

## **PLANS BOARD**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 24th September 2008 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford**

**PRESENT:** Councillors I.T.W.Fletcher, (Chairman), A.A.Meredith (Vice-Chairman), R.Aveley (as substitute for R.G.Chaplin), M.J.Smith, J.A.Francis, G.M.Green, F.R.Picken and H.Rhodes.

#### **ALSO PRESENT:**

Councillor R.K.Austin for planning application W2008/0811, Councillor V.A.Fletcher for planning application W2008/0863, Councillor S.M.Kelly for planning application W2008/0870 and Councillor A.J. Eade for planning application W2008/0962.

#### **PB-35        MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 3rd September, 2008 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

#### **PB-36        APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor R.G.Chaplin.

#### **PB-37        DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor J.A.Francis declared a personal interest in planning application W2008/0921 – Shortwood School, Limekiln Lane, Wellington, Telford and stated that she would leave the meeting prior to the consideration of this particular item.

Councillor H.Rhodes declared a personal interest in planning application W2008/0870 – St Mary's Church Hall, Red Lees, Ketley, Telford and stated that she would leave the meeting prior to the consideration of this particular item.

Councillor M.J.Smith declared a personal interest in planning applications W2008/0811 – 139 Crescent Road, Hadley, Telford and W2008/0838 – Haybridge Hall Bungalows, Haybridge Road, Hadley, Telford and stated that he would leave the meeting prior to the consideration of both of these particular items.

Councillor R. Aveley declared a personal interest in planning applications W2008/0811 – 139 Crescent Road, Hadley, Telford, W2008/0916 – 8 Paddock Close, Wellington, Telford, W2008/0921 – Shortwood School. Limekiln Lane, Wellington, Telford, W2008/0923 – 48 Harley Close, Wellington, Telford, W2008/0973 and W2008/0976 – Portway House, Plough

**PB240908MINS**

Road, Wellington, Telford and stated that he would leave the meeting prior to the consideration of each of these particular items.

Councillor I.T.W.Fletcher declared a personal interest in planning applications W2008/0838 – Haybridge Hall Bungalows, Haybridge Road, Hadley, Telford and W2008/0863 – 37 Ainsdale Drive, Priorslee, Telford where he had been requested to address the Board as local ward member on behalf of an objector – however he further stated that he would relinquish the Chair for this particular item, speak as the local ward member and then retire from the meeting for the determination of this particular item.

**PB-38            PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION**

(a)    W2008/0437 – The Malthouse, Springfields, Newport, Shropshire

This application sought planning permission for a change of use of 'The Malthouse', Springfields, Newport a modern industrial unit to an indoor climbing centre. Members were reminded that consideration of the application had been deferred at the Board meeting held on 23rd July 2008 following the Members' visit to the application site on 23rd July and the resolution to defer the decision to enable the Applicants to submit plans identifying the correct site area, an amended parking layout and supporting information which had now been submitted.

It was confirmed to the Board that the amendments now reflected the actual land ownership and the resultant site had been reduced in size which in turn had lead to the loss of available parking space. However the amended parking layout had been drawn up in discussion with the Council's Highways Engineer, and further comments regarding the amended plans and additional information had been received as detailed within the report.

Many of these points reiterated previous comments made during the application process. However, it was noted that whilst a booking procedure and limiting numbers of climbers would help to regulate the level of parking in the site and on adjoining streets, this would be self-regulation only, and could not be controlled by condition or enforced.

The amended plans now showed the correct site area and whilst parking was constrained by the limited area, the Highways Engineer had no objection to this layout and possible overspill parking in Station Road.

Officers confirmed that there were no changes to the recommendation of the original report to approve the change of use of the industrial unit to a climbing centre, and the proposed conditions also remain unchanged.

**RESOLVED** – that in relation to planning application W2008/0437 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

(b) W2008/0626 – Land at Newport Business Park, Audley Road, Newport, Shropshire

Members received this application which sought outline permission for residential development on the Newport Business Park, Audley Road, Newport.

An initial indicative layout showed 55 dwellings arranged broadly in horseshoe configuration, and suggested to be a mix of 2, 2 and a half and three storey properties. The proposal showed two access points into the new development – one at the existing business park main site entrance on the bend of Audley Road and Audley Avenue, and the other off Avenue Road on the site of the carpet shop and the existing cement works access, opposite Newport Junior School.

Members were however referred to the update sheet which provided further details of discussions that had taken place between the applicant and the Council as a result of the applicant's seeking a reduction in the amount of affordable housing provision below the required 35% claiming that this reflected the current market conditions.

A number of members were concerned in connection with the precedent that would be created if the proposal was agreed by the Board without them having the benefit of a full and detailed assessment of the applicant's submissions in favour of a package of Section 106 contributions which fell below what would normally be expected in respect of a development of this nature in this location. Accordingly, it was proposed that consideration and determination of this application should be deferred until the next Board meeting in order for the Council to receive a detailed financial assessment of the applicants' viability appraisal and more information regarding the appropriateness of the Section 106 contributions which had been offered.

Accordingly, it was;

**RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0626 that determination of this application be deferred in order for the Council to receive a detailed financial assessment of the applicants' viability appraisal and more information regarding the appropriateness of the Section 106 contributions that had been offered.**

*N.B. Prior to the consideration of this particular item Councillors R.Aveley and M.J.Smith left the meeting in accordance with their previous declaration of interests.*

(c) W2008/0811 – 139, Crescent Road, Hadley, Telford

This retrospective application related to the change of use of a residential dwelling to an after-school club for religious teaching at a residential premise located at 139 Crescent Road, Hadley, Telford. Members were informed that the applicants had been using the property for the past 10 years where they

**PB240908MINS**

had been teaching basic Islamic studies to children between the ages of 5 and 16. Members were advised that Councillor M.J.Smith and Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council had requested that the application should be considered by the Board.

The Board was advised that the applicants believed that the building would lend itself to the individual teaching of up to 70 pupils, although they currently taught only 40 children. The hours of opening would be from 4.30 pm to 6.00 pm during term time and school holidays. The property comprised a two storey 3-bedroom semi-detached house and whilst no external changes had been made the only internal alterations had seen a bedroom wall being knocked down to create two teaching rooms on the first floor.

The local ward member, Councillor R.K.Austin was invited to address the Board and he spoke in favour of the applicants and that they had provided this facility for the last 11 years. He referred to the history of the facility which had previously been run from the former Hadley Infants School, which had subsequently been demolished for the current Hadley Learning Community (HLC). Members were reminded that whilst the applicants had received an offer for the use of the facilities at HLC they had stated that the rental cost was prohibitive and of the distance between HLC and the families that would use the facility. He stated that the applicants were right to offer their cultural teaching within the community and he referred the Board to similar properties within the Wellington area. If the application was refused the applicants would be unable to offer the facility elsewhere. Councillor Austin advised that the applicants had accepted that they should have obtained prior approval and that he had visited the property and stated that he felt that the property was sound. Finally he referred Members to the level of support for the facility that was outlined within the report. He requested that if the application was approved he suggested that extra conditions could be imposed in connection with a maximum number of children and time limited for a period of 18 months in order to assess the use of the property.

The Board was referred to the consultation responses that had been received as outlined within the report together with the relevant planning history, relevant planning policy and planning considerations. Members were referred to the update sheet that was tabled which included a further letter from the applicant's agents.

Members whilst acknowledging the benefits of the facility and supporting the principle of such an after school club were concerned as to the size and suitability of this modest dwelling and its location within a residential locality and the adverse effects the proposed use would have in relation to traffic movements, car parking and potential highway safety issues especially in view of the fact that a maximum of 70 children was proposed, as well as general noise and disturbance to local residents

Officers had concluded that the premises were an inappropriate and unsuitable property and site for an after school club as it did not comply with the adopted planning policies contained within the Wrekin Local Plan nor the

**PB240908MINS**

LDF Core Strategy. In conclusion it was considered that the community and social benefits of providing this facility in the location did not provide sufficient justification to override the existing policy presumption against the proposed use.

**RESOLVED** – that in relation to planning application W2008/0811 that planning permission be refused on the grounds that the Local Planning Authority considered that the change of use of this property from a residential dwelling to an after-school club was unacceptable. It was felt that the intensity of the proposed use within a modest residential property in a predominantly residential area would adversely affect the residential amenities presently enjoyed by people living in the surrounding area by reason of traffic generation, noise, nuisance and general disturbance. The proposed use was therefore deemed to be contrary to the provisions of Policy LR1 of the Wrekin Local Plan and Policy CS10 of the LDF Core Strategy.

*N.B. In accordance with their previous declarations of interest Councillors I.T.W.Fletcher and M.J.Smith left the meeting prior to the consideration of the next agenda item. Councillor A.A.Meredith (Vice-Chairman) took the position as Chairman of the meeting.*

(d) W2008/0838 – Haybridge Hall Bungalows, Haybridge Road, Hadley, Telford

Members considered this application which related to an application to erect 5 terraced bungalows together with a community building on land adjacent to Haybridge Hall, Haybridge Road, Hadley, Telford.

The local ward member, Councillor Smith had requested that the application should be considered by Plans Board because of the concern of some residents of Hadley about the application and any future use of the grounds.

Councillor R.K.Austin, local ward member was invited to address the Board and stated that whilst in favour of the application he reminded the Board that Haybridge Hall was well liked and that residents would be keen to retain the features of the existing hall and that developers should remain mindful of the existing covenant, which should protect the hall. He was of the view that the existing trees within the site should be protected by a Tree Preservation Order but that after looking at the proposed design he was of the view that it was excellent in appearance.

Members were advised that at present the site comprised of Haybridge Hall, an impressive, but unlisted, early 19<sup>th</sup> century house, and 19 one-bedroom bungalows which were located around a green within the spacious grounds of the Hall. There were many fine specimen trees within these grounds but none of them were protected by Tree Preservation Orders.

The applicants were proposing to dispose of the Hall, whilst retaining the existing bungalows, and supplementing them with the erection of the 5

**PB240908MINS**

additional bungalows and a separate community building. The Hall would be sold off with the original covenant that stated that the building must be used 'for the benefit of the elderly'. The applicants had suggested subdividing the building into dwellings for sale to the active elderly or converting it into a residential/nursing home for the elderly. Any such development would require a separate planning application and the Board were informed that this was not for consideration within the current application.

Members were referred to the consultation responses, planning history, planning policy and planning considerations as outlined within the report. Members although welcoming the application and the proposed design were also of the view that, where possible further steps should be undertaken to protect the hall and the mature trees on the site.

In conclusion officers had considered that the proposed development was acceptable, that the design and layout of the new buildings would relate to and respect their surroundings, and would not damage the existing mature trees within the site. The development would not be harmful to the residential amenities of nearby dwellings or detrimental to the character and appearance of the site or the surrounding area.

Accordingly, it was;

**RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0838 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.**

*N.B. Councillors I.T.W.Fletcher and M.J.Smith returned to the meeting. The meeting was reminded of Councillor I.T.W.Fletcher's earlier declaration of interest that advised that he would wish to address the Board as local ward member in connection with the following agenda item but that afterwards he would withdraw from the meeting prior to the determination of the application.*

(e) W2008/0863 – 37 Ainsdale Drive, Priorslee, Telford

This application sought permission for the erection of a two storey front gable extension across the width of the dwelling situated at 37 Ainsdale Drive, Priorslee, Telford. The development would replace an existing single storey mono-pitch porch lean-to and would comprise an entrance hall, dining room and w.c at ground floor, and enlarged bedrooms 1 and 2, with en-suite bathroom at first floor level.

A local ward member, Councillor I.T.W.Fletcher addressed the Board and advised that he had been requested by one of the local objectors in connection with the application. He cited that the reasons for the objection were based on overdevelopment of the property, with significant increase to its size, the impact on the amenity of the neighbour who lived opposite the application site with problems of overlooking from first floor windows and that the front extension encroached on the building line.

**PB240908MINS**

The other local ward member, Councillor V.A.Fletcher was invited to address the Board and she stated that she had been requested by the applicant to represent the applicant's views. She had some photographs which she was allowed to distribute to the Board that showed the relationship of the property within the surrounding area and that the proposed design improved the distinctness of the property. She also informed the Board that the extension unlike the previous design did not extend the full width of the present property and that the existing front garden would remain in its present size. The Board were also advised that the percentage increase of the extension would not be as much as was stated within the report.

Members were referred to the consultation responses, planning history, planning context and the relevant planning considerations. Members were also referred to the additional information that had been provided by the applicant as detailed in the update sheet.

Officers had concluded that whilst there would be no other properties of this exact design or character and that the extension would project beyond the front of the existing building, there was not a particular established form or character of development in Ainsdale Drive. Therefore the extension should not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, due to the position and orientation of the application property and adjoining dwellings. There was a distance of some 13 metres from No. 41 Ainsdale Drive opposite in the cul-de-sac and no windows were proposed on the side gables of the property to affect either No.41 or No.36 next door, and further that the extension would not lead to a loss of privacy to No.9 Ainsdale Drive opposite, due to the orientation of the properties.

Officers had further concluded that the previous approval was a material consideration in assessing the current similar scheme and that the extension to the frontage would not have a significant or adverse impact on adjoining properties or the character and appearance of the area.

Accordingly, it was;

**RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0863 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.**

*N.B. In accordance with her previous declaration of interest Councillor H.Rhodes left the meeting prior to the consideration of the next agenda item.*

(f) W2008/0870 – St Mary's Church Hall, Red Lees, Ketley, Telford

This outline planning application (to include access) related to the demolition of St Mary's Church Hall at Red Lees, Ketley, and the erection of two detached houses on the site. The proposed development would comprise two detached houses. An indicative layout had been submitted with the application which showed how the two dwellings could be laid out on the site, although the applicant had stated that he only wanted to agree the access at

**PB240908MINS**

this outline stage. Matters relating to layout, scale, external appearance, and landscaping would be left to the reserved matters stage.

Members were advised that the local ward member, Councillor S.M.Kelly and Ketley Parish Council had requested that the application should be considered by the Board.

Councillor S.M.Kelly was invited to address the Board and he cited concerns that the proposed application would represent over-development within the locality and whilst he appreciated that legislation and Building Regulations would protect the neighbouring properties he wished to express their concerns for the application. He also stated that the proposal would adversely affect the current informal arrangements of a further nearby property with regards their emptying septic tank. He requested that there was a need to undertake a full risk assessment and environmental survey together with a sustainable car parking plan for the adjacent St Mary's Church. He was also of the view that the application did not satisfy the requirements contained within the LDF in connection with the site selection criteria and the associated sustainability principles.

The Board were referred to the consultation responses that had been received together with the relevant planning history, planning policy and planning considerations as outlined within the report.

Members were advised that efforts to find alternative uses for the Church Hall had been unsuccessful because of the dilapidated condition of the premises. A Commercial Feasibility Report, prepared by a firm of local estate agents, concluded that the building did not lend itself to any conversion or adaptation to a commercial or business use, and, in any case, such uses would probably conflict with the residential nature of the immediate area around the site.

Officers also felt that the site was large enough to accommodate two detached dwellings, together with their associated access, parking and private garden requirements, without prejudicing the character and visual amenities of the surrounding area. The development would not adversely affect the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings by virtue of any overlooking, although the design of the actual dwellings would need to carefully consider the position of windows.

In view of the fact that almost all the properties in this part of Red Lake are in residential use it is considered that the erection of two dwellings on this site would be acceptable.

Notwithstanding this Members were concerned about the application and resolved not to accept the recommendation at this stage. Instead they requested further information in relation to the proposed sewage arrangements (particularly for the neighbouring properties), alternative car parking arrangements for the church. Members agreed to propose a deferment of the application until this additional information could be provided.

**RESOLVED** – that in relation to planning application W2008/0870 that consideration and determination of this planning application be deferred to enable further information to be supplied to the Board in connection with the proposed sewage arrangements (particularly for the neighbouring properties) and alternative car parking arrangements for the church.

*N.B. Councillor H.Rhodes returned to the meeting. In accordance with his previous declaration of interest Councillor R.Aveley left the meeting prior to the consideration of the following agenda items.*

(g) W2008/0916 – 8 Paddock Close, Wellington, Telford

This application sought approval to the proposed erection of a single rear extension and pitched roof with canopy at front of property situated at 8 Paddock Close, Wellington, Telford. The property was a semi-detached house located on a corner plot within a residential area of Wellington. The dwelling had a front garden bounded by a large hedge, the boundary then changed to a brick wall to the side of the property which continues to form the parking area to the rear.

The property had been previously extended to the side in addition to a conservatory to the rear. Due to the fact that part of the rear garden had been separated for parking space and access to the detached garage, also located in the rear garden, amenity space is currently limited.

Members were referred to the consultation responses, planning history, relevant planning context and the planning considerations relevant to the application.

No objections had been received from neighbours; however Wellington Town Council had objected on the grounds of overdevelopment and the proposal being out of keeping with the existing development. Officers had considered that overdevelopment of the site was no longer an issue due to the gain in space in the rear garden from the repositioning of the wall and that the proposal for a single storey rear extension and canopy to the front of the property was not out of keeping with the existing dwelling, but respected the character of the property and would not appear incongruous within the street scene.

Accordingly, it was;

**RESOLVED** – that in relation to planning application W2008/0916 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

*N.B. In accordance with her previous declaration of interest Councillor J.A.Francis left the meeting prior to the consideration of the next agenda item.*

(h) W2008/0921 – Shortwood Primary School, Limekiln Lane, Wellington, Telford

Members considered this application which sought permission for the erection of an extension to the existing sports hall to form an after school club, opposite the existing Shortwood Primary School, Limekiln Lane, Wellington, Telford. The proposed extension was approximately 12.7m deep and 8.6m wide and would form a reception area, large family area, associated toilets and soft play area, which is fenced in with canopy over and a smaller grassed play area. These facilities were to be for the benefit of the new Shortwood Primary School (which was situated opposite), and other local schools.

The Board were advised that no objections to the proposal had been received during the consultation period.

Officers had concluded that the proposed extension was acceptable in terms of scale, mass and design and in keeping with the context of the site. The proposed community use as an after school club was acceptable within the context of this educational facility, and had appropriate links to the existing primary school. The proposal would not be harmful to the residential amenities of nearby dwellings.

Accordingly, it was;

**RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0921 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.**

*N.B. Councillor J.A.Francis returned to the meeting.*

(i) W2008/0923 – 48 Harley Close, Wellington, Telford

This application sought to obtain retrospective permission for the erection of a 1.2m high fence to the front of the property situated at 48 Harley Close, Wellington, Telford.

The Board were advised that the local ward member, Councillor K.L.Tomlinson had requested that the application should be considered and determined by the Board. Members were advised that the area was characterised by open plan frontages although some properties did have fencing along the side separating the plots. This mostly consists of interwoven wooden panel fencing. Few properties have boundary treatments at the frontages and these mostly consist of low walls of approximately 0.3m in height. The original permission for the four bungalows removed permitted development rights for fences at the fronts of the houses to safeguard the visual appearance of the area.

Members were referred to the update sheet which was tabled at the meeting which provided details of the consultation responses that had been received.

**PB240908MINS**

The Board was reminded that the area was characterised by open plan frontages, which had been secured via the removal of permitted development rights on the original application. The proposal was for the retention of a 1.2m high green wire mesh fencing to the back of the pavement. Officers considered that the height and location of the boundary treatment, created an incongruous feature within the street scene, which was significantly detrimental to the character of the area.

The fencing, being a metal wire fencing coated and coloured green, was not considered to be a traditional residential boundary feature and was more suited to be used as security fencing such as at the nearby Charlton School, and was considered uncharacteristic within this residential setting, and detracted from the character and appearance of the area therefore being contrary to policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan (Saved policies).

**RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0923 that planning permission be refused on the grounds that the Local Planning Authority considered that the proposed fencing, by reason of its scale, design and materials, created an incongruous feature which was detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene and general area. Accordingly, the proposal was contrary to Policies CS15 of the Local Development Framework – Core Strategy 2007 and UD2 of the Adopted Wrekin Local Plan 1995 - 2006.**

*N.B. Councillor R.Aveley returned to the meeting.*

(j) W2008/0962 – 18 Highfield, Church Aston, Shropshire

This application sought consent for the proposed felling of six scots pine trees within the garden of number 18 Highfield, Church Aston, which were part of a group of trees within a Tree Preservation Order.

The local ward member, Councillor A.J.Eade was invited to address the Board and he referred to this application being part of a sustained effort to remove the trees. He wished to refer Members to the petition that had been supplied and the view of the Parish Council as outlined within the report. Councillor Eade reminded the Board that the trees were subject to a current Tree Preservation Order and referred to Policy OL11 in that the trees were a visible, prominent and local landmark and urged the Board to uphold the existing Tree Preservation Order. He requested that the Board should undertake a site visit to assess the application further.

Members were referred to the comments from the Tree Officer contained within the report and his view that the trees did not warrant any further protection as they were of poor visual amenity and that they considered them to be hazardous. The Tree Officer was present at the meeting to amplify his views during which he stated that the TPO was over 40 years old and that it was incumbent for the Council to review Tree Preservation Orders. He also advised that the applicant had obtained further independent advice which had

**PB240908MINS**

accorded with his view. He advised that during a site visit he had seen one base of one of the trees moving in the wind.

Following a brief discussion Members were minded to agree to a site visit in order to assess the application further.

**RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0962 that consideration of this application be deferred to enable a site visit to be undertaken prior to the next Board meeting.**

*N.B. In accordance with his previous declaration of interest Councillor R.Aveley left the meeting prior to the consideration of the following agenda items.*

(k) W2008/0973 – Portway House, Plough Road, Wellington, Telford

The Board considered this proposal for the conversion of premises situated at Portway House, Plough Road, Wellington, Telford to 5 flats, 4 x 2-bedroomed flats on the ground floor and first floor flat and 1 x 3 bedroomed flat on second floor. The proposal also included the demolition of the existing boundary wall with Vineyard Road with the wall being repositioned closer to the road, retaining a smaller verge. This alteration along with acquisition of land to the rear of Portway House of Charlton Flats would give provision for 8 car parking spaces, accessed off shared driveway adjacent to No. 3 Plough Road.

Members were informed that Portway House was a Grade II Listed, three storey building, situated on Plough Road in Wellington. The building was previously occupied by Severn Hospice, but the property was now vacant.

The Board were referred to the consultation responses, planning history, planning context and relevant planning considerations as outlined within the report.

An adjacent neighbour had raised issues of visibility within the site, and potential blind spot to rear of his property. It was considered a condition for a reversing mirror, would be sufficient to over come any concerns.

Officers had concluded that the principle of residential development was acceptable within this highly sustainable location within Wellington District Centre. The proposed works would preserve the special character and appearance of the Listed Building and Conservation Area and would not be harmful to the residential amenities of nearby dwellings.

**RESOLVED - that in relation to planning application W2008/0973 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.**

(l) W2008/0976 – Portway House, Plough Road, Wellington, Telford

This application was the associated application for Listed Building Consent in connection with the previous application.

**RESOLVED – that in relation to a planning application W2008/0976 that Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.**

*N.B. Councillor R.Aveley returned to the meeting.*

(m) W2008/1002 – Madeley Roundabout, Parkway, Madeley, Telford

This proposal was for the erection of 4no. freestanding non-illuminated advertising boards 1200mm x 500mm raised by 400mm on twin poles, on the Madeley Roundabout, Parkway, Madeley, Telford. The signage would advertise Elliot Bridgman which was based on Stafford Park. It was noted that there were currently advertisements on the site for the same company which this proposal replaced. The roundabout was situated on the junctions of Kemberton Road, Queen Street, Legges Way, Parkway and High Street and was one of the main routes through the area and to Madeley town centre.

Members were referred to the update sheet which contained the comments of the Council's Highway Engineer who confirmed that they had no objections to the proposal.

Members were reminded that various signs to promote local businesses had been installed at several roundabouts in Telford and Wrekin as part of the Telford and Wrekin Community Sponsorship scheme. The signs were considered generally acceptable where they would not result in visual clutter or a distraction to highways users. In this regard, the Highways Engineer had raised no objections to the advertisements and the signs were an adequate size for the island and therefore acceptable.

Accordingly, it was;

**RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1002 that advertisement consent be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.**

(n) W2008/1039 – Blists Hill Museum, Legges Way, Madeley, Telford

This application sought permission for the proposed construction of an overspill car park to accommodate 142 cars, extension of the access road and diversion of public footpath. The site was located to the north of the Blists Hill Museum Legges Way, Madeley through an access point shared with the existing car parks. Members were reminded that an earlier scheme for the development of a 242 space car park was withdrawn in 2007 following concerns over the scale of development and the impact on the surrounding landscape (reference number W2007/0094).

**PB240908MINS**

Members were referred to the planning considerations that were relevant to the application as detailed within the report. Members were also referred to the additional information that had been outlined within the update sheet that was tabled at the meeting. These included comments from Madeley Parish Council, the Council's Recreation Officer, the Highway Engineer and a neighbour objection. The comments related to highlighting the importance of the retained Local Plan policy OL4 in connection with development within the Green Network; request for a Section 106 agreement to secure the retention of community facilities resulting from the loss of community land; the need for a Footpath Diversion Order, the need to protect trees on the periphery of the application site, the value of the site to the local community and traffic movements and anti-social behaviour that might be experienced within the car park.

The Board was advised that the proposed car park would only be used for the occasions that large scale events took place at the museum site and would be routinely locked so that access could not be obtained.

After consideration of the points raised, it was felt by officers that the original recommendation should remain. This was subject however to supplementary conditions in respect of protection of tree works. Whilst s106 monies had been requested to address the loss of the land as part of a community facility from the Parish Council and the Outdoor Recreation Officer, it was felt that in this instance, the scheme would support the vitality of the museum and its role in the Gorge which, was a material consideration, outweighed the proposed contributions and accordingly, the proposed requests were not recommended.

Having considered the detail of this application in particular against the form of the previous proposal and the comments raised earlier, it was felt by officers that this scheme represented a significant improvement over the earlier application. Accordingly and in accordance with the varied recommendations as outlined within the update sheet it was,

**RESOLVED** – that in relation to planning application W2008/1039 that subject to no new additional planning issues being raised that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning & Environment to grant planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report as updated by the update sheet tabled at the meeting.

**PB-39            SITE VISITS**

**RESOLVED** – that in respect of planning application W2008/0962 – 18 Highfield, Church Aston a Site Visit be made at 4.00 p.m. on 8th October, 2008 prior to the meeting of the Board.

**PB-40      PLANNING APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

The Board received for information details of planning applications that had been determined under delegated powers.

The meeting end at 8.15 p.m.

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....