. The issue of housing delivery has become increasingly important since the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012, which established the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' should Authority's be unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The new policy approach is seen as key by the Government to significantly boosting housing supply across the country and ensuring development is sustainable. A number of recent planning appeal decisions throughout England have reinforced the importance of the five year housing land supply issue. It is therefore necessary to consider the current position in Telford & Wrekin with regards to its five-year land supply. Evidence has now come to light demonstrating only a 2.5 year supply exists, meaning that where the LPA cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply then relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date. For Telford & Wrekin Council this means policies CS1 (Homes) which identifies dwelling requirements for Telford, Newport and the rural area and potentially CS6 (Newport) and CS7 (Rural Area) which seek to direct housing into certain locations in line with the strategy. This means that applications cannot be refused on the grounds of housing supply alone and there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. As the development is a committed and allocated site within the urban area the site is considered sustainable, furthermore it is available, achievable and deliverable within the next five years. It is therefore able to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) regarding the delivery of housing in a sustainable location. The applicant notes this is a greenfield site, with good access to major infrastructure and is part of an established and popular residential area. As such, they anticipate a good level of commercial interest and are already receiving

an increasing number of enquiries from potential purchasers. Therefore, subject to a favourable determination at Planning Committee, the Homes and Communities Agency anticipates that a portion of the site will be marketed later this year. The delivery of new housing on the site will contribute towards ensuring that new housing is delivered in Telford and Wrekin over the plan period.

Accessibility and Highway Safety:

Policy CS9 (Accessibility and Social Inclusion) sets out the need for development to promote sustainable forms of transport by providing public transport, cycling and pedestrian routes to improve accessibility. It also highlights the importance of locating new development in existing centres to minimise the distance people travel to access key services. The proposed development meets the aims of this policy as the site is well served by existing public transport, walking and cycling routes. Furthermore, each parcel of land is located in close proximity to key services (including local shops and Redhill Primary School).

Access roads and highway infrastructure have been created to the site as part of the original New Towns 7(1) permission. Additional highway information was provided as part of the application when officers queried local highway capacity and infrastructure. Additional planning obligations to contribute toward the highway network in the locality were requested as part of the application process as the original scheme did not provide for this matter. Unfortunately as this is a committed and allocated site new sites should take account of anticipated traffic flows associated with this site rather than the other way around and the 'Greater flexibility for planning permissions' does not allow for the Local Planning Authority to seek additional planning contributions. It is considered that conditions securing the detailed design of new roads are appropriate to attach to any permission.

Open Space:

The proposed development will incorporate new areas of open space and will also be located in close proximity to existing areas of open space. This will contribute towards meeting the aims of Policy CS11 (Open Space) in terms of protecting and enhancing areas of open space across the Borough. The previous application included the provision of on-site play facilities, which is still required. The Parks & Open Spaces Officer has however requested the definition of LEAP within the S106 agreement to be amended to relate to the facility itself rather than the and around the facility which is accepted by the applicant. The maintenance of informal open space is to be carried out in accordance with a standard condition and schedule of rates.

Ecology:

Policy CS12 (Natural Environment) states that the natural environment of the Borough (including the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and that of the Borough's Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Areas of Special Landscape Character, Local Nature Reserves, Wildlife Sites and Ancient Woodland sites) will need to be protected and enhanced over the plan period. It also states that the natural environment will be protected from development that has the potential to adversely impact on its sustainability. Further to the original objection by the Council's Ecological Officers, clarification was provided on ecology matters in the form of a letter. As such the Council's Ecological

Officers have provided further comments requesting additional information to be provided regarding newt mitigation (e.g. extent of the fencing, timing of works, trapping details, ecological supervision during certain site works, enhancement measures etc.). This information will be provided as part of an update report and it is considered appropriate to apply conditions regarding newts, bats, badgers and nesting boxes, as well as lighting, landscaping and buffer zone details. In addition standard advisory informatives to protect ecology will be applied to any permission.

Design:

Policy CS15 (Urban Design) sets out the need for design of development to assist in creating and sustaining safe places, strengthening local identity and protecting a positive local image. This is further supported by policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan. The development framework for the site demonstrates how the proposed development will achieve these aims. The design approach and concepts contribute towards delivering a mixture of dwelling types, access to public open space and green spaces as well as to public transport. Details of design, layout and landscaping are still to be finalised through reserved matters application(s) but as noted above this is a committed residential site with a development framework that will set out principles of development.

Drainage and Land Constraints:

Additional drainage information has been provided and it is considered appropriate to include conditions regarding a scheme for surface and foul water disposal as requested by the drainage engineer. There are no concerns with regard to land contamination or the stability of the site.

Financial Contributions and Viability:

A new S106 agreement is required to accompany a new planning application and slight changes of wording and terminology reflect the time that has passed since the original application came to committee in 2003. The financial amounts originally secured cannot be revisited and remain the same, however, the wording changed relates to affordable housing as well as Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) instead of Multi Use Games Areas (MUGA). The figures of contribution remain the same as originally required as follows:

The proposal will provide 25% affordable housing broken down between 20% affordable rent and 5% shared ownership. There will be a mix of housing types provided in these two different forms of tenure.

A primary education sum of £405,336.96 will be provided on a phased basis to enhance existing primary education facilities within a 2 mile radius, consistent with the previous approval. No secondary school sum was secured as part of W2002/1421 originally and given the recent planning approval for the Holy Trinity Academy at Priorslee it is not considered there is sufficient basis to request a planning contribution for secondary school facilities. It should also be noted that the proposed secondary school off the end of Salisbury Avenue was abandoned as a proposal in favour of the Holy Trinity Academy site as a more sustainable and deliverable site for a school than the greenfield site at the end of Salisbury Avenue.

There have been some minor amendments to the recreation planning gain with the MUGA now being NEAP however the financial contributions which total £122,300 remain the same.

This is to be divided as follows:

- £50,600 for creation of a NEAP within 1000m of development
- £42,500 toward an upgrade of the existing NEAP at Kesworth Drive
- £29,200 toward the adoption of the NEAP to be created on-site

Conclusion:

Given the time that has passed since the original permission was granted Officers considered it appropriate for planning committee members to consider this application again. The 'Greater flexibility for planning permissions' legislation introduced in 2010 was removed in October 2013, however as this application was made at the time the legislation was active and needs to be treated as such. The principle of development has been established through historic planning permissions, as such this application seeks to simply extend the time limit. It is considered that this proposal seeks to renew an allocated and committed housing site within the Telford urban area in a sustainable location and will help to meet the housing shortage the Borough faces. Accordingly the proposal accords with both local and national planning policies.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the conclusions above, the recommendation to Planning Committee on this application is that DELEGATED AUTHORITY be granted to the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management to GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following:

- A.) The applicants entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Council (terms to be agreed by the Service Delivery Manager of Development Management) relating to:
- (i) To provide 25% of dwellings built as affordable dwellings comprising of 20% affordable rent and 5 % shared ownership;
 - (ii) A contribution of £122,300 toward the provision, maintenance or enhancement of play equipment or facilities near to the application site;
 - (iii) A contribution toward the provision of primary education of £405,336.96 based on the scheme provided;
 - (iv) The maintenance of informal open space to a detailed schedule of rates.
- B.) 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. A03 Time limit – Submission of reserved matters.
 3. B02 Standard outline some matters reserved.
 4. B10 Details of materials.

5. B57 Land contamination.
6. B83 Protection of new dwellings from A5 noise.
7. B121 Landscaping design.
8. B126 Landscape management plan and maintenance details for areas.
9. B150 Site environmental management plan for construction works.
10. BCustom Phasing plan.
11. BCustom Highway Requirements – details of access, layout, parking, surface water drainage and road construction.
12. BCustom Drainage – Surface Water drainage method.
13. BCustom Drainage – Scheme for foul drainage.
14. BCustom Ecology – Natural England EPS License.
15. BCustom Ecology – Pre-commencement check for bats and badgers.
16. C38 Development in accordance with masterplan and deposited plans.
17. C76 Landscape implementation hard & soft.
18. CCustom Ecology – Lighting plan.
19. CCustom Ecology – Buffer zone.
20. CCustom Ecology – Erection of nest boxes.
21. CCustom NEAP to come into use prior to the sale of adjacent dwellings.

- I06 Section 106
- I25e Trenches
- I25f Replacement planting
- I25g Enhancement planting
- I25m Nesting birds
- I32 Fire authority
- I35custom Site clearance
- I35custom Storage of materials
- I35custom Ground nesting species
- I40 Conditions
- I44 Reasons for grant of approval

TWC/2014/0057

Land west of The Cottage, Arleston Village, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire
Outline planning permission for the erection of 30 No. bungalows for the elderly,
replacing the provision of 50 No. extra care housing units permitted under planning
permission TWC/2012/0240

APPLICANT

Helical (Telford) Limited

RECEIVED

20/01/2014

PARISH

Wellington

WARD

Arleston

OFFICER

Libby Harper

COUNCILLOR ANGELA McCLEMENTS HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS
APPLICATION IS DETERMINED BY THE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of development, development in the Green Network,
housing need, affordable housing, Deed of Variation.

THE PROPOSAL:

Outline planning permission was granted in October 2012 in respect of a wider site
area (as per plan RG56-Rev B shown edged in blue) surrounding the application site
- reference TWC/2012/0240, with all matters reserved bar access arrangements.
This application seeks to replace part of this approved scheme – principally
comprising the 50 bed Extra Care facility containing 30 affordable care Extra Care
units. This would be alongside amendments to the wider site through an alternative
housing mix to ensure an element of land that was also to be taken up by open
market within the new application site can still deliver the desired 103 houses within
the permitted residential areas. The approved and revised Parameters Plan show
the distinction between the land parcels entailed. Permission is therefore
alternatively sought for 30 affordable bungalows for the elderly within the application
site. The approved scheme is subject to a Section 106 Agreement including a
requirement for provision of the affordable Extra Care units.

BACKGROUND:

Following the grant of outline permission, the consultants were engaged to seek
interest from a number of housing associations to construct and operate the Extra
Care facility. Seven organisations were approached with all but two confirming that
the site was not of interest for reasons that included 'the site falls outside the area
that we cover', 'we are not looking to pursue extra care apartments' and 'we already
have a presence in Telford'. Two organisations were interested: Bromford Group and
Wrekin Housing Trust.

In respect of the Bromford Group, in March 2013 they advised of concerns about the
sale prospects of the private extra care units given that the majority of units within
the block would be for social rent. When subsequently asked if they would consider
taking on the extra care facility if the entire block of 50 units were for social rent, they

declined and eventually reported in June 2013 that they were 'not looking at extra care in Telford'.

A greater level of interest was expressed by Wrekin Housing Trust (WHT), and undertook to make a grant application to the Care and Support Specialised Housing Fund on the basis of developing the Extra Care scheme for 100% affordable units prior to the bid deadline in January 2013. Successful bids were announced on 24th July 2013, with the Wrekin Housing Trust bid for the Arleston site not having been successful, and in the absence of any grant money WHT would advised the applicant that they would be unable to proceed in delivering the Extra Care scheme. The submission material goes on to outline that alternative development options for this part of the site have been considered which would provide affordable housing and accommodation for the elderly with 30no. bungalows to be provided as affordable housing in conjunction with a Registered Provider, having been derived as a replacement to the 50no. Extra Care facility (30no. affordable).

Through the replacement application, approval of access is again sought with all other matters reserved. Access to the wider site has been approved (2 accesses, one from Dawley Road, and the second from Arleston Lane) and there is no change to the approved access arrangements as a result of the proposed bungalows with vehicular access to the bungalows provided off Dawley Road through to the application site, as reflected on the illustrative layout. In terms of plans overall, the applicant has provided a parallel set of plans accompanying the approved outline scheme amended to reflect the changes within the application site: the aforementioned Revised Parameters Plan for the site (outside of the application site, the Revised Parameters Plan (RG-58) remains the same as the Approved Parameters Plan (RG-38H).

The 30no. bungalows would be provided as a mix of one and two bedroom bungalows of 1 and 1½ storeys in height. The illustrative layout proposes 13 one bedroom bungalows and 17 two bedroom bungalows (the 1½ storey units). Notably, the design of the bungalows has been proposed as being built to HAPPI standards (Housing our Ageing Population: Panel Innovation). The standards seek an appropriate design in new homes for older people based on a panel report identifying ten critical design elements, such as circulation spaces that encourage interaction and avoid an 'institutional feel', and generous internal space standards. These were then elaborated by a subsequent implementation report which further recommended accessibility to wheelchair standards and all homes to be level access.

The Revised Parameters Plan for the application site shows open space along the eastern and northern boundaries adjacent to the rear of the properties on Toll Road and Kingsland. This reflects the open space provision in the Approved Parameters Plan, although a reduction has arisen in the level of open space to the east side of the bungalows. The Approved Parameters Plan shows 0.43 hectares of open space within the area defined as the application site and the Revised Parameters Plan shows 0.32 hectares within this area. The reduction in open space from the approved plan equates to 0.11 hectares representing 1.5% of the wider site area (7.26 hectares).

Through this application the applicant reserves the right to deliver the Extra Care facility representing a potential fall-back position as an extant permission should the demand for bungalows alter and the localised market for Extra Care on this site change. A Legal opinion has been sought on the scope to have the existing permission, as well as a new permission, in place tied to the original permission in terms of delivery. It has been confirmed that this is unusual in the Borough it is appropriate with an intrinsic link between the existing and new schemes through a Deed of Variation, such that were the new scheme to come forward then the original Extra Care development would become obsolete including the conditions specifically dealing with the Extra Care being not relevant.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site subject to this application comprises 1.01ha (14% of the total development area) of private open land sitting in the western section of the roughly shaped 'U', in the north east corner of the wider 7.26ha site approved under planning application TWC/2012/0240 (05/10/2012). The site is situated in Arleston, north of the M54 between Dawley Road to the west and Arleston to the east, with the land being set back from Dawley Road to the west; adjacent to residential properties of Kingsland forming the northern boundary of the site, together with Arleston Village forming the eastern boundary. The site is formed of higher ground in the context of the wider site.

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 northern and eastern boundaries principally comprise of hedges and being open to the wider site to the south and west.

Access to the application site can currently be gained through the wider site from an existing access on Dawley Road running between Arleston and Lawley, which also forms a Public Right of Way that runs through the wider site through to Toll Road and beyond to Arleston Lane. The existing access serves residential properties and the Serchem factory, which are located to the immediate west of Arleston Village.

Within walking distance 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/2012/0240 - 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***. Outline Granted 05/10/2012

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 01/06/ 2011

W91/1161 – Outline planning permission for up to 142 dwellings. Refused 15/01/1993

W91/1138 – Outline planning permission for up to 95 dwellings. Refused 15/01/1993

W91/1137 – Residential development for about 95 dwellings. Withdrawn 05/06/1992

W90/0031 – Outline planning permission for 257 dwellings. Refused 11/04/1990

W79/567 – Outline planning permission residential development. Refused 01/11/1979.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Guidance:

National Planning Policy Framework

Wrekin Local Plan:

EH7 Contaminated Land

EH8 Remedial action on Contaminated Land

UD2 Design Criteria

UD4 Landscape Design

UD5 Public Art

T4 Development Principles

T22 Planning Obligations

OL3 Green Network

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

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

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Wellington Town Council: No objection

Ward Councillor - Councillor Angela McClements: Object

The previous application heard in August 2012 was granted due to the exceptional circumstances of an Extra Care provision, told was sufficient to outweigh the loss of green network land, with a concern raised that it was being used as a means of acceptance for development on land which had previously been turned down for development.

Residents have raised concerns that the site is not sustainable for the elderly and the land required for the bungalows is likely to be greater than the land required for the Extra Care Home. This could have a greater impact on wildlife and the environment. There is likely to be increased traffic flow as a result of greater number of units being built, traffic congestion and speeding down Dawley Road has been an on-going complaints since becoming a councillor, don't see anything in the report about the increase in traffic as a result of the massive new build at Lawley.

One resident has raised concern that their property will be surrounded on three sides by the development and there is no detail on how the estate road will cross the lane, which is used by lorries collecting and delivering goods to Serchem.

Whilst residents welcome the bungalows against the three-storey Extra Care facility, there is no recognition in the outline planning application how the bungalow development would benefit the community, having been promised community facilities with the Extra Care Home.

Residents concerned about the layout of the site and number of bungalows being proposed and the buffer between Arleston Village being narrower, resulting in greater intrusion to the unique character of the Village.

Affordable Housing: Comment

Considers it unfortunate that the Extra care housing element of the development will not now be delivered but supports in principle the proposal to provide 30 specialist bungalows for older people. The accompanying Planning Statement describes the reasons why the Extra care housing scheme that was proposed originally is unable to proceed, which are acknowledged. The alternative proposal *to develop affordable housing and accommodation for the elderly* (Para 1.15) was discussed in principal with the agent, although the Council has not been involved in the creation of these outline proposals.

Given that this scheme is intended to provide alternative provision to an Extra care housing scheme, the proposal to develop an exemplar specialist housing scheme for older people is very much welcomed. The bungalows will be built to the standards proposed by the national report *Housing Our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation* (HAPPI), 2009 (Para 1.15) This report was commissioned by the Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) to look at how best to address the challenge of providing homes that meet the needs and aspirations of older people. The HAPPI Panel stressed the importance of appropriate design in new homes for older people and identified ten critical design elements:

- generous internal space standards
- plenty of natural light in the home and in circulation spaces
- balconies and outdoor space, avoiding internal corridors and single-aspect flats

- adaptability and 'care aware' design which is ready for emerging telecare and telehealth technologies
- circulation spaces that encourage interaction and avoid an 'institutional feel'
- shared facilities (including communal facilities) and community 'hubs' where these are lacking in the neighbourhood
- plants, trees, and the natural environment
- high levels of energy efficiency, with good ventilation to avoid overheating
- extra internal and external storage for belongings and bicycles
- shared external areas such as 'home zones' that give priority to pedestrians

The HAPPI2 Report, *Housing our Ageing Population: Plan for Implementation* (2012) added to the above, including:

- accessibility to wheelchair standards and all homes to be level access
- provide predominately two bedroom apartments of dwellings, because of the greater flexibility this offers.
- offer a housing tenure and management regime that will ensure some control is retained by the residents

In the Officers view, a scheme built as an exemplar and that achieves the HAPPI principles above, will represent an acceptable alternative to the original Extra care housing proposals. This is an appropriate location for such a scheme, which will help to meet the needs of the growing number of local older people in the borough. It will also achieve a number of other benefits, including helping people to live more independently, reducing under occupation and contribution to health and social care priorities. However the indicative design dwelling type 'C' shown in The Design & Access Statement appears to show that this type would not be level access (there is no first floor layout plan), which would not be suitable. It is therefore suggested that the following essential requirements be linked to any planning consent, either by condition or as part of an amended S106 agreement:

1. To achieve a mix of dwelling types that are for social rent, predominately 2 bedroom, all level access and include a proportion that are built to full wheelchair standard.
2. For the dwellings to be designed to meet the HAPPI principles and for the draft design to be assessed by an independent expert to help ensure that these principles are met. There is also the opportunity for the applicant to provide a strategy for the wider dissemination of this scheme as an exemplar and model of good practice.
3. To transfer the dwellings to an appropriate housing association.
4. For an appropriate local lettings plan to be agreed with the Council, prior to first letting.

Environmental Health (Contaminated Land): Support subject to conditions
 The Environmental Health Officer has requested a condition to cover potential land contamination as the scheme relates to a housing development further to paragraphs 109 and 121 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Development Plans: Support

Support the principle of the development as a replacement development identifying a five year land supply submitted it should not be considered against the housing numbers set within policy CS1 but its sustainability should be considered against other relevant local planning policies. Further considered that the scheme accords with the requirements of Core Strategy policies CS3, CS9, and CS11, alongside Wrekin Local Plan policies OL3, OL4, T4 and T22. Advice should be sought from the appropriate council officers in order to determine whether or not the scale, layout and wider impact of the proposed development will be in accordance with policies CS15, UD2, UD3 and UD4. Further advice should be sought if and when an application for reserved matters is submitted. With reference to policy H23 relating to affordable housing an affordable housing target of 38% to 40% should be pursued in Telford, but this will need to be considered in light of discussion with and comments from the applicants and the council's Housing Officer. Consideration should also be given to the evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Affordable Housing Viability Study.

In summary, a position is advised that under the National Planning Policy Framework's 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' the most important consideration will be whether or not the development will constitute *sustainable development*. This development proposal lies within Telford's development boundary, within a sustainable location. The range and type of housing and the appropriate level of affordable units should be negotiated with the applicant in the context of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and also in liaison with the Council's Housing Officer. On balance, the principle of the proposal is supported in development plan policy terms.

Highways: Comment

The Highways Officer references comments made on TWC/2012/0240 (summarised comments as below) whilst identifying comments regarding the travel plan condition and associated S.106 contribution as now no longer relevant considering the extra care facility is being removed.

TWC/2012/0240

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.

Built Heritage Conservation: Comment

The Conservation Officer has advised that it is difficult to offer support without any detailed or suggested elevations. The external appearance here will be the key to off setting the dense grouping of the sides of the 'quad'. Inclined to prefer the idea of a grouped quad as proposed here over a single large mass extra care facility however so this does represent an improvement in principle. Design and materials will be a matter for a later application but the developers should take their lead from a more traditional style of development rather than applying a typically 60's/70's layout and appearance beloved on so many other bungalows. The character of the old settlement of Arleston should at least be nodded to in the design, not swamped with modern forms and designs.

Urban Design: No comment

Parks & Open Spaces: Comment

Comments that there appears to be very few car parking spaces provided. Many elderly people can and do drive for transport for essential visits for shopping and visits to relatives etc. Given the location of the nearest shops I would anticipate many more residents would wish to have access to personal transport than the proposed car parking provision. Additional car parking should be provided so this does not lead to indiscriminate parking on open space / verges.

Arboricultural: Comment

No objection to the house substitution, it must be noted that the Tree Survey which accompanied the original application will require an update as it was undertaken with regard to BS:5837 (2005) which has now been updated by BS:5837 (2012).

Drainage: Support

Considers that the Flood Risk Assessment is acceptable in principle but that a detailed drainage design must be submitted as part of the reserved matters application. The Officer has advised that whilst the development has the right to make a connection to the existing watercourse at greenfield rates, there are known downstream capacity issues, and for this reason an assessment of the watercourse downstream of the site will be required prior to any connection being made. This should include the section of open channel in Arleston Village and a CCTV survey of the 375mm culvert in the gardens of properties in Chartwell Road up to the point of connection with the public sewer in Woollam Road.

An assessment of the suitability of this system to receive these flows should be made and submitted for approval. Details of how these issues will be addressed through offsite improvement works should also be submitted. Conditions therefore requested for a scheme for surface water drainage including restrictions on the rate of run off, as assessment of the downstream watercourse and culvert to include the identification of any defects and details of how these will be addressed, and the submission of a scheme for foul drainage. Conditions are requested to cover this investigation, alongside the submission of a scheme for foul and surface water drainage.

Ecology: Comment

The Ecologist has advised that the areas of valuable and sensitive habitat on the site fall outside of the area covered by this new application TWC/2014/0057 and are dealt with appropriately under the original TWC/2012/0240 planning permission. In respect of species they have advised:

- Bats - trees with bat roosting potential which require retention are outside of the area covered by this new application; potential for bats to be foraging around this current application area and to be affected by any lighting erected as part of this proposal. Repetition of the relevant conditions from the original 2012 decision notice will cover this potential risk – condition 19 relates to lighting
- Badgers - Badger setts are known to be present on the site but not in the area to which this new application applies. Nonetheless, a pre-commencement inspection survey should be carried out to ensure that badgers have not colonised new areas of the site in the intervening time, covered by condition
- Woodland Birds - site has potential for nesting wild birds to be present. An informative should be on the decision notice
- Reptiles - no evidence of reptiles being present was recorded during the reptile survey in 2008 but Bioscan (February 2012) recommend that if the site has not been cleared by 2013 then the reptile survey should be repeated, a suitable condition is provided.

Sustainability: Comment

The Sustainability Officer advises 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. The Design and Access Statement does not explicitly address the need to conserve resources, use renewable technology or build-in future adaptability. However, it is important that sustainable design features do not require a lot of user input to make them work.

One of the most effective ways of securing more sustainable developments, is to develop these buildings to be designed and built for a long life and for a range of people, and should be easy and affordable to run and maintain and as energy and water efficient as possible.

Disabled and older people tend to spend more time indoors and have less ability to regulate body temperature therefore year round thermal comfort is vital. Many are also on low incomes so reducing fuel consumption is particularly important. As such, the built development will need to meet the Lifetime Homes standard.

Shropshire Fire Service: Comment

As part of the planning process, consideration should be given to the information contained within Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service's "Fire Safety Guidance for Commercial and Domestic Planning Applications".

Shropshire Council: No comment

Environment Agency: No comment

West Mercia Constabulary: No objection

English Heritage: No comment

Neighbours

34 letters of objections have been received further to a period of consultation, issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Lack of neighbour consultation
- Development on greenspace – removal of area where children play, damage to wildlife, removal area for locals to enjoy, Green Belt land
- Area forms natural break between Wellington and Lawley, stopping urban sprawl and provides a green lung
- Increase in traffic – already increased since Lawley Development, impact on Cock Hotel junction, suitability and sustainability of area for elderly persons questioned in original objections location at top of hill result in increased traffic; insufficient parking; and, highway safety issues – including relationship with heavy vehicles entering and leaving the site, underestimate trip levels generated
- No detail how estate road will cross the lane serving Midfields Serchem and Heathersett – carrying a lot of heavy lorries, gas main down northern side and would need to be crossed
- Area not built on before so why now
- Original application approved because of exceptional/special circumstances which no longer apply – care unit and associated public facilities reason for development in green network and no longer exist and benefits no longer applicable, setting a precedent
- Sufficient brownfield sites in Telford without need to encroach in to Green Network
- Proposal goes against localism – majority of people of Arleston against the development

- Decrease in property values
- Noise and dust issues
- Better location for bungalows if allowed – to west of Midfields as a low old house and lot less affect than 2 storey houses
- Requirement for wall – 8 foot wall along western boundary between Midfield and proposed road to ensure less dust and interference from construction
- Greater land take up bungalows to Extra Care – greater impact on the environment and greenspaces, retention was to reduce visual and general environmental impact of the development as emphasised in the original application now of lesser importance
- Bungalows better when considering visual effect on the landscape (noted on elevated land) but would still ruin the area – uniqueness of Arleston Village as unique, lovely village, surrounded by woods and fields
- Flooding - greater importance of need for green space/woodland areas further to recent flooding in England, floods at Old Hall Close, Bucks Head Football Ground, Dawley Road area when difficulties arose near the opencast mining area near New Works
- Expansion of hard surface area (roof, drive, garage) and impact on drainage linked to reduced green spaces, lack of capacity in brook running through Arleston Village to take a lot of additional water
- Drainage already overloaded
- Significant reduction in the identified green spaces around the original development – development squeezed into a small space
- Transport needed for elderly – shopping purposes, steepness of Dawley Road
- Confusion about what is the ‘Site’ – western field which includes 1.01 hectares, or whole area around Arleston Village
- Surfeit of care homes in Telford area with developers dropping Extra Care Homes as no takers raised in previous objections Told at Public Meeting that the outline planning permission hinged upon the Extra Care Home if the Green Network was to be encroached upon
- Retirement village of mixed ownership – housing associations and private better helping to free up larger housing for families
- Consider needs of future generations
- Position of development – argued in 2012 impossible for elderly people to climb back from shops to the home leave them dependent on unreliable and infrequent public transport, physical conditions the same and site unworkable for elderly people.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

Context of development proposal

The principle of residential development for elderly persons has been established on the parcel of land subject to this application further to grant of outline planning permission for 103 dwellings and 50 Extra Care units (Ref: TWC/2012/0240) covering a wider site area extending to Dawley Road to the west, Arleston Manor Drive to the south and Arleston Lane to the east. The site lies in Telford as the focus for development in the Borough in accordance with policy CS3, and was judged to be a sustainable location with good access to a range of services and facilities. There are bus stops within 400m of the Site and a train station in the centre that will

adequately serve the proposed development. The accessibility of the proposed development accords with policy CS9. This stance remains unchanged.

Key to the determination of this application is therefore the distinction between what development was proposed for the land subject to this application in the original, versus the new, application and the merits entailed in accordance with a presumption in favour of sustainable development of national planning policy. This application seeks to bind the existing outline permission and the redefined proposal for an alternative to the Extra Care facility through a Deed of Variation to the original S106, such that delivery of the application site would arise in conjunction i.e. tied and therefore be part of the scheme forming the wider Land at Arleston site.

As part of the original application, the land subject to this application was proposed to deliver an Extra Care unit with 30 of the 50 units being affordable provision, alongside further open market residential units as indicatively shown on the approved parameters plan. The applicant has defined how attempts to secure a Registered Provider to operate the Extra Care facility have been unsuccessful, and is therefore seeking an alternate approach to deliver development including an alternative form of affordable provision concurrently.

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 level of protection from development where it is identified it meets one of the 6 aims. Saved policies 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.

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.

Previously in relation to the 'exceptional circumstances' element identified in Policy OL4 of the Local Plan, development across the wider site was accepted by the Local Planning Authority. This position was derived bearing in mind the need to provide an Extra Care facility taking into account an identified need to provide a further 500 additional home up to 2021 on the basis of the Council's Care and Support Strategy (2006). At that point less than half of the 500 homes had been completed in Telford & Wrekin, with most of these in the south of the Borough. Officers therefore considered that the need for an extra care facility was evident and supportive of the principle of an Extra Care facility in this location to serve Wellington.

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 applicant contended that currently enclosed/private land would be brought into community/ recreational use and ecological/biodiversity interest would 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 considered that this would offer some compensation for the loss of Green Network land and through the S106 agreement would ensure that the green space is maintained and accessible for the wider public in perpetuity. Notably, following withdrawal of an earlier scheme there had been a reduction in the amount of the site to be developed with approximately 50% of the site (3.6 ha) 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 was an area of dispute between the landowners and local residents, officers considered 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.

In terms of the approved scheme, Officers considered that were the proposal just a standard residential scheme, that there would be insufficient community benefits to outweigh the harm of the development to the green network. With a need for the open market residential development for viability purposes to provide an extra care facility on the site, identified in the housing strategy as a type of specialist housing in demand for an ageing population, such 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 approximately half of the site, and green network in this locality in accordance with Policy OL4 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

This time round, the application material acknowledges similar consideration of the relationship with the Green Network is required with the replacement of the Extra Care facility with 30 bungalows with the resultant changes to the approved Parameters Plan. The applicant contends that in any comprehensive review of the Green Network, and in light of the approved outline scheme, the site would be unlikely to retain its Green Network designation. Notwithstanding this, an assessment in terms of contribution to the aims of the Green Network has been provided.

In relation to the 'exceptional circumstances' element identified in Policy OL4 of the Local Plan, the applicant contends that the proposed use of the site for bungalow development will not affect the approved Parameters Plan for the wider site and that there would only be a 1.5% change in the open space provision across the site overall (the footprint or land take for bungalow development would be slightly greater in area than the footprint of the permitted Extra Care), such that the assessment of the previous application that approximately 50% of the whole site remains as woodland and open space is essentially paralleled, and was accepted during the previous application as addressing many deficiencies and recommendations in the Council's Assessment of Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities. In this

respect Officers accept that the development will again deliver significant community and environmental benefits as required by Policy OL4 and CS11 in providing a long term managed, and significant amount, of publicly accessible open space.

Taking the Green Network context further as warranted by this application, consideration of the six aims defining the designation is required in terms of the relationship between the land as it stands, and through the proposed development – remembering that the proposal would be intrinsically linked to delivery of the wider development land. Officers consider that the application site would continue to maintain Telford as an attractive place to live and work. A revised approach has only marginally reduced the level of open space to be secured, such that an extensive green area would be retained through development, landscaped boundaries being a noticeable a feature of the Indicative Layout plan as a matter to be pursued through the reserved matters stage. In this respect the provision of reinforces hedgerow boundary and buffer planting shown in Figure 8 of the Design & Access Statement is acknowledged. Development at this edge will reduce the separation of the built up area in this location, but notably the application site provides a good level of separation to properties in Arleston Village through the provision of the attenuation pond and parkland area as well retaining a landscaped boundary. Further, taking the wider application as a whole (again recognising the linked form of this proposal), the development secure the retention of a significant green wedge between areas of residential development contributing to this aim.

Whilst access to the land remains an area of dispute between the landowners and local residents, delivery of development - both exclusively through this part of the site and inclusively across the wider site - would provide for the improvement and management of existing habitats, community and recreational benefits, access points and paths, supplying a source of open land to help meet local recreational needs and derive open space linkages. Shropshire Council have raised no comment on this application with areas of archaeological interest lying outside of the application site, a condition having been placed on the wider site approval to protect the area of potential value (Condition 15.). Officers are of the opinion that the applicant's assessment of the site and the proposal against the Green Network aims is sufficient to meet the requirements of policy OL3 and OL4 contributing to or being complementary to the aims of the Green Network.

During the previous application a lack of a five year land supply was raised as an issue favouring the scheme. This was discounted in terms of the level of permissions granted at that time against the Regional Spatial Strategy target. Since the previous application was permitted, five year land supply has come to the fore. As obligated by the National Planning Policy Framework, Telford & Wrekin Council must identify and update annually a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of housing against its housing requirements set out in the adopted development plan, the Core Strategy (2006-2016). Evidence has now come to light as published in the Council's 2013 Land Supply Statement demonstrating that a housing supply exists of 2.5 years such that a sizeable shortfall exists, meaning that where the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply then relevant policies for the *supply* of housing should not be considered up-to-date. For Telford & Wrekin Council this means policies CS1 (Homes) which identifies dwelling requirements for Telford, Newport and the rural area are out of date. This means that applications

cannot be refused on the grounds of housing supply alone and there will be a presumption in favour of *sustainable* development.

The value of a replacement form of affordable housing for the elderly in meeting need is fundamental to the determination of this application. Whilst it is accepted that the percentage of affordable housing falls below the starting point envisaged by policy H23 linked to the wider site, the Council's Housing Officer supports the principle to provide thirty specialist bungalows for older people acknowledging the reasons why the Extra Care housing scheme is unable to proceed – deliverability is adjusting to the market. The intention to develop an exemplar specialist housing scheme for older people is very much welcomed, with provision of bungalows to the standards proposed by the national report *Housing Our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation* (HAPPI), as a suitable alternative to the Lifetime Homes standard suggested by the Sustainability Officer.

Through the progress of this application further clarification has been sought as to the extent of this intention, with provision of a review of the scheme thus far by PRP Architects who have been involved in the compilation of the HAPPI Report and has implemented many schemes both before and since the publication of this report which meet the principles to which it aspires.

PRP believe the proposed design of the scheme meets the criteria and aspirations set out in the HAPPI Report and supports it on that basis. They specifically identify that the HAPPI Report is not a definitive set of standards and because it is open to interpretation and potentially subject to change do not advocate it to be used in the form of a planning condition. The letter references the HAPPI Panel recognition of the enduring popularity of the bungalow, and can be a very good HAPPI model with dual aspect (or more) and excellent potential for high levels of daylight; the potential for full height windows or doors without the problems associated with having to provide guarding; direct access to a garden or patio; its own easily recognisable front door and the appearance of mainstream, ordinary housing - essentially a far cry from the type of institutional older persons housing that HAPPI sets out to improve upon. Bungalows are not constrained by fire regulation so there is also the opportunity for offering a more open-plan internal layout which is not generally possible with upper floor flats.

The material goes on to identify that the criticism levelled at the bungalow is that it is often associated with poor quality place-making. The way in which the bungalows are arranged in this scheme around a central shared semi-private garden court, is considered to work really well in creating a sense of place, a neighbourhood community and a close-knit social group. A suggestion is made in this regard to include some form of communal gathering space where residents could socialise and which would strengthen the sense of community. The space standards proposed for this scheme are judged to be generous – considerably higher than the minimum extra care standards. The typical one-bedroom unit has the flexibility of a third living space which can be left open to the lounge or closed off as a study or for a sofa-bed for overnight guests.

An issue was raised by the Council's Housing Officer was raised in respect of indicative design dwelling type 'C' appearing to show that this type would not be

level access (there is no first floor layout plan), and would not be suitable. However, the PRP reviewer has advised that the typical two-bed unit with an extra bedroom/en suite in the roof (described as a 'dormer bungalow') is an appropriate HAPPI model as part of general mix of dwelling types. The ground floor area is still 60m², even when the space for a stair is taken out, this is reasonable. The second bedroom in this unit type would most likely be used by relatives, visitors or carers to stay over and is not a problem being located at first floor level.

The review material has been reviewed by the Council's Housing Officer, the general support welcomed, and the context of dormer bungalow provision appreciated. Modest amendments on this basis are under review by the applicant including seeking a small number of units to be fully wheelchair accessible, and provision of an upstairs en-suite within the 1½ storey units; an update will be provided to members at Planning Committee. Further HAPPI design criteria not referenced by PRP: outside storage (need acknowledged in section 9 of the Design & Access Statement), energy efficiency and care-readiness can be dealt with at a more detailed stage.

The Housing Officer advises that a scheme built as an exemplar and that achieves the HAPPI principles will represent an acceptable alternative to the original Extra Care housing proposals. This is defined as an appropriate location for such a scheme, which will help to meet the needs of the growing number of local older people in the Borough. It will also achieve a number of other benefits, including helping people to live more independently, reducing under occupation and contribution to health and social care priorities. Although a potential Extra care housing scheme will not be provided, a number of similar schemes are either in the development pipeline or under consideration within the area, whilst conditioning of HAPPI standards may not be appropriate, this is something that will be pursued at the Reserved Matters stage.

A number of essential requirements have been identified to form part of an approval either by condition or as part of an amended S106 agreement and would be taken forward to ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling types, and an obligation to meet the HAPPI principles, transfer of the dwellings to an appropriate housing association, and for an appropriate local lettings plan to be agreed with the Council, prior to first letting.

Provision of affordable elderly bungalows will again provide residential development in a sustainable location in Telford as the focus for development in accordance with Core Strategy policies CS1 and CS3, providing a greater mix of house types and size. Officers are of the view that the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that an Extra Care facility at this point in time in this location is not a deliverable option, and when compared to the alternative provision of affordable elderly bungalows this will help meet a further accommodation need for our growing elderly population in a form of accommodation with an adaptable element as the needs of its occupants change as a scheme endorsed by a leading architect in delivering schemes meeting HAPPI principles, with the added benefit of being at a lower height than the 3 storey Extra Care facility, such that concerns raised in representations as to the massing of the building would be addressed.

Highways

A Transport Technical Note has been submitted as part of this application assessing the likely transport implications of the revised form of development. This concluded that during the am peak hour, there would be an additional 11 two-way vehicle trips and during the pm peak hour there would be an additional 8 two-way vehicle trips. The Local Highways Authority has commented on this application referencing representation made to the previous application, but have not raised an issue with the increase in traffic as defined by the alternative form of development.

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.

The development would be linked to the obligations entailed by the Section 106 agreement of the approved scheme for the maintenance of the new junctions created by the development and a new signal controlled pedestrian crossing. The need for a contribution towards the support and monitoring of the travel plan in association with the extra care would be obsolete where bungalow development were entailed.

Officers continue to consider that the site is well served by public transport, with the indicative design including the bungalows showing links to the wider site demonstrating 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. The development has exploited opportunities for sustainable transport modes in accordance with NPPF guidance.

Officers therefore concur with the transport assessment that the increase in traffic is negligible in transport terms and the impact on the highway network is likely to be imperceptible in comparison to the previously consented scheme such that the alternative scheme is considered appropriate in respect of the principle of highways and access subject to the imposition of conditions and further consideration of the layout of the site at the Reserved Matters stage including compliance with Manual for Streets guidance in terms of the internal road layout.

Ecology

The ecological evidence provided has been reviewed in the context of the site by the Council's Ecologist, thus advising that the areas of valuable and sensitive habitat on the site fall outside of the area covered by this new application TWC/2014/0057 and are dealt with appropriately under the original TWC/2012/0240 planning permission. There is however species specific potential implications of the development with potential for bats to be foraging around this current application area and to be affected by any lighting erected as part of this proposal. Repetition of the relevant conditions from the original 2012 decision notice are therefore considered appropriate to cover this potential risk.

A pre-commencement inspection survey has also been requested to ensure that badgers have not colonised new areas of the site in the intervening time and can be controlled by condition. The site has potential for nesting wild birds to be present, an informative has been requested in this respect. No evidence of reptiles being present

was recorded during the reptile survey in 2008 but Bioscan (February 2012) recommend that if the site has not been cleared by 2013 then the reptile survey should be repeated, and again can be suitably covered by condition. On this basis, Officers are content that the proposed approach and controls through condition are appropriate at this stage to ensure the protection of wildlife in accordance with policy CS12.

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 are no objections raised relating to trees with a request for an update to the Tree Survey as the version accompanying the original application as submitted for this scheme needs to be undertaken in accordance with letter BS:5837 (2012). Officers consider the need to retain the trees to the northern and eastern perimeter of the site to be critical to retain the green character of the site, and this can be adequately controlled through conditions.

Drainage and Flooding

A range of methods are proposed to convey drainage from the development, that being foul to mains sewer, and surface water to sustainable drainage system / mains sewer / pond/lake / soakaway / existing watercourse. A Flood Risk Assessment was undertaken to inform the determination of the original outline application has been revised to take account of the alternate scheme in the context of the wider approved scheme. It reaffirms that the application site remains within Flood Zone 1, with low risk of flooding. The risk of flooding is from pluvial events and surface water runoff and is therefore considered acceptable, and in compliance with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Provision of an attenuation pond is proposed within this area of open space, being one of three ponds proposed across the wider site to manage the discharge of surface water drainage. In order to ensure the impact of development on this greenfield site is mitigated in drainage terms, further information will be required by condition in accordance with the request of the Council's Drainage Officer and Severn Trent Water. The proposal to adopt a positive drainage system utilising attenuation features is supported in principle.

In respect of drainage to an existing watercourse, the proposal includes the discharge of surface water to a ditch course within Arleston Village which 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 greenfield rates, as per existing and can be conditioned as such. Furthermore, the 'stream' is on third party land therefore the Local Planning Authority cannot insist that such works are undertaken.

In response to these issues, a basic survey was undertaken of the 'stream' by the applicants and consider that improvement works could be undertaken for £5,000. Provision of a bond for £5,000 prior to commencement of development has been included in the S106 for the previous application to be held by the Council by which owners of the stream can draw upon to undertake works to de-silt and do repairs. 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. As the two developments would be tied through the Deed of Variation document, this bond would relate to the new application site also, the imposition of an additional condition requested by the Drainage Officer in respect of an assessment of the downstream watercourse and culvert is therefore considered to be appropriately covered by existing controls.

Geotechnical and Contamination Issues

The site lies in an area subject to standing advice of the Coal Authority and can be appropriately covered by an informative. In order to address potential contamination, a condition can be imposed requiring further investigation prior to the commencement of development in order to address any concern in respect of policy EH7.

Design Principles and Heritage

The Indicative Layout (RG11 Rev Ad) indicates the bungalows forming a quad composition, with a mix of one (13no.) and two (17no.) bedroom bungalows of 1 and 1½ storeys in height proposed at this stage. Bungalows are land hungry and the external treatment of the units would be key to off setting the dense grouping of the sides of the 'quad' as highlighted by the Conservation Officer, whilst a no comment response has been received from the Council's Urban Designer. The grouping adds to a sense of place and the mix of different height units represents an opportunity to design an alternative feature piece of the wider development to the three storey Extra Care facility, the lower height being an acknowledged factor by a number of local parties. The development as affordable housing for the elderly shares many of the principles of often characterful and well-designed Almshouse developments across the country, with an opportunity to link to the character of the old settlement of Arleston, including materials, this should be further explored through the reserved matters stage to provide further merit for the scheme and add to the quality of the local environment as required by policy UD2. More of a staggered influence through mixing up the 1 and 2 bedroom bungalows than that proposed in the Housing Mix Plan (RG15 Rev H) should be sought. A positive level of landscaping is indicated in the layout plan and would complement a well designed detailed proposal, again accounting for the HAPPI principles as a feature to be further explored through the reserved matters stage. The layout suggests provision of shared surfaces and would

add to the character of the development. The manoeuvrability of some parking spaces looks a little tight and will need to be reviewed in a detailed scheme.

Based on the indicative layout, the majority of units would benefit from views in to the internal courtyard; and whilst not being single aspect as a dimension identified to be avoided within the HAPPI principles, there are however, a number of units sitting in corner plots either with limited or void of this benefit, a number of which have limited alternative amenity. The design of such units needs to be reviewed at the reserved matters stage to address this deficiency.

Planning obligations

A Deed of Variation is sought to link this application to the existing outline permission for the wider site under TWC/2012/0240 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. This would provide a distinct response where the bungalows (as the preferred development option) would come forward to:

- secure the provision of the 30 bungalows as affordable elderly units
- secure trigger point in terms of the occupation of open market dwellings (20) requiring a contract to be entered for the transfer of units to a Registered Provider
- occupation controls and eligibility
- exclusion of occupiers exercising a statutory right to buy
- housing tenure split arrangements
- prior to any commencement, the Local Planning Authority be made aware of which scheme is being implemented, and obligation ensuring the access of Dawley Road is in place before implementing Phase E.

Notably, provision of the bungalow scheme would negate the requirement for a contribution of £5,000 for the provision of support and monitoring of the Travel Plan required under condition 3 of the approved scheme as defined in provision 3.4 of the S106 for said permitted scheme.

Other issues

A lack of neighbour consultation was raised early on in the progress of the application with steps taken to undertake wider consultation in order to address this issue. The application was also advertised by four site notices in the vicinity of the application site and wider previous application site.

Notably, local residents and the ward Councillor have raised a lack of detail around how the estate road will cross the lane serving Midfields Serchem and Heathersett has been raised including provision of a gas main down the northern side and that this would need to be crossed. This issue was accepted as part of consideration of the wider application site as part of TWC/2012/0240 and the need for a lack of detail to be addressed as part of a Reserved Matters application, this remains the case through an application covering the wider site.

Residents have advised as to the requirement for an 8 foot wall along the boundary between the neighbouring residential property Midfields and proposed road to ensure less dust and interference from construction. This area falls outside the

application site (to the south) and therefore is not relevant to this application, nonetheless it is noted that means of enclosure forms part of the conditions (Condition 4.) on the wider site, together with a Site Environmental Management Plan (Condition 20.) which necessitates consideration of measures for the control and reduction of noise from construction works, and hoarding to contain dust, the applicants attention is generally drawn to residents' concerns for consideration through the reserved matters stage.

The issue of the loss of green network and impact on children's health has been raised by a number of residents. The 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.

The site has been referenced as Green Belt land within neighbour representation, as a point of clarity the land can be defined as greenfield (i.e. undeveloped) and greenspace, with no designated Green Belt existing in the Borough.

Conclusions

The proposal provides an alternative form of housing accommodation for the elderly in an affordable provision; as discussed above it is considered that 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 the NPPF for the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

RECOMMENDATION: That subject to the applicant entering into a S106 Deed of Variation as detailed in the report to replace the 30 affordable extra care units with the 30 affordable bungalows, the Development Management Manager be given delegated authority to issue a GRANT of OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions (subject to refinement):

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 Highway access provision
7. Bcust Highway details
8. B057 Land Contamination
9. Bcust Foundation details
10. B062 Foul and Surface Water drainage
11. BCust Badger survey
12. BCust Reptile survey

13. BCust Tree survey
14. C130 Tree Protection
15. C131 Services in root protection areas
16. C133 Details of Trees for removal
17. B145 Lighting Strategy
18. B150 Site Environmental Management Plan
19. C071 Soil Levels in Tree root protection zone
20. C072 Burning/storing in tree root protection zones
21. C101 Erection of ecology boxes
22. Ccust Ecological Mitigation Strategy
23. C38 Development in accordance with plans
24. Dcust No approval of layout

INFORMATIVES

S106 agreement – Deed of Variation
Sustainable Urban Drainage
Contaminated Land
Protected Species
Bats
Nesting Birds
Update Survey
Trenches
Broadband
Fire Authority
HAPPI Principles
Conditions
Reason for grant of outline permission