

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 10th December, 2008 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford

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

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor H. Williams for planning application W2007/1254 and Councillor K.L. Tomlinson for planning application W2008/1038.

PB-59 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on 19th November, 2008 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PB-60 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor A.A. Meredith (Vice-Chairman).

PB-61 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

PB-62 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

- (a) W2007/1254 – Plot E, Pool Hill/Doseley Road, Dawley, Telford, Shropshire

Members were reminded that this application was deferred by members at Plans Board on the 19th November 2008 to enable members to undertake a site inspection. This was an outline application for residential development on a plot of land to the east of Doseley Road and north of Pool Hill Road, Dawley. The site was located approximately one kilometre to south west of Dawley Centre and 1.5km from the Town Centre. It was irregular in shape and bounded to the north by Upper Pool Hill, to the west by Doseley Road and to the south and west by existing dwellings fronting Pool Hill.

The site covered an area of 1.21 ha and sloped steeply from the higher ground to the north and east towards the south. There was a drop of 14 metres from north to south and existing hedgerows and vegetation around the boundaries of the site that screened it. At present access into the site was from Pool Hill Road with the land being used for rough grazing. The Board were also advised that there were four mineshafts within the site and a further 2 shafts within 20m of the site.

Councillor H. Williams, one of the Ward Members for Dawley Magna, was invited to speak to the Board and outlined her concerns. She initially thanked

the Members for attending the earlier site visit and reiterated the comments that she had made at the previous Board meeting which centred on concerns for increased highway safety issues that would result from the development to both other road users and pedestrians, questioned the adequacy of the current drainage infrastructure if the development proceeded and the overall design of the development.

Members were also referred to the update sheet that had been prepared since the publication of the final report and that a revised design and access statement had been received from the applicant.

The Board were informed that the plans attached to the original report had demonstrated how the site could accommodate 35 dwellings with the one apartment block at the northern portion of the site only being of two storeys in height. As the proposed number of dwellings had been reduced the applicant's sought a reduction in the amount of the contribution for primary education and this had been agreed to be at the rate of £1250 per dwelling excluding any one bedroom dwellings.

Extra conditions were requested in connection with the future maintenance of the open area of land situated at the northern end of the site and other open space areas and the second extra condition to ensure that any remedial requirements were also undertaken in relation to the presence of radon gas on the application site.

Members were referred to the contents of the original report that had been presented to the Board meeting in September and following a discussion; it was,

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2007/1254 that the Head of Planning & Environment be granted delegated authority to grant outline planning permission subject to the applicant/owner entering into Section 106 obligations to provide a financial contribution to off-site outdoor recreational provision, education facilities, improvements to a public right of way and 22.5% affordable dwellings and subject to the conditions as outlined within the report together with the inclusion of extra conditions to provide that no development should be commenced until a scheme for the future maintenance of the open spaces on the site had been submitted and also to ensure that the presence of radon gas is taken into account.

(b) W2008/0372 – Land at Greenacres Farm, Stanton Road, Ellerdine heath, Shropshire

The Board was referred to this application and that following a recent review of current case law in respect of the superseding of historic Section 106 agreements, it had been noted that the previous committee resolution in respect of the substitution of the original legal agreement for an agricultural workers dwelling was not in line with current best practice. Accordingly, Members were requested to reconsider the previous recommendation.

The crux of the matter was in the use of specific items in the earlier recommendation. The use of the term 'revocation' involved a distinct legal process through which the Council would formally seek to take action to quash the earlier agreement. This course of action however lies at odds with the preceding term that this action was voluntary.

To overcome this dichotomy, the conflict between pursuing a formal legal process as opposed to a direct agreement between the parties concerned, it was recommended that the earlier recommendation was simplified to confirm a single course of action.

For the clarification of any doubt, the voluntary agreement between the parties involved the applicant agreeing through a unilateral undertaking under Section 106 of the Planning Act not to implement the earlier planning consent if approval was granted for the provision of a similar dwelling in a different location.

The applicants had already submitted a draft agreement to the Local Planning Authority which had been considered by the Council's Solicitor. This agreement established that the applicant would not implement the approved application W2005/0591 for the agricultural workers dwelling. This agreement was felt by officers to offer sufficient protection to the Council to allow enforcement action to be taken through a court injunction if both dwellings were built. In due course, the earlier approval would lapse by virtue of the time limitation condition.

As it was intended that the proposed dwelling would be for use a temporary period within which it was hoped that the applicant would prove the commercial viability of the poultry operation over a period of three years, the agreement would also restrict occupancy of the dwelling to agricultural workers.

For clarity, the condition attached to the original consent in respect of installation of the mobile home and the timing of the stocking of the poultry unit with birds had been recommended.

Members were also referred to the additional information contained within the update sheet that had been prepared following the preparation of the report to amend the recommendation and delete reference to occupancy restrictions in the unilateral undertaking.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0372 that subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Unilateral Undertaking not to implement the earlier planning permission W2005/0591 then delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning & Environment to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

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

The Board were reminded that consideration of this application had been deferred at the Board meeting that was held on 24th September 2008 to allow a financial viability assessment to be undertaken.

The planning update to members explained that the applicants did not agree to provide 35% affordable housing, as set out in the Core Strategy Policy CS6 for Newport, due to difficulties in the current economic downturn climate, but would provide 20%. Officers negotiated 25% affordable housing. Officers had sought advice from the Council's Asset & Property dept who considered the applicant's financial listings not unreasonable and the Council did not have evidence to the contrary. Therefore officers considered that this 25% provision was on balance acceptable.

It was noted that Members had previously expressed concerns that this would set a precedent to other developments in Newport and that the Council ought to be sure that the justification for providing less affordable housing than that stated in Policy CS6 was justified. Hence Members requested the application be deferred for a more detailed analysis of the applicant's financial information.

Officers had since sought the advice of a consultant and had received their findings, which were summarised within the report. It was reported that the applicant had been advised of the consultant's findings and that additional information was required of them. This had recently been submitted but a further deferment was requested to allow time for this additional information to be assessed and further considered by Officers before the application was submitted to Members for determination.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0626 that consideration of the application be deferred in order to allow time to consider the details of recently submitted information.

(d) W2008/0844 – Wellington Road Surgery, Wellington Road, Newport, Shropshire

This application was deferred at the Plans Board meeting on 29th October 2008 in order for the Council to investigate any alternative and additional car parking facilities for the surgery.

It was reported that the Council's Highways Engineer had looked for Council owned land within 400 metres walking distance of the surgery, but did not find any sites that would be suitable.

The applicants had also submitted a Travel Plan which they hoped would encourage patients and staff to travel to the surgery by alternative and sustainable modes of transport. However, the Council's Highways Engineer had stated that in appropriate circumstances Travel Plans were regarded as a

positive step forward in dealing with highway issues, but it must be noted that by the very nature of how the surgery operated a Travel Plan was likely to have a very small mitigating effect on car usage.

The Council's Highways Engineer had stated that the additional information provided by the applicant failed to enhance the provision of parking within the site, and therefore did not overcome his concerns with regards to highway safety in the immediate vicinity of the application site. He therefore maintained his objections to the planning application.

The Council's Highways Engineer had offered response to various suggestions that had been put forward by the applicants to mitigate any future traffic and parking problems as outlined within the report.

Members, during the debate that followed, expressed a view that the extra health provision that would be situated at the surgery would benefit the local residents within Newport and would outweigh the perceived traffic and parking issues that had been outlined within the report and through the cited concerns of the Council's Highway Engineer. Accordingly Members expressed support of the application and accordingly; it was,

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0844 that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning & Environment to grant planning permission subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions to be included within the planning approval.

(e) W2008/1038 – Land adjacent to, Princess Royal Hospital, Apley Castle, Leegomery, Telford, Shropshire

Members were reminded that this application had been deferred at the last meeting in order to request the applicant to investigate alternative sites closer to the centre of Leegomery.

The Board were informed that the Telford and Wrekin Primary Care NHS Trust had now stated that they would not be able to consider Leegomery Local Centre as a location for a temporary doctor's surgery, for two reasons:

- (a) A GP surgery is already situated at Leegomery Local Centre and another surgery there could compromise the existing medical practice
- (b) The PCT would be concerned at locating a temporary demountable structure there because they would not be able to guarantee the security of the building

The PCT had also confirmed that they were not able to find any other suitable sites in the Leegomery area that could accommodate a new GP surgery.

Councillor K.L.Tomlinson was invited to address the Board on behalf of Councillor K.T.Blundell who was currently absent. Councillor Tomlinson stated that whilst Councillor Blundell was not against the principle of the proposal per se she considered that the development should take place within the Leegomery Centre. This was on the basis of better access to the Centre being

achieved by the provision of an existing bus route and that there was also existing chemist provision.

Members were also referred to the updated information sheet that had been prepared following the publication of the report which advised of letters that had been received from the current doctor's surgery located within the Leegomery Centre in support of the location within Leegomery Centre being used and also further letters from the Parish Council in which they repeated the terms of their objections to the application, with further additional comments.

The Board were also referred to the additional letter and background paper from the applicant's agents. Members were again referred to the contents of the original report that had been submitted to the Board on 19th November 2008.

It had been established and concluded by Officers that the application site was an 'under doctored' area of Telford. The application site was considered to be an acceptable location for a temporary surgery whilst a more permanent site could be found in the Apley/Leegomey area. The site was situated relatively near to a regular bus route, adequate car parking could be provided, and it would have only a limited impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The application complied with the relevant policies in statutory local plans by virtue of providing essential community services and benefits to the people of Apley/Leegomery.

As a result there was no change to the officer recommendation as a result of the above information.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1038 that temporary planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

(f) W2008/1202 – Tibberton Primary School, Maslan Crescent, Tibberton, Shropshire

This application was for the erection of a demountable building on part of the school playing field at Tibberton Primary School. The demountable would be of a standard timber finish, single storey classroom building, which would be relocated from Holmer Lake. The building was intended to provide pre-school and out of hours facilities. Tibberton Primary School was situated in the centre of the village off Maslan Crescent, with an adjoining large playing field surrounded by housing.

The Board was referred to the report in which the relevant planning policy, planning history, planning considerations and the consultation responses that had been received were outlined.

Members were advised that the demountable building would be located on the playing field area near to the main school building. Members were also

advised that the proposed location had been amended following consultations with the local Parish Council. The proposed location of the demountable would require the junior football pitch to be repositioned 10.5 metres, and although it would result in the loss of an area of the playing field, the use of the existing pitches would not be affected. On balance, it was considered that the demountable facility would not have a significant impact on the overall area of formal open space. The Council's Leisure Services Section also had no objections to the proposal. The demountable would be an adequate distance from surrounding housing such that its function would not significantly detract from local residential amenities.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1202 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

(g) W2008/1218 – 17 Highfield, Church Aston, Shropshire

The application was originally for consent to fell two Scots Pine trees and one Larch tree. However, following the Council's Woodland Officer's recommendations the proposed works had been amended to the felling of one pine tree and work to one other pine tree and one Larch. The trees were located at Highfield which was a residential cul-de-sac situated on the eastern edge of Church Aston. No.17 was a two-storey detached house and the rear garden featured several trees which were part of the wooded bank which adjoins The Folly footpath to the rear.

Members were referred to the relevant planning policies applicable to the application together with the consultation responses that had been received.

The Board was informed that the subject trees were the tallest trees in the rear garden of the property and were visible from outside the site. However the smaller Scots Pine tree which was proposed to be felled had been identified as being in poor condition by the Woodland Officer. The rear garden benefits from other smaller trees, which also contribute to amenity and provide screening.

On balance, the amended proposal to fell the one Scots Pine tree, and works to the other two trees was considered acceptable and would not result in a significant loss in the amenity provided by existing tree cover in this area. Although consent was granted for tree felling at the adjoining No.18 subject to a replanting condition, replanting was not considered necessary in this case, with only one tree now proposed to be felled. There were other trees in the rear garden to No.17 which would provide adequate amenity to retain the character of the area.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1218 that tree preservation order consent be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

(h) W2008/1267 – Public Open Space, rear of Bromley Way, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire

This planning application related to the installation of a children's ball court and seating area on land to the north of Bromley Way in St Georges. The site, was located between Bromley Way and West Street, and to the west of Marrion's Hill, and was presently part of a larger flat area of grassland that was used for informal recreation. To the north of the site was a steeply sloping wooded embankment and to the west a group of mature trees. A small length of existing footpath would need to be diverted to accommodate the facility.

The proposed ball court would measure 12 x 20 metres, have a tarmac surface to it, and be surrounded by a 3 metre high mesh fence. A cycle rack, litter bin, and seating shelter would also be provided. The proposed play/recreational facilities were intended to be used predominantly by local children and young people aged between 3 and 16 for play, football, basketball, cricket, and socialising. The venue could also provide opportunities for occasional small localised events.

The ball court was intended to replace the one that had been closed down at the former Gower Street Youth Centre. Ward Councillors, the Parish Council, West Mercia Police, and the Beth Johnson Housing Association (owners of the properties in Bromley Way) had all been involved in finding an alternative location for the ball court. It was further understood that they all supported this facility and the site that had been chosen. Local children and young people had also helped in not only finding a site but also in identifying what facilities should be included within it.

The Board were also referred to the consultation responses, and relevant planning history, policies and planning considerations.

This replacement ball court was considered to be urgently required by the children and young people of St Georges. Many bodies and partners (as well as the young people themselves) had been involved in trying to find an alternative location for this facility, and although this site did not meet with the NPFA guidelines it was considered that it represented the only feasible and realistic location in St Georges. It was considered that the urgency and need to provide this ball court more than outweighed any problems of noise and disturbance that may be experienced by local residents when the facility had been installed.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1267 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

(i) W2008/1255 – Garrison Roundabout, Land off New Trench Road, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought permission for advertising consent to display three non-illuminated advertisement signs on the Garrison Roundabout, on land off

the New Trench Road, Donnington, Telford. The Garrison Roundabout is more commonly known as the 'Three Guns roundabout' due to its distinctive display of artillery, and is situated on the A518 near Donnington in a built-up area of Telford.

The proposed signs were similar in size to those now displayed on several roundabouts in the Telford area, and were intended to promote local businesses, as part of the Telford & Wrekin Community Sponsorship scheme. In this case the proposed signs would advertise recruitment for the Territorial Army. The signs would be 1200mm across, and this size had been agreed with the Council's Highways Officer as an acceptable size with regard to highway safety and visibility. In this location, the proposed signs were considered acceptable as they would not result in excessive visual clutter, and would not detract from the amenities of the surrounding area generally.

However, Members were referred to the update sheet that was prepared following completion of the report which cited the objections of Lilleshall & Donnington Parish Council who had stated that the signs would spoil the look and character of the roundabout particularly when regard was given to the character and historic standing of the guns. A number of Members also expressed concerns about the application and the proposed location of the signs at this particular roundabout and concurred that the erection of the signs at this location would be detrimental to the character and amenity of the roundabout and the surrounding locality.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1255 that planning permission be refused on the grounds that the proposed signs would be considered to be detrimental to the character and amenity of the roundabout and the surrounding locality.

PB-63 SITE VISITS

No Site Visits were arranged.

PB-64 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 ended at 7.05 p.m.

Chairman:

Date:

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

PLANS BOARD – 14TH JANUARY 2009

Schedule 1 : Planning Applications for determination by Board

`A' List : Major developments and/or cases in conflict with policy

-
- W2008/0676** Erection of single storey 5 bedroomed self contained living unit
Land adjacent to, Standford Villa, Sambrook. Recommendation Code: FG -
Ward: Edgmond **1**
- W2008/1252** Conversion of single dwelling into 3 flats **28, Stafford Road,**
Oakengates, Telford, Shropshire. Recommendation Code: FG - Ward: Ketley
& Oakengates..... **7**
- W2008/1325** Tree works as per schedule **Land at, Cricketers Lane, St**
Georges, Telford, Shropshire. Recommendation Code: TPG - Ward: Priorslee
..... **11**
- W2008/1336** Crown lift and shaping of lower canopy to Blue Atlas Cedar tree
Land to the rear of, 21, Priorslee Village, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire.
Recommendation Code: TPG - Ward: Priorslee **12**

Agenda Type : A

W2008/0676 Erection of single storey 5 bedroomed self contained living unit Land adjacent to, Standford Villa, Sambrook.

Recommendation Code: FG

Ward: Edgmond

APPLICANT:
LDGC Limited

RECEIVED ON:
05/06/08

PARISH
Chetwynd

WARD
Edgmond

CASE OFFICER:
Phil Baker

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES: Design, Appearance, Access, Parking, Effect on Residential Amenities.

THE SITE AND THE PROPOSAL:

This planning application relates to the erection of a self-contained independent living unit within the grounds of an existing Care Home at Standford Villa at Sambrook.

Standford Villa is a large detached two storey property set in 1.5 acres of grounds. The site slopes upwards towards the eastern boundary of the site where the neighbouring dwelling of Byre Cottage is located.

The application site lies at the junction of the A41 (Chester Road) and the minor road that leads to the village of Sambrook. The hamlet of Standford Bridge lies immediately to the south of application site.

The Care Home, which opened in 2006, provides accommodation and care facilities for adults aged 18 to 65 who have moderate learning difficulties. The applicants operate other Care Homes in Newport, Hinstock, Prees, and Stoke-on-Trent

At present the Care Home accommodates 5 adults, and the proposed unit would accommodate another 5 people. The new unit would comprise 5 separate bedrooms, each with an en-suite bathroom, together with a communal lounge, kitchen/dining room, laundry, storeroom, and office. Room sizes and internal space within the proposed unit have been designed to be in excess of the National Care Standard minimum requirements.

The proposed building would be mainly 5 metres in height (but rising to 6 metres in the middle), and constructed in traditional brick and tile that matches the materials used on Standford Villa. The new unit would be situated within a large area of open space to the east of Standford Villa, approximately 17 metres from the existing building. (This is closer to the main building than shown on the originally submitted plans). A total of 10 parking spaces would be provided for the entire site.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FROM THE APPLICANTS:

The applicants have stated that they specifically chose this location to operate a Care Home because it was in a rural location, but highly accessible to all the facilities available in Newport and Telford. They feel the Care Home has been operating very satisfactorily since it opened in 2006.

The applicants want to establish another care unit on the site because there is apparently a big demand for such facilities in this part of the country, and a severe shortage of such accommodation.

The residents of the Care Home are in their 20s and 30s, and this type of accommodation helps prepare them for independent living. However, if they want to stay there for the rest of their lives they would be able to do so. Their stay at the Care Home is quite voluntary, and they could request to leave at any time.

The applicants are at pains to point out that the whole ethos is to make this an ordinary home for the residents, where they can lead a full and active life, not an institution where they are restrained and restricted.

The residents would come from another Care Home or from their own homes, and would be referred to the Home by a Primary Care Trust or a Social Services Department, who would pay for their accommodation. The applicants would decide if a prospective resident was a suitable person to live there, and they would be fully assessed as to whether they would fit in with the other residents of the Care Home.

The applicants have stressed that they do not contemplate accommodating anyone with a history of violence or anybody who has been to prison. Neither would they take anyone who is a known paedophile, arsonist, or criminal.

At the moment the existing 5 residents are looked after by 5 staff who are on duty between 8.00am and 10.00pm, and by 2 staff at night between 10.00pm and 8.00am. In addition to this there are emergency back-up staff if any situation warranted it. There is, therefore, never a time when the residents are there alone in the Care Home by themselves. The proposed care unit would have a similar number of staff. Staff integrate with the residents at all times and therefore do not have their own rest rooms or staff quarters.

When entering the Care Home a Care Plan is drawn up for each resident. This usually includes what training and tuition is required to meet their individual needs, and to allow them to lead active and fulfilled lives. Many attend colleges, day centres, or voluntary work placements.

The Care Home has 2 minibuses which transport the residents to their colleges and day centres, and also take them shopping and to recreational facilities. Staff are required to accompany the residents at all times (although one existing resident is able to come and go as he likes).

The applicants acknowledge that some residents do get worked up from time to time but they claim that many of the allegations that have been made by local residents are either exaggerated, unfounded or untrue. For instance, to their knowledge, no

resident has been chased across the A41 or has attempted suicide, and there have only been two documented cases of a new resident running out of the grounds. In addition, staff will testify that at no time have residents threatened or abused anyone.

The applicants emphasise that this is Care Home, not a prison or a secure unit, because that is not the type of person being accommodated here. The facility is not an institution or a hospital, but is a household for a group of individuals who live there as a community. This is their home, and the purpose of the staff is to facilitate their lives in order to ensure that they live as 'normal' a life as possible.

The applicants stress that the Care Home is fully registered with all the Social Care bodies, and is subject to the standards as set out in the Care Standards Act 2000. They are also subject to regular inspections by the Commission for Social Care (CSCI). They feel that the new building would provide the highest possible care standards and facilities that a purpose-built unit can provide.

The applicants consider that the proposed development would have a positive knock-on effect by providing employment for up to 17 Care staff at Standford Villa if this proposal was implemented.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

6 letters of objection have been received from local residents, summarised below as follows:

- The existing use of the building causes fear and distress to local people who feel threatened and unable to leave their homes. These feelings would increase if the new unit was built
- Existing residents are regularly heard shouting and swearing, both within the grounds and out in the lane, at all hours of the day and night
- Loud-mouthed offensive behaviour is not wanted in this small quiet community
- Existing residents leave the premises without supervision. An increased number of residents would potentially create more issues
- Carers have to follow the Care Home residents to get them to return (and chase them across the busy A41). One resident was forcibly restrained in the local public house car park and another threatened to commit suicide in the lane
- Current levels of supervision are inadequate
- Could jeopardise the safety of local children
- Absence of any street lighting would cause a hazard to anyone using the road
- Restricted visibility when exiting the site. Increased usage of the access will make this a traffic hazard. Congestion at this point could lead to a serious accident
- The area needs to be kept naturally tranquil
- The size and height of the building is inappropriate, and not in keeping with its surroundings
- A previous application to build on this site was refused on appeal
- Will adversely affect property values in the area

The Parish Council has objected to the application for the following reasons:

- The present use of the property has given rise to problems with neighbouring occupiers. It is alleged that the residents of the Care Home have intimidated local residents by being abusive and using offensive language.
- There are no recreational facilities for the Care Home residents in this area, and there is no regular bus service to Newport
- The floor area of the new unit would be larger than the existing property and would dwarf it.
- The access to the site is extremely dangerous. It is a narrow gateway and visibility for vehicles exiting the site is poor – there have been several near misses with traffic on the Sambrook road. Even fire engines have to park outside the property.
- Concern at the efficient disposal of sewerage and waste from the site
- Planning permission has been refused for a development on this site in the past

The Council's Highways Engineer initially had concerns about the under provision of car parking within the site. However, he has subsequently seen amended drawings which show the provision of 10 parking spaces for the whole complex, and considers this to be an adequate number of spaces for the whole site. He has no objections to the vehicular access arrangements into and out of the site entrance, either now or in the future if this application was approved.

The Council's Geotechnical Engineer - no objections to the application.

The Council's Drainage Engineer - no objections, subject to a condition requiring a soakaway test to be undertaken.

PLANNING HISTORY:

In 2004 planning permission was refused for a single bungalow on the site on the grounds that it would be located in the open countryside, and did not form an extension to a suitable settlement. (Ref: W2004/0381)

In 2007 planning permission was granted for a change of use of a detached office to a self-contained living unit. (Ref: W2007/0857)

PLANNING POLICY:

The following policies are relevant in the determination of this application:-

LDF Core Strategy
CS15 – Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan
UD2 – Urban Design

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

This application has generated a number of letters of objection from local residents and the Parish Council. The predominant grounds of objection relate to the

behavioural problems of the residents who currently live at Standford Villa, and how these problems would increase if the new unit was built on the site.

Therefore, the main issue is whether the proposed development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the locality, and have such an undue impact on the amenity of local residents, as to warrant a refusal.

The perception of local fears has to be balanced against whether verifiable harm was likely to arise, and whether other safeguards are in place.

There is no compelling evidence that the proposed development would be a threat to public safety or lead to an increase in crime and disorder. Neither is there firm and substantiated evidence that the Care Home residents would be a risk to local people. This is due to the relatively small number of people residing at the Care Home; the degree to which they are supervised; and the high staff/resident ratio.

Since the Care Home opened in 2006 no complaints have been received by the Planning Enforcement Officer, and it is understood that no incidents have been reported to the police or to the relevant Social Care authorities.

Whilst recognising the concern and fears of local residents, there is no convincing evidence that the proposed development would undermine the amenity and safety of local residents in the immediate vicinity.

There is a national objective of transferring people from large institutions to smaller, local units. The applicants claim that there is an urgent need for more of these Care Homes, and your planning officers consider that the need for the facility outweighs any possible disturbance or inconvenience that it may cause.

The Care Home, and the proposed new unit, would be properly registered with the relevant Social Care bodies. It is subject to regular inspections by the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) and has to comply with the standards contained in the Care Standards Act 2000. Any contravention of the vigorous guidelines would be dealt with accordingly. It is felt that this should give adequate protection to neighbours' amenities.

In all other respects it is considered that the development is acceptable. It is felt that the design and appearance of the proposed single storey building, and its location within the grounds of Standford Villa, reflects and respects the character of the locality, and is sympathetic to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. It will to a large extent be screened by an existing roadside hedge, and a condition will be imposed to ensure its retention into the future.

The Council's Highways Engineer has no objections to the proposed access and parking arrangements, believing that the new unit will not generate any substantial increase in traffic.

In short, your planning officers consider that the proposed development would not cause any undue harm to the character and appearance of the area, or have any discernible or significant impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring

residents by reason of its use. In addition, the building itself is considered acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. A3 – Full permission
2. C120 – Amended plans submitted
3. B15 – External materials
4. C86 – Car parking
5. D138 – Restrictions on use of building
6. Development to be used in conjunction with the existing Care Home facility at Standford Villa at all times, and not occupied as separate independent residential accommodation
7. D131 – No further windows
8. C78 – Retention of hedges
9. C100 – Landfill gas mitigation measures
10. B65 – Soakaway test

REASONS FOR APPROVAL:

There is no compelling evidence that the proposed development would be a threat to public safety or lead to an increase in crime and disorder. Neither is there firm and substantiated evidence that the Care Home residents would be a risk to local people. This is due to the relatively small number of people residing at the Care Home; the degree to which they are supervised; and the high staff/resident ratio.

There is no convincing evidence that the proposed development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the locality, or have an undue impact on the amenity and safety of local residents.

The need for the facility outweighs any possible disturbance or inconvenience that it may cause. The Care Home, and the proposed new unit, would be properly registered with the relevant Social Care bodies and be subject to regular inspections. Any contravention of their vigorous guidelines would be dealt with by the authorities.

Notes

Agenda Type : A

W2008/1252 Conversion of single dwelling into 3 flats
28, Stafford Road, Oakengates, Telford, Shropshire.
Recommendation Code: FG
Ward: Ketley & Oakengates

APPLICANT:
Mr David Bradshaw

RECEIVED ON:
04/11/08

PARISH
Oakengates

WARD
Ketley & Oakengates

CASE OFFICER:
Anna Robinson

OAKENGATES TOWN COUNCIL HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS PLANNING APPLICATION IS CONSIDERED AT PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of development, scale and design, amenity issues, highways issues.

THE PROPOSAL:

The application seeks planning permission for conversion of an existing two-storey property into 3no. flats, with 1no. unit located at first floor level and 2no. units at ground floor. The conversion requires a number of external and internal alterations and additions, such as the installation of an external staircase at the rear (replacing the existing internal staircase), removal and addition of internal walls. A single storey rear extension is also proposed in order to form adequate accommodation to create 2 ground floor flats.

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site comprises a vacant four-bedroomed end of terrace Victorian property, with single storey rear extension and lean-to structure. There are two front bay windows and a central door entrance, with further windows and doors located to the side and rear. A sizeable but currently overgrown garden area/informal drive are located to the side and rear of the property, sloping up to the eastern boundary, with the A442 beyond. The garden area is screened by wall, hedging and trees, with a Tree Preservation Order to the rear of the site. There is an existing gap (vehicular entrance) to the side.

The application site is in an established predominantly residential street, and is situated in a sustainable location, on the edge of Oakengates District Centre and within easy walking distance to the bus and railway stations, large central public car park and shops.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Oakengates Town Council objects to the application on the grounds that there would be no provision of off-street parking to serve the three flats.

One neighbour letter of objection has been received with the comments summarised below:

- A few small alterations have been made following the previous refusal, but the change of use is still not appropriate in the area
- Only cosmetic changes from the previous refusal
- Problem concerning parking of six vehicles – heard that privately owned car park opposite may be utilised
- Dearth of car parking in the area for the existing residents, and additional vehicles would exacerbate problem
- Change of use would not enhance local area – a house that is part of the heritage of Oakengates.

PLANNING HISTORY:

W2007/1214 Residential development, Full refused

W2008/0965 Conversion to 3no. flats, Full refused

POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Policy

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS3 Housing

Core Strategy

CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan 1995 – 2006

UD2 Design Criteria

H6 Windfall Sites

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

There have been two previous refusals for residential development/conversion at the property. The initial scheme sought permission to reinstate a two storey element and create a new dwelling. The Local Planning Authority refused the application as there was insufficient evidence of an original two storey element, and it was considered out of keeping and detrimental to adjoining properties.

The recent refusal was for a similar scheme to the current application, with conversion to 3no. flats. Amendments were discussed and requested by the Local Planning Authority, but none were submitted. The application was refused for reasons of unacceptable design, layout, detrimental impact, and loss of amenity space, given over to parking provision within the site. The Agent discussed the refusal with the Local Planning Authority, but did not submit informal drawings prior to resubmission.

The principal changes in the current submission compared to the previous application are relatively minor – the front door has been retained giving access to Flat 1, additional openings on the side elevation have been reduced and now limited to the new door at first floor level (Flat 3) accessed via the new external staircase, and the internal arrangement of Flat 1 has been revised. The staircase is a rather incongruous addition to the property, although it will be screened from the street by the existing frontage of the building.

The amenity space has been retained and the proposal no longer includes car parking provision. The existing informal driveway has relatively poor visibility and the access would not be adequate for 3 individual households to use. If parking provision had been provided within the site, the majority of the amenity space would be comprise parking and turning area, and would have a greater impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining property, No.26 Stafford Road. However, in this central and sustainable location, close to the District Centre and public transport links, it is not considered necessary to allocate parking. There is also a potential issue of overlooking of the adjoining property from the first floor accommodation (Flat 3) in particular, as existing windows would now serve more habitable rooms; however no new windows are being added to the building.

The plans refer to a new single storey extension at the rear of the property as permitted development. The Local Planning Authority has advised that if the property is converted into flats prior to the erection of the extension, the proposed extension would require planning permission. The sub-division to 3 flats appears to be dependant on this single storey extension being included, which would form the bedroom to Flat 2. The Council's Environmental Engineers have requested a shallow mining investigation for the proposed extension. The Local Planning Authority has requested full elevational drawings of the extension to enable consideration of this element as part of the proposed conversion.

The Local Planning Authority has requested that the financial viability of the conversion is established. Officers have advised the Agent that conversion to 2no. units would be more appropriate form of development for this property, and officers have concern that 3no. units would be overdevelopment. The existing 2-storey property could easily be converted to 2 units without the need for as many internal or external alterations, or the need for the additional single storey rear extension. It would create one flat at ground floor and one flat at first floor. The proposed first floor plan demonstrates few alterations are required to create a single 2-bedroomed flat with large living and bedroom accommodation; whereas the ground floor plan identifies more significant changes and limited living and bedroom accommodation to the 2no. ground floor one-bedroom flats.

With regard to the proposed extension, (bedroom to Flat 2), it appears relatively modest in size and of an appropriate form and scale in relation to the existing building.

Whilst the scheme is not ideal, and conversion to 2no. units would be more suitable, the resubmission has overcome the previous issues of poor design and layout and loss of amenity space. The external alterations have been minimised, and should have less impact on the character and appearance of the building, maintaining the central door (entrance to Flat 1) facing the street and retaining a greater residential feel and activity on the street, with only one new door and staircase to the side elevation. Whilst officers consider that 2 flats would create a better form of development and 2 better sized flats, the property is in a sustainable location and will provide adequate communal amenity space to the side and rear, maintaining the existing and prevailing character of rear garden areas, not parking area as the previous scheme proposed; and on balance, the proposal is considered acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to submission of details of financial viability and amended plans, and the following conditions:

1. A3 Timescale
2. C68 Materials to match existing
3. Shallow mining investigation
4. Submission of landscaping scheme

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The application site is situated in a sustainable location, within walking distance of Oakengates District Centre and the railway and bus stations. The proposal would maintain the character and appearance of the existing building and streetscene, and provide adequate amenity space.

Notes

Agenda Type : A

W2008/1325 Tree works as per schedule
Land at, Cricketers Lane, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire.
Recommendation Code: TPG
Ward: Priorslee

APPLICANT:
Telford & Wrekin Council

RECEIVED ON:
27/11/08

PARISH
St. Georges & Priorslee

WARD
Priorslee

CASE OFFICER:
Andrew Mackriell

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: None.

MAIN ISSUES: The need to protect the future health and amenity of the trees, in the interests of safety and the surrounding environment.

THE PROPOSALS:

It is proposed to carry out works to maintain eleven mature Sycamore trees adjoining the highway verge on Cricketers Lane. The nature of the proposed works include crown thinning, crown reduction, cutting back over extended branches, and killing ivy on the trunks. No trees are proposed for felling.

SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA:

The row of trees are situated to the rear of the highway verge on Cricketers Lane and adjoin the boundary to rear gardens of houses in Crest Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

'Saved' Policy OL11 in the Wrekin Local Plan.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The Council's Arboricultural Officer has no objections to the proposed tree works and considers the works necessary. He proposes to supervise the works.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The mature Sycamore trees provide considerable amenity value in this residential area and contribute significantly to the street scene. The proposed maintenance work is identified by the Council's Woodland Officer as necessary in order to protect the future health of the trees so that they can continue to enhance the environment in the area.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT TREE PRESERVATION ORDER CONSENT subject to the following condition:

1. The extent of the tree works shall be agreed on site with the Council's Woodland Officer and the works shall be carried out by an appropriately qualified and insured arboricultural contractor.

Notes

Agenda Type : A

W2008/1336 Crown lift and shaping of lower canopy to Blue Atlas Cedar tree
Land to the rear of, 21, Priorslee Village, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire.
Recommendation Code: TPG
Ward: Priorslee

APPLICANT:
Telford & Wrekin Services

RECEIVED ON:
05/12/08

PARISH
St. Georges & Priorslee

WARD
Priorslee

CASE OFFICER:
Andrew Mackriell

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: None.

MAIN ISSUES: The protection of the tree in order to maintain its public amenity value.

THE PROPOSALS:

It is proposed to carry out minor crown lifting and shaping of the lower canopy to the Cedar tree.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The subject tree is a distinctive and attractive Blue Atlas Cedar situated on a prominent corner site adjoining the highway in an urban residential area. There are many other trees in this residential estate which contribute to the character of the area.

PLANNING POLICY:

'Saved' Policy OL11 in the Wrekin Local Plan 1995-2006.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The Council's Arboricultural Officer has no objections to the proposed tree works.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

This distinctive tree is prominently situated in the street scene where it provides amenity and enhances the local environment. The proposed tree works have been specified by the Council's Woodland Officer as appropriate in order to maintain the health and amenity value of the tree.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT TREE PRESERVATION ORDER CONSENT subject to the following condition:

1. The tree works shall be carried out by an appropriately qualified and insured professional arboricultural contractor.

Notes