

## **PLANS BOARD**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 8<sup>th</sup> December, 2010 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire**

**PRESENT:** Councillors N.A. Dugmore (Chairman), J.A. Francis, V.A. Fletcher (substitute for Councillor D.R. Chaplin), G.M. Green, R.T. Kiernan, F.R. Picken, H. Rhodes and M.J. Smith

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor A.A. Meredith (for planning application TWC/2010/0046), Councillor A.D. McClements (for planning application TWC/2010/0314 and Councillor A.J. Eade (for planning application TWC/2010/0428)

#### **PB-57      MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the Plans Board held on the 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2010 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

#### **PB-58      APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor D.R. Chaplin

#### **PB-59      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor G.M. Green declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application TWC/2010/0492.

#### **PB-60      DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

None.

#### **PB-61      SITE VISITS**

None.

#### **PB-62      PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION**

##### **(a)      TWC/2010/0046 -Tudor Rose Cottage, 4 Chetwynd End, Newport, Shropshire**

This application sought full planning permission for the erection of a small, single storey rear extension to provide a utility room and WC, the installation of two pitched roofs over the existing flat roofed extension and the proposed extension, and a detached sun room in the rear garden. The application was part retrospective as the detached timber sun room/shed had already been erected. Planning permission was only required for the single storey rear WC and utility room extension, the installation of the pair of pitched roofs and the retention of the sun room shed, as the other proposed alterations were permitted development and only required Listed Building Consent, for which an application had been submitted. Tudor Rose Cottage was a Grade II Listed Building within the Newport Conservation Area and was the end

property in a row of six dwellings. Determination of the application had been deferred at the previous meeting of the Board to allow Members to make a Site Visit.

There was a common boundary between the application site and the adjoining property, No 6 'The Honey House' comprising the rear wall of the kitchen and outbuilding belonging to that property. Representations had been received from the owner of No. 6. Some of the issues raised were in respect of an on-going neighbour dispute concerning the sandblasting of the boundary wall, which had resulted in the bricks becoming porous. The other issues raised were summarised in the report, including that of an ongoing damp problem.

The Council's Conservation Officer had no objections to the proposal subject to appropriate conditions. Representations had been received from the occupant of The Honey House on a number of issues, including that of on-going damp, as described in the report. The existing flat roof over the kitchen extension, which had Upvc windows, detracted from the character and appearance of the Listed Building. An earlier consent had allowed a pitched roof over part of the existing rear extension but this revised design, which included removal of the flat roof, would be an enhancement which would have a positive impact upon the character and appearance of the Listed Building, the street scene, and the Conservation Area.

The sun room, which had the appearance of a large garden shed, was not attached to the Listed Building or visible within the public domain and, therefore, would have no impact upon the character and appearance of the Listed Building or the Conservation Area. It was positioned close to the boundary wall with No.6, which the owner of that property considered would impede her access to the wall for maintenance purposes. However, there was no minimum separation distance required between the structure and the wall for maintenance access and it was not a material planning consideration and was covered by separate legislation. The Council could not insist that the applicant amended the proposal in this way and it was considered that the proposed development was acceptable in policy and design terms and would help to solve the existing damp issues.

Whilst the damp issue was not a material planning consideration, officers considered that the proposed extension would help to alleviate the problems experienced by both the applicant and the neighbour. Building the small extension adjoining the neighbour's boundary wall would allow the applicant's rainwater guttering and foul drainage arrangement to be altered. The guttering would be re-routed into the valley gutter between the two new pitched roofs and the extension sealed and lead flashed to the wall of no.6 with the box gutter adjacent to the neighbour's wall draining to a soakaway in the applicant's garden. The abutting of the new extension to the existing boundary rear wall would also cover the area of sandblasted brickwork and any damp proof membrane inserted into the neighbour's wall would further prevent ingress of damp. The extension would be constructed upon a raft foundation which would minimise the amount of excavation required and ensure the stability of the neighbouring property.

As the proposed extension would adjoin the neighbour's wall, their consent would be needed for this work to go ahead. Notice had been served on the owner but any subsequent refusal for any works on their land was not a planning matter. The

design of the proposed rear extension for the utility room and WC was considered acceptable and beneficial to the neighbouring property. The proposed development complied with the Council's 45 degree code, sufficient private amenity space would be retained and parking was unaffected.

Councillor A.A. Meredith spoke on behalf of the owner of No. 6 Chetwynd End. He said that she had no objections to proposed extensions but would wish there to be a 1 metre gap to allow access for maintenance purposes. She accepted that both her own and the applicant's architects were of the view that the proposed extensions would help to alleviate the damp problems but with only a 50% chance of success. In addition to addressing the Board, Councillor Meredith had circulated written information which included a comment made by the objector that, in the event of the application being approved and she no longer having access to her wall, she would have no option but to sue the Plans Board for negligence and seek damages.

Mr. T. Rowland, agent for the applicant, responded to Councillor Meredith's comments. He outlined the ways in which the proposed works would address the issues of damp and added that No. 6 itself did not have a damp course.

The Council's Solicitor outlined the relevance of the Party Wall Act with regard to this application and briefly outlined the process, which existed alongside the planning process, to provide a process in situations such this where the proposed wall was going to abut the boundary. He also referred to the threat to sue the Board made by the owner of No. 6 and informed the Members that, in the circumstances of this application, there was no realistic prospect of any liability on the Local Planning Authority should the permission be granted and the threat should be disregarded.

Councillors V.A. Fletcher and J.A. Francis expressed concerns regarding the issue of damp and, in addition, Councillor Fletcher considered that the new gables on the proposed extension would not enhance the character of the Listed Building. Conversely, Councillor F.R. Picken said that abutting the wall of the extension to the existing party wall would be the preferable option to resolve the issue of damp. Councillor G.M. Green said that she would abstain from any vote on the application as she considered that the application was the subject of a neighbour dispute over which the Board had no jurisdiction.

In response the Head of Housing & Planning informed the Members that the issue of damp was not a planning matter and that there were technical means available to address them should the owner of No. 6 be so minded. With regard to the impact of the new gables on the Listed Building, the Planning Officer responded that this was a matter of balance but the Council's Conservation Officer considered the proposal to be acceptable and it had been designed to address the current situation.

Councillor H. Rhodes proposed the recommendation to grant planning approval, as set out in the officer report, but there was no seconder. Therefore, Councillor V.A. Fletcher, seconded by Councillor J.A. Francis, proposed that planning permission be refused on the grounds that the application was contrary to Policies HE3 and HE16 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0046 planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The Local Planning Authority considered that the alterations and extensions to the Listed Building would result in the loss of architectural features and not maintain the essential form, character, or historic interest of the building and would adversely affect its setting. Accordingly, the application was contrary to Policy HE16 of the Wrekin Local Plan;
2. The Local Planning Authority considered that the alterations and extensions to the Listed Building would not be of the highest standards of design required to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, the application was contrary to Policy HE3 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

(b) TWC/2010/0093 - All Labour In Vain, Wellington Road, Horsehay, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for the demolition of the existing public house and the erection of 7 three bedroom and 2 four bedroom dwellings on a site of approximately 0.29ha in size. The wider area was predominantly residential in character and comprised largely two storey development. The site was designated as 'white' land in the Wrekin Local Plan and there was a presumption in favour of development which accorded with other policies within the Development Plan.

Objections had been received from the occupants of four properties, as set out in the report and Dawley Hamlets Parish Council had raised concerns regarding the loss of the existing pub as a community facility under policy CS10 of the Core Strategy. However, as set out in the report, the Council's approach to this had been supported by the Planning Inspector at the appeal for the loss of the Charlton Arms public house and hotel in Wellington and officers considered that the provision of other public houses and facilities was sufficient to meet the daily needs of local residents.

6y6

The proposed buildings would front the adjacent road with private gardens and parking to the rear, an acceptable layout which responded well to the surrounding context of development. The buildings would be two storeys in height and of an appropriate scale and massing to reflect residential development in the area. There was a change of ground level within the site, which the design of the properties had exploited to give a two storey front elevation and a three storey rear elevation. Amended plans had been received to alter the front porches to plots 5 and 6 and to remove the balconies proposed in the original plans, as set out in the report and, accordingly, the proposal complied with policies CS15 of the Core Strategy and UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

The neighbouring properties were situated on approximately the same ground level as the proposed front elevation of the dwellings with a separation distance of between 15 and 34m, given the shape of the plots. This was considered sufficient to ensure that the development would not have an adverse impact, in terms of privacy,

overlooking and outlook, on the residential amenities of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed layout had one plot with direct access off the road, the other 8 plots being served by a private drive, together with provision for 2 allocated parking spaces per dwelling, 5 visitor spaces and a turning facility. This level of parking provision was considered acceptable and the Highways Officer considered that there would be no detrimental impact on highway safety, subject to appropriate conditions to ensure these were laid out and available for use prior to occupation of the dwellings.

With respect to ecology, the proposal had been amended to include additional planting along the north boundary to increase the opportunity for biodiversity on the site and to protect the nesting birds which had been identified on the site. These measures could all be controlled through the imposition of appropriate conditions as set out in the report.

Neighbour objections had been raised regarding issues of noise and disruption during the construction period but these would only have a short term impact and could be adequately controlled through an appropriate condition. With regard to drainage issues, it was considered that a scheme requiring further details would be sufficient to ensure that the site was adequately drained.

Members expressed regret at the loss of this community facility but recognised that the application before them would provide housing for the borough and was a preferable alternative to the building becoming derelict.

**RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0093 be granted planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.**

(c) TWC/2010/0314 - 45 Dawley Road, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought planning permission to change the use of the existing retail unit, which was sited at the end of a row of shops with two floors of residential accommodation above, from a delicatessen (Use Class A1) to a combined delicatessen and hot food take-away (Use Class A5). The application form stated that there would be 1 full-time and 1 part-time employee with proposed hours of opening of 10am to 11pm 7 days a week. Councillor A.D. McClements, the Ward Member, had requested that the application be considered by the Plans Board.

A communal car parking area was located to the front of the units, which was in a modern, flat-roofed building located within a predominantly residential area on the edge of Wellington. While not designated as a District Centre, it was a Local Centre. There were currently no take-away units within the row of shops, which had a mix of uses including a betting office, an off-licence, a motor supplies shop, a Halal butchers, with a convenience store located on Dawley Road. .

Wellington Town Council had objected to the application as summarised in the report and the Wellington Local Policing Team and the Wrekin Housing Trust, which owned the unit and residential units above, had objected on the grounds that the area

around the shops had historically been subject to anti-social behaviour, which they had worked hard to resolve. The Policing Team considered that the take-away would increase such problems by remaining open to 2300hrs and would result in concern and disturbance to local residents. Fifteen letters of objection had been received from local residents, as summarised in the report. There had also been a significant amount of support for the proposal on the grounds that there were no take-aways in the area and one would be of benefit to the local community. The update report tabled at the meeting clarified that the objections had been submitted by residents of the flats above the shops and in close vicinity of the application site with the letters of support being predominantly from residents in Arleston and Wellington, including Dawley Road, with some from the wider area of Telford and Shropshire.

Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy outlined Local Centres such as Arleston as the focus for accessible local services and small scale community facilities to meet people's day-to-day needs. The mix of uses within a local centre should be carefully managed and the development must assist in creating vibrant, safe and attractive places with a design that reflected and responded to the locality. As outlined in the report, the nearest take-aways were some 300 metres distant on Watling Street. Therefore, officers considered that the proposal would conform to this policy and would not result in a proliferation of such food outlets.

In regard to guidance in policies PPS23 and PPG24 and the concerns raised by objectors, officers had discussed the proposal with the Council's Environmental Health Officer and had sought amendments to the scheme. The Environmental Health Officer had no objections subject to conditions to ensure that the development was implemented in accordance with the revised scheme and noise levels were strictly controlled. The update report tabled at the meeting informed the Board that the Precautionary Principle referred to in PPS23 and PPG24 should be followed if there was a likelihood that a development would have harmful effects on health, in terms of pollution from noise and odour, etc., but not with regard to other aspects such as antisocial behaviour.

The Police had been requested to provide evidence of the problems at these shops and whether the suggested earlier closing time of 2200 hours would improve the situation. They had responded that in the past twelve months there had been 44 incidents of anti-social behaviour reported in the vicinity together with 8 recorded crimes. Consequently, there was a high fear of crime in the area, which local agencies had attempted to address. The shops were a community focal point and attracted groups of people which the police considered would be increased if the application was approved. Closing at 2200 hours rather than 2300 hours would make little difference and the opening of a late night take away at this location would result in increases in crime and anti-social behaviour in addition to increased volume of complaints to the Local Authority regarding noise nuisance and litter. Any community benefits arising from the application would be outweighed by the inevitable reduction in confidence and the increase in fear of crime that would be experienced by local residents. Should planning permission be granted, the Police had requested that a good quality CCTV system covering the inside and outside of the premises be installed and maintained and, if the owners were proposing to include a delivery service into their business model, consideration should be given to

how this operated, particularly if vehicles were frequently coming and going from the premises. Furthermore, there should be no gaming machines on the premises. Officers had noted these and the update sheet tabled at the meeting recommended that these points be addressed by appropriate conditions.

The unit currently had a metal vent on the side gable wall to provide extraction for food cooked in association with the delicatessen and the submitted scheme had been amended by the installation of a new extraction system whereby an external flue, extending 1.5m above the flat roof of the 3 storey building, was attached to the side gable wall in order to meet Environmental Health requirements. However, as the flue would be set back some 5.5m from the frontage of the shop unit towards the rear of the building, it would not be overly prominent in the streetscene. Neither would it significantly alter the character or appearance of the building and details of materials could be conditioned to ensure it was in an appropriate finish.

The revised scheme had addressed the concerns raised regarding noise and odour from the extraction system and it was considered that a reduction in the proposed hours of opening would reduce the noise and disturbance from customers and vehicles and minimise the adverse impact on adjoining residential amenities. Therefore, officers had suggested that a condition stating that the take-away must close at 10pm with staff vacating the premises by 10.30pm would be appropriate. In addition, the applicant had stated that an additional litter bin would be installed at the shop unit, the location of which could be agreed by condition.

With regard to other concerns raised, officers did not consider that approval for a take-away in this unit would set a precedent for further approvals as all applications were considered on their individual merits and with regard for the relevant national and local policies. The unit shared the existing communal parking area and it was considered that the proposal would not lead to parking problems. The site was in a sustainable location in an existing local centre close to Wellington District Centre within an established residential area. The Highways Engineer had no objections and there are no highway safety issues. On balance, whilst the change of use had caused concern for some local residents, there was also significant local support for the proposal.

Councillor A.D. McClements, Ward Councillor for Arleston, spoke against the application and stressed the concerns of local residents, the police, Wellington Town Council and the Wrekin Housing Trust, as owners of the property, relating to anti-social behaviour, crime, noise, smell and litter. These views were supported by Joanna Deacon, a local resident, who said that approval of this application would exacerbate the existing problems centred on the shops.

In response the applicant's agent, David Humphreys, referred to the amended scheme and proposed installation of a flue to address the issues of noise and smell, which had complied with the requirements of the Environmental Health Officer. He referred to other similar applications within Telford & Wrekin where the police had recognised the benefit of increased surveillance when a shop was open. He considered that the applicant had addressed and fully complied with all the issues which were within his control.

Members expressed support for the views put forward by objectors, particularly those of local residents. Whilst it was not possible to legislate against anti-social behaviour the Council did have a duty to prevent the environment that fostered such behaviour.

There being no proposer and seconder for the officer recommendation that the application be approved, it was proposed and seconded that it be refused.

**RESOLVED** - that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0314 planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. **The Local Planning Authority considered the proposed change of use to a take-away facility was unacceptable as it would result in the loss of a retail unit, leading to a proliferation of take-away establishments within the Arleston locality, and consequently would be detrimental to the character of the predominantly residential area. Subsequently the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS5, CS9 and CS15 of the Core Strategy;**
2. **The Local Planning Authority considered the proposed change of use was inappropriate in this location as it would result in an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance caused by customers and vehicle movements, to the detriment of residents in the flats above the shops, Dawley Road and the surrounding properties in a predominantly residential area. Furthermore the proposal would lengthen the opening hours of these retail units increasing the level of disturbance to existing residential properties in an area which was already subject to a high level of antisocial behaviour. Accordingly it was contrary to Policy CS9 & CS15 of the Core Strategy and national guidance contained in PPG24 Planning and Noise;**
3. **It was also considered that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on highway safety caused by the increase in traffic and the existing parking inadequacies which were shared by residents and retail users. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and PPG13 Transport.**

(d) TWC/2010/0428 - Longford Cottage, Longford Road, Newport, Shropshire

This application sought permission for the demolition of an existing double garage and the erection of a double garage, garden store and shower with ancillary living accommodation over and an internal staircase on the ground floor. The proposed building measured 9m. wide, 6.3m. deep and 6m. high with walls of facing brickwork and concrete tiles for the pitched roof to match those used on the adjacent house. The existing flat roof garage was of no special architectural merit

Councillor A.J. Eade, the Ward Councillor, had requested that the application be determined the Plans Board. He considered that the proposed development was acceptable and that any issues relating to the future use of the replacement garage

could be dealt with by conditions. Determination of the application had been deferred at the previous meeting of the Board to allow Members to make a Site Visit.

The applicants had stated that the ancillary living accommodation would only be used as guest or overflow accommodation. When applications for double garages with living accommodation over were submitted officers endeavoured to ensure that the proposals were not overly large and only provided basic amenities so that the accommodation remained subsidiary to the main dwelling. The more conducive or advantageous was the accommodation the more likely it was to be used as a main residence or separate household, which could then lead to enforcement proceedings. Therefore, officers normally requested the omission of all dormer windows, although rooflights were acceptable, and the provision of outside staircases.

Officers had no objection in principle to the application but considered that the scale and size of the proposed development would be inappropriately large for an ancillary structure and that the dormer windows were too domestic in appearance and contributed to the over-size of the building. It had been proposed to the applicants that, if they were willing to replace the dormer windows with rooflights, the size of the accommodation and the internal staircase could be considered to be acceptable. However, the applicants were unwilling to agree to this change and the proposal, as submitted, did not relate positively to its context or respect and respond to the site and its surroundings. Therefore, it was considered that the new building would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding environment.

Councillor A.J. Eade, Ward Member for Church Aston & Lilleshall, spoke in support of the application. He said that the proposed development was at the rear of the site and, as it was not overlooked by any other property, would have no detrimental impact of neighbouring amenities and the barn sited to the side of the application site would dwarf the proposed garage. In conclusion, he considered that the scheme would respect and respond to the site. He referred to the concern that the garage could be used as a residence but assured the Board that this was not the applicant's intention, as the building would be too small, but such a use could be controlled by the imposition of an appropriate condition.

Several Members considered that, following the site visit and given the size of the site, the proposed garage would not be overbearing. In addition, the Chairman agreed that the structure would be too small to be used as a domestic dwelling. However, Councillor H. Rhodes drew the Board's attention to the fact that the application was contrary to policy.

On being put to the vote, the officer recommendation that the application be refused was not supported. A proposal, as seconded, that planning permission be granted was approved by a majority vote.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0428 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to a condition restricting the use of the garage to parking and storage

**with ancillary accommodation above but not to be a separate unit of accommodation and to determine appropriate conditions.**

(e) TWC/2010/0458 - 62 Wrekin Road, Wellington, Shropshire

This application from Telford & Wrekin Council sought full planning permission for the conversion of the traditional single storey, former school building, the erection of 4 terraced dwellings to the rear of the site, with associated parking, a new site access, associated landscaping and engineering works. The building currently provided offices for Council services which would be relocated to the new Wellington Civic Centre. The proposal also included a new roundabout to serve Wrekin Road and 'Roseway'. The application site was located in a predominantly residential area comprising Victorian and inter-war terraces together with modern semi-detached houses and flats.

Wellington Town Council had no objection to the proposal. The Highways Officer had no objection in principle subject to conditions regarding the construction of car parking and the mini roundabout. The Conservation Officer considered that, as the existing use was in itself a conversion, the principle of converting the building was acceptable. The Council's Arboricultural Officer, had prepared a tree survey, as submitted with the application, which acknowledged that retention of all the existing trees on the site might not be possible and recommended that a condition regarding replacement planting be imposed. The School Organisation Officer had advised that, as the capital receipt would be used to support the Borough Towns Initiative, a contribution towards educational facilities from this development would not be sought. The Parks & Open Space Officer had requested a contribution towards upgrading the offsite recreational facilities and, following negotiations with the applicant, had requested a contribution of £375 per dwelling. Three neighbour letters of objection had been received, as summarised in the report.

The development site was classed as white land and, therefore, there was a presumption in favour of development. The building did not benefit from any statutory or local protection and could be demolished without planning consent. However, the applicant had sought to protect and preserve the character of the site, which was in a highly sustainable location close to Wellington District Centre. Its development would help to provide community benefits in the area and, therefore, the proposal complied with policy CS5.

The conversion of the existing building would provide 8no. 2 bedroom duplex apartments with mezzanines to provide additional bedroom and bathroom accommodation for each unit. The proposal also sought to demolish the existing modern single storey elements including a flat-roofed extension which did not enhance or relate to the main building; this would create a central courtyard area. There would be a combination of small private garden areas to the north of the building and communal areas and a total of 8 allocated parking spaces and 8 visitor spaces would be provided. To the rear of the building a terrace of 4 new units comprising 2½ storey 3-bedroom properties was proposed with single parking spaces to frontages and amenity space to the rear, which was considered acceptable. The existing vehicular access would be replaced by a widened access

point in a central position directly opposite Roseway, with a new mini roundabout on Wrekin Road to improve highway safety, which would improve highway safety.

The layout, scale and design of the new properties were considered acceptable and in keeping with the existing building and the character of the surrounding area. The alterations to the building and removal of the modern extensions were also deemed appropriate and the Conservation Officer considered that the revised scheme, with a reduction in rooflights, was of an acceptable design and appearance. The scale and design of the terraced row was in keeping with the context of the existing building and adjoining development in Wrekin Road and the orientation of the new dwellings would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties. The existing boundary wall along Wrekin Road would be removed but other boundary walls would be retained and raised to 1.8m to maintain privacy to existing and proposed properties together with 1.8m timber fencing between the units. The proposal provided adequate amenity space which it was considered would not have a detrimental impact on existing or proposed residential amenity. However, it was suggested that a condition to remove householder permitted development rights would ensure that residential amenity to both existing and proposed residents was preserved. Therefore, it was considered that the proposal complied with H6 and UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

With regard to objections raised by neighbouring occupants, it was considered that security would be improved as continual use of the site would provide natural surveillance rather than only during office hours as at present. With regard to the impact on the existing retaining wall, the applicant would have to ensure such walls were adequately retained in order to comply with building regulations. With regard to the value of properties, this was not a material planning consideration.

Councillor H. Rhodes expressed concern at the possible loss of trees or damage to their roots but the Planning Officer referred her to planning condition B14 relating to landscaping design including replacement planting.

**RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0458 be granted planning permission subject to written confirmation from Property & Design to provide a financial contribution of £4,500 towards the upgrading of the community use recreation facilities and to the conditions as set out in the report.**

(f) TWC/2010/0492 - Madeley Academy, Castlefields Way, Aqueduct, Telford, Shropshire

This application was in respect of planning permission for the erection of extensions, the creation of additional car parking and the formation of a new pedestrian access on the site.

The main extension was a two-storey building situated to the south of the main building on a site which had limited use due to a change in the ground levels at that point. It was proposed that the building would be built off the existing lower ground level of the Academy so that there was only a single storey visible from the key

north-west elevation from Castlefields Way. The location of the extension would not affect the natural light to the main Academy building and a new access would be provided via a ramp. The form and features of the extension would follow those of the existing buildings, with materials of a similar nature. The proposal to extend onto an existing hard standing was considered appropriate subject to conditions regarding materials.

The proposed restaurant extension was at lower ground level in the form of a concentric curve set at the centre of the existing restaurant. As the proposal was predominantly glazed and single storey, it would provide a stepped approach to complement the existing form of the buildings. The proposal would be sited on an existing hard standing and, given the proposed additional pupil numbers, it was a necessity and considered appropriate subject to conditions regarding materials.

The Vocational Learning Centre was a single storey pod-like building sat separately to the main Academy building and the proposal to extend onto an existing building and hard standing was considered appropriate subject to conditions regarding materials.

All these buildings would be fully accessible to the disabled and the two-storey extension would include a new lift. The proposed car park would provide an additional 20 car parking spaces for members of staff and was located on an area of hard standing adjacent to the tennis courts. It was considered to be acceptable subject to a condition regarding an updated travel plan prior to occupation.

The proposed pedestrian access was located at the southern end of the site through a belt of trees onto the footpath adjacent to Castlefields Way and was required due to the congestion at the main entrance at peak times at the start and end of the school day.

The Academy had, through the original planning consent, provided various mitigating measures to accommodate access to the site. Given the nature of the development, measures for pedestrians and cyclists were of paramount importance and included enhancements to the signal junction, the footway/cycleways leading to the site and the Public Right Of Way which provided an off-road link to Aqueduct. This latter facility was included in the original submission but its use was now being discouraged by the school. As a result there was a higher than expected use of the footway crossing the Ironbridge Bypass at the Castlefields Roundabout. The pedestrian survey provided suggested that 10% of pedestrians used this route and, with the proposed extensions and additional pupils, it was estimated that approximately 100 children would wish to cross in this direction to/from the Academy. Whilst this route did receive some improvements, it was on the basis of a relatively low level of use, which had not transpired, and measures such as an over-bridge or a signalised crossing would be too expensive and difficult to justify with the latter conflicting with the operation of the Bypass and the roundabout. As such, any further enhancements would be relatively limited in scope. The Council's Road Safety Officers had identified a range of improvements, as set out in the report, the combined cost of which would be £35,000. Given that the Council's Arboricultural Officer had made an objection to the route of the proposed footpath, as originally submitted, it was recommended that an alternative route be considered and

determined in conjunction with him on site in order to ensure that a mature tree in particular could be retained and to minimise the loss of trees generally.

Members welcomed the application particularly in respect of the proposed highways improvements. Councillor V.A. Fletcher queried whether the proposed speed limit of 40 mph should be lower. In response the Head of Housing & Planning said the Local Highways Authority would respond to any such views put forward by concerned Members.

**RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2010/0492 planning permission be granted in consultation with the Council's Arboricultural Officer for the reasons mentioned in the report and subject to the signing of appropriate legal documentation for planning contributions for highway safety improvements and to the conditions as set out in the main report.**

(g) TWC/2010/0527 - 4 Hiatt Avenue, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought planning permission for the erection of a single storey front extension, a side and rear extension, and a single storey side and rear extension measuring a minimum of 2.3m wide and 13.8m deep, to create a utility room, bed/sitting room and ensuite bathroom. The property was a semi-detached house situated in a quiet cul-de-sac and was set back about 1m from the neighbouring semi-detached property.

The small single storey extension to the front of the property would result in an alignment of the external wall with that of the neighbouring property and provide an entrance porch and extended lounge area. This was considered acceptable as it would have no detrimental impacts on the adjoining property (No.2 Hiatt Avenue) or other immediate properties and would be in keeping with the existing street scene. In addition, it would help to simplify the appearance of the existing elevation by removing the rather incongruous artificial stone panel to the side of the front door.

The single storey extension to the side and rear of the property, measuring 13.83m x 3.25m would be constructed of orange/brown brickwork with cream painted render panels and areas of horizontal timber boarding covered by a hipped pitched roof. It would provide a utility room and a bed-sitting room with en-suite facilities and a covered timber pergola lean-to would link this with the existing rear elevation. Four full height windows including two patio doors would be inserted into the side elevation facing the rear garden to No. 2 Hiatt Avenue with that serving the en-suite bathroom being obscure glazed. One of the patio windows would serve the bed-sitting room while the other would serve the utility room.

The proposed side/rear extension would require the removal of the existing garage and would extend out to the boundary line which, despite a shared driveway, was pinpointed by an old fence post which sat between the two garages. It was considered that the side extension would have a detrimental impact upon the neighbouring property (No.6 Hiatt Avenue) as one of their two kitchen windows would directly face the proposed extension, resulting in an overbearing effect on the residential amenities in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy.

The single storey extension running 13.83m along the side boundary was considered unacceptable due to the scale of development which was disproportionate in relation to the original dwelling and its impact on neighbouring properties. It would also consume approximately 35-40% of the rear garden area. Although single storey, it had the potential to overlook the neighbouring properties, 2 & 6 Hiatt Avenue and would have an unacceptable overbearing effect on them.

Members agreed that the proposal was too large and would constitute over-development of the site.

**RESOLVED** - that planning application TWC/2010/0527 be refused planning permission for the following reasons:

1. **The Local Planning Authority considered that the size, design and positioning of the proposed single storey side and rear extension would result in a cramped form of development resulting in an inadequate and unsatisfactory amount of private amenity space for both existing and future occupiers of the application site dwelling house therefore be contrary to 'saved' Wrekin Local Plan Policy UD2;**
2. **The Local Planning Authority considered that the proposed single storey side and rear extension by reason of its location and orientation, would be likely to have a detrimental effect on the amenity of the adjoining residential property in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy. Accordingly, the development would be contrary to 'saved' Wrekin Local Plan Policy UD2 and Government guidance contained in PPS1 and PPS3;**
3. **The Local Planning Authority considered that the proposed side and rear extension by virtue of its scale, mass and form would be disproportionate to the scale and character of the original dwelling house and would be likely to have a detrimental impact on the character and amenities of the local area which would be contrary to 'saved' Wrekin Local Plan Policy UD2 and Core Strategy Policy CS15.**

(h) TWC/2010/0564 - Southwater Regeneration, Telford Centre, Telford, Shropshire

This application by Telford & Wrekin Council sought approval of the reserved matters for the erection of a new purpose-built Civic Offices (sui generis) on a significant location at the south-east corner of the proposed Southwater Square incorporating local authority offices and flexible Use Classes Order A1 to A4 restaurant and retail development. It also included details of the public realm in the vicinity of the proposed replacement Southwater Lake. The proposed Civic Offices formed part of the masterplan to create a vibrant new heart for the town centre, integrating the International Centre, the existing leisure complex and other existing town centre uses including Meeting Point House, the library, hotels, etc. with entertainment, leisure and night-time uses.

The proposed Civic Offices had been designed to provide an appropriate civic quality and to be a benchmark for subsequent development through design quality and high quality materials. The aim was for the building to achieve BRE Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) 'excellent' status in terms of sustainable design in line with the planning conditions attached to the outline permission. The proposal comprised a gross internal development area of 8,434sqm of which 7,816sqm was civic offices (sui generis) and 617sqm A1-A4 (flexible) restaurant and retail space. This would be provided as a five-storey building incorporating three wings of accommodation arranged around two atria. Height to the roof parapet was 22m with a further 2.95m addition of relating to the plant room located on the roof. A new Southwater Lake would introduce a formal open space feature that would not only integrate the building into the Town Park but also provide space for informal activity and relaxation. Terraces would project from the ground floor of the building into the lake to create hard and soft landscaped 'fingers'.

The building would be set at the same level as the square and a consistent ground floor level throughout would be provided to allow maximum flexibility of use within the building as well as providing maximum accessibility for users. It would provide new office space for departmental staff, the Contact Centre and 'First Point'. The latter had generated significant visitors and would be located on the ground floor together with a coffee shop and seating areas. The ground floor would also contain back of house facilities, together with flexible A1-4 retail/restaurant uses.

With regard to car parking, the multi-storey car park previously discussed would not now come forward and the temporary use of Randley Lorry Park would be necessary with further information on lighting, barrier detail and drainage being sought. It was recommended that a condition requiring the provision of 250 minimum car park spaces including surfacing, drainage etc, be imposed. However, disabled spaces should be on the Southwater car park rather than at Randley.

A letter of objection letter had been received from Pegasus (Planning Consultants) on behalf of Meeting Point House, as summarised in the report.

The Design & Access Statement (DAS) that had accompanied the outline permission had required development to strive to provide a more positive inter-relationship with the Town Park to maximise this unique asset and had also raised an expectation that the new Civic Offices, along with other new structures, should provide a powerful icon based on the interplay between buildings, urban form and Park while creating sustainable buildings which architecturally were "highly distinctive". The design of the new Civic Offices was bespoke and would provide a highly legible civic building of significant quality which would meet these requirements through a five storey building able to sit easily and begin to achieve visual and aesthetic dominance over existing neighbouring leisure buildings. The scale would also allow considerable opportunities to improve views towards the Town Centre from the Park.

The proposed building would use the highest quality materials, including white terracotta tiles for the office element above ground level with blue brick used for column elements in the ground floor and as subdivisions for openings within the terracotta panels. This would give solidity to the building base and frame the entrance when viewed from Southwater Square. The remainder of the ground floor

would be enclosed in aluminium framed curtain walling and glazed full height windows. Timber would be used sparingly, predominantly as a foil to the dominant brick and terracotta tiles and the roof would have a timber clad plant area set back from the parapet edge. The necessary building services had been carefully designed out.

The report detailed the energy efficiency measures that would be incorporated into the proposed development and it was considered that these would deliver significant benefits in terms of carbon emissions reductions and energy efficiency and should comply with the conditions attached to the outline permission, subject to final accreditation.

In terms of landscape design, the public realm directly associated with the Civic Offices planning application was confined to the areas between the southern elevation to the Town Park boundary and Southwater Lake. The proposals for soft landscaping were designed to offer a softening of the Civic Offices when viewed from the Park and to help in providing biodiversity interest and in contributing to the health of the lake.

The proposals overall had been the subject of considerable public and stakeholder consultation and the proposed building would provide a modern and flexible environment to meet corporate requirements for operational excellence and flexibility together with opportunities for contemporary methods of working. The proposal satisfactorily demonstrated how the development would act as a focus for Southwater and set a standard for future development.

The update report tabled at the meeting outlined the consultation responses received from the Fire & Rescue Service and the Drainage, Energy, and Land Contamination Officers. The comments from the Fire Service were in respect of access for emergency fire service vehicles and the installation of sprinkler systems in commercial premises. It was, therefore, recommended that an appropriate Informative be attached to any planning consent. The Land Contamination Officer had recommended that a requirement be included for the submission of a land contamination report.

Members indicated their general approval of the scheme and, in particular, welcomed the use of sustainable energy technology. The new Civic Offices would set the standard for subsequent buildings in the Southwater area. Some concerns were expressed regarding car parking but Members noted that this was an issue that was being addressed outside of this planning application.

**RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0564 reserved matters approval be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the main report and to the imposition of an additional condition relating to land contamination requirements and the issuing of an Informative concerning the advice given by the Fire Officer, as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.**

The meeting ended at 8.08 p.m.

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....

**TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL**

**PLANS BOARD**

**5<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2011**

Schedule 1 - Planning applications for determination by Board

<b>TWC/2010/0259 Rough Park House, Woodside Avenue, Woodside, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5PG</b> Application to replace extant Planning Permission W2005/0294 for conversion of existing Grade II Listed Building to form 5 apartments and erection of 18 new apartments and associated parking , plus alterations to existing access and new boundary treatment .....	<b>2</b>
<b>TWC/2010/0260 Rough Park, Woodside Avenue, Woodside, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5PG</b> Application to replace extant Listed Building Consent W2005/0295 for conversion of existing Grade II Listed Building to form 5 apartments and erection of 18 new apartments and associated parking , plus alterations to existing access and new boundary treatment .....	<b>9</b>
<b>TWC/2010/0332 The Huntsman Inn, Wellington Road, Little Wenlock, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 5BH</b> Erection of a two storey extension to provide restaurant with accommodation above, erection of 1no. holiday let cottage, 3no. dwellings, associated access and a flag pole (Amended Plans and Additional Information Received) .....	<b>10</b>
<b>TWC/2010/0521 Telford Millennium Community, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire,</b> Erection of 83no. dwellings with associated roads , sewers and infrastructure ....	<b>22</b>
<b>TWC/2010/0566 Telford International Centre, St Quentin Gate, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 4JH</b> Application site comprises existing landscaping and car parking areas .....	<b>29</b>
<b>TWC/2010/0596 69 Haybridge Road, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 5JL</b> Single storey front and side extensions and first floor extension to rear .....	<b>32</b>
<b>TWC/2010/0652 Donnington Recreation Ground, School Road, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 8HT</b> Provision of a new children's ball court on former tennis court and erection of 3.5m high fencing .....	<b>36</b>
<b>TWC/2010/0745 Highway Verge, Priorslee Avenue, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9TG</b> Determination under Part 24 of the GPDO for the erection of a 14.8m high telecommunication pole with antennae and erection of equipment cabinet .....	<b>39</b>

TWC/2010/0259

Rough Park House, Woodside Avenue, Woodside, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5PG  
Application to replace extant Planning Permission W2005/0294 for conversion of existing Grade II Listed Building to form 5 apartments and erection of 18 new apartments and associated parking , plus alterations to existing access and new boundary treatment

**APPLICANT**

Mr Gyan Ghuman

**RECEIVED**

15/06/2010

**PARISH**

Madeley

**WARD**

Woodside

**CASE OFFICER**

Valerie Hulme

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES: Listed building in poor state of repair, long planning history including repairs notice and urgent works notice, context of site, enabling development, access and parking arrangements, amenity space, boundary treatments.

REFER ALSO TO APPLICATION TWC/2010/0260.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

This proposal seeks to renew the extant Planning Permission W2005/ 0294 which recently expired on the 30/09/2010; to restore the fabric of the building, and convert to five one-bedroom flats, with two flats on each of the ground and first floor, and a further single flat at second floor level. The proposal also involves the demolition of a single storey flat-roofed addition at the rear, and the erection, in its place, of an additional two storey gabled element to complement similar gabled structures alongside.

The proposal also includes the erection of two blocks of two bedroom apartments, providing an additional 18 units. These would be split between twelve apartments in a block to the east of Rough Park House, extending towards the rear of the site, and six in a block to the west. Some car parking spaces would be provided to the site frontage, whilst most of the car parking provision, and a bin store enclosure, would be located to the rear of the site.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:**

Rough Park House is a detached three storey 18th century former farmhouse that is Grade II listed; which formed part of a 19<sup>th</sup> Century parkland landscape with the Main Rough Park House that is now demolished.

The statutory listing describes the building as:

Late C18 house. Whitewashed brick. Plain tile roof with stone coped gable ends and brick dentil eaves. Single pile plan. Three storeys. Three bays. Sash windows with glazing bars in segmental headed openings. Central Doric doorway with engaged columns and pediment. Large plaque above doorway. Brick chimney stacks over gable ends. Two storeyed gabled wing at rear.

The building is situated in the center of the site; the land is elevated above Woodside Avenue which adjoins the sites northern boundary. A strip of Green Network land is located to the east of which a small area within the site edged red falls within on the North Eastern corner. To the immediate west and south of the site are three storey terraced dwellings, and further terraced dwellings are located beyond the Green Network strip, in the form of the 'Radburn' designed housing estate erected in the late 1960's.

The land to the north of Woodside Avenue is used as grazing land, and also allocated as Green Network on the Wrekin Local Plan; this land was historically used in connection to the Riding Stables which once used the site. A series of footpaths run through this area, connecting the residential area to wider parts of Telford, including the Town Centre.

Approximately 200m to the south west of the Listed Buildings curtilage the regeneration of Woodside is currently underway; erecting a mix of residential units on the site of the 1960's flats which were demolished approximately 7 years ago. Further regeneration work is imminent, and the Council is currently considering an application of prior notification for the demolition of 40 dwellings surrounding Rough Park House.

The house and its grounds had been the subject of vandalism, arson and fly-tipping over the years that they had been vacant; the applicant has erected a solid boarded fence as a temporary measure on the boundary to prevent any further damage to the site. Behind this boarding, the site now has a very poor visual appearance, although the house itself, despite the abusive treatment that it has received, is still regarded as being eminently worthy of restoration and re-use.

There are some substantial trees, particularly to the east of the site, on the Council's Green Network land, plus some along the Woodside Avenue frontage.

#### PLANNING HISTORY:

W90/0648 and W90/0700 - Planning and listed building consent applications for large extension to Rough Park House for use as an elderly persons' residential home. REFUSED.

W90/1230 and W90/1231 - Internal alterations and change of use from single dwelling to multiple residential accommodation. GRANTED.

W91/1230 and W90/1231 - Erection of an accommodation block for use as nursing home or hotel or bed-and-breakfast accommodation or home for the homeless. REFUSED.

W2001/0789 and W2001/0790 - Erection of 3 blocks of semi-detached dwellings and 3 detached dwellings, plus new access road. WITHDRAWN.

W2003/1026/1027 and W2003/1184/1186 - Conversion of Rough Park House to five flats and proposed residential development (outline application) within the grounds to provide 3no. houses and 13no. flats. - Considered at Plans Board meeting on 31st

March 2004, when it was resolved that planning permission would be granted, subject to the owners entering into a Section 106 Agreement to link progress on the restoration of the house with that of the new-build properties. This Section 106 Agreement was never signed and the application was later withdrawn in 2007.

W2005/0294 and W2005/0295 – Conversion of existing Grade II Listed Building to form 5 apartments and the erection of 18 new apartments and associated parking, access and boundaries – Approved subject to a S106 relating to an agreed amount of restoration work on the listed building being achieved within a certain period of time, and the timing of the construction of the new-build in relation to the restoration of the listed building.

In spite of previous planning consents, the property has changed hands several times and no development has commenced on the site. Urgent works notices under Urgent Works Notices pursuant to Section 54 of the of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 have previously been served on the owner which did result in some degree of roof protection and site security however the condition of the structure and the site continues to deteriorate further to the detriment of not only the listed structure but also to the amenity of the surrounding area. A recommendation for a formal Repairs Notice was therefore made to Plans Board earlier this year, which was subsequently approved and has been served. This requires the owner to:

- To carry out the repairs in accordance with the Notice and specification and to confirm that works will be carried out in a reasonable time scale within 2 months of the date of the notice, or;
- To enter into discussions with the Council regarding the Council acquiring the property by agreement

If the applicant does neither then after 2 months the Council can commence Compulsory Purchase Order for the property under Section 48 of the Act.

#### CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Conservation: has raised no objections given the previous consent, subject to conditions imposed on previous application.

Highways: has raised no objections.

Contaminated Land: raises no objections subject to conditions; however it should be noted that the site is 160m south of a closed, unlicensed landfill site which took place during the 1970's.

Sustainability: recommends that the development is constructed to achieve Level 3 for Sustainable Homes if constructed before April 2013, and Level 4 after this date in accordance with the Boroughs Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan.

Ecology: Originally raised objections considers the site is located close to potential bat foraging habitat, and considered roosting bats and nesting birds could be affected and subsequently requests surveys prior to determination. However noting there is no roof has removed the objection

Shropshire Fire Authority: have raised no objects, and provided basic guidance regarding access, water supplies and sprinkler systems.

Madeley Parish Council has objected to the proposal “with considerate vehemence”. The site has been subject to speculative proposals since 2003, with its condition deteriorating since planning permission was granted in 2005. Urgent works notices have previously been served and indicate the lack of commitment to the building. Subsequently it is considered that the application should be refused and a repairs notice is served, and in default of the notice to proceed with compulsory purchase powers. If however the Council is minded to approve the application, planning consent should be limited to a year. If the Council is to view this as a new application then the application should be considered against PPG15 s2.16 the adopted Local Development Plan, and Core Strategy DPD – Policy CS14, and should not be approved. Furthermore it is noted that Madeley Parish Council had previously objected to the proposal on the grounds that the proposal failed to respect the form, relationship and detail of the Listed Building. They consider that there is little cross-reference to the listed building, and the massing of the proposed new development would lead to an over-development of the site that would overwhelm Rough Park House and obliterate the context of the house from its surroundings. They also refer to the demolition and loss of ancillary buildings.

1 local letter of objection has been received on the grounds of disturbance from building works, in combination of the building works for the redevelopment close by.

#### POLICIES:

##### National Policies:

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS3 Housing  
PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment  
PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation  
PPG13 Transport

##### Core Strategy:

CS1 Homes  
CS3 Telford & Wrekin Council  
CS8 Regeneration  
CS14 Cultural, Historic and Built Environment  
CS15 Urban Design

##### Local Plan;

UD2 Design criteria.  
H6 Windfall Sites in Telford & Newport  
H23 Affordable Housing  
HE15 Demolition of listed buildings  
HE16 Alterations and additions to listed buildings

#### PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

As can be noted from the lengthy planning history, stretching back well over a decade since Rough Park House ceased to be occupied; various owners have

suggested different options for bringing the building back into productive use. Unfortunately, however, schemes for the house have usually been submitted in association with "enabling development proposals" which have been totally inappropriate, in terms of design, impact on the listed building, scale of development, nature of use etc. This has led to the refusal or withdrawal of most of the submitted applications, and, unfortunately, the deterioration of the building. The current condition of the building, after remaining vacant for many years and as a consequence of major acts of vandalism, is very poor. In spite of previous planning consents, the property has changed hands several times and recent discussions with the current owner on the concerns for the future of the building have not resulted in any new proposals being put forward.

As part of the consideration of the previous applications, in 2003, advice was sought from English Heritage, and the Inspector of Historic Buildings for the West Midlands Region visited the site. He expressed strong concern regarding the building's conditions and circumstances, but notwithstanding this, he considered that, even in its derelict and dilapidated state, the building was fully worthy of its listed status: "It is still clearly a Georgian house, which combines the polite architectural fashion of its symmetrical front elevation with the local vernacular building tradition of the sides and rear in a characteristic and attractive way. In the context of Woodside's twentieth century landscape, this solitary survivor from the Georgian period is a particularly valuable local cultural asset, carrying its messages from the past to the present community and to our successors.....Such buildings are a finite resource, and the area would be poorer for its loss." Further advice was sought in 2009 during the consideration of the repairs notice; English Heritage considered that as the only remnant of an earlier historic development in a large area of 20<sup>th</sup> Century development the building has a significant heritage value. English Heritage reiterated that the demolition of this building is not an option and there is a pressing need for the building to be safeguarded and brought back into use.

The proposed development, as previously approved takes a modern approach to the site. The response to the site characteristics has been to reinforce the existing grain of the surrounding development, by forming a new private square, whilst at the same time reinforcing the existing street pattern. The existing house would be fully renovated, and integrated into the new street/square. The private square would be predominantly hard landscape to accommodate cars, at a rate of 1.5 spaces per apartment. It is proposed that the hard landscape would be in interlocking concrete blocks - a small-scale material. The boundary would be predominantly low walling with railings, with planting to soften and enhance the perimeter. To the north of the site, the proposed buildings are aligned to form a street frontage, to visually link the 60s housing to the eighteenth century house. The proposed smaller apartment block would effectively "mediate" between the adjacent 60's terrace and Rough Park House. To the east, the new "street" turns the corner, and visually re-connects to the 60's terrace to the south of the site.

Rough Park House and the 1960's terrace are both three storey in scale, and it is intended that the scale of the building would be continued, aligning the proposed eaves line with that of the existing house. The 1960's housing dominates the area; the fenestration patterns of these houses are irregular, and "functional" in their disposition. The fenestration pattern to the Georgian house is, characteristically,

symmetrical. The proposed buildings, set either side of Rough Park House, also have symmetrical facades, which echo, but do not imitate, the existing house. The elevations to the east and south are freer in their composition. In terms of the character of the proposed development, the applicants do not feel that it is appropriate to mimic either the existing house or the 1960's housing, but consider that their proposals are respectful in scale and size, and echo the composition of the eighteenth century façade, whilst having a contemporary and robust identity.

Planning Officers previously considered that the proposal represented a unique opportunity but was also a great challenge by the fact the future of the site has been undetermined for over a decade. There were clearly unknown quantities relating to the development, not the least of which are the costs of the works on the listed building, and the difficulty of predicting accurately how much the apartments would sell for, on this particular site, and at a time when the housing market is uncertain. Subsequently the application was approved by members of Plans Board subject to a S106 relating to the timed restoration of the Listed Building.

Since the approval of the application, the permission has not been implemented, nor has the timed restoration specified within the S106. Subsequently members of Plans Board in 2010 supported the serving of a Repairs Notice, which required substantial works to the building; The Council, have served the notice, but to date no work has commenced on site. Any further permission on the site will not prevent the Council commencing Compulsory Purchase Proceedings if the Repairs Notice is not complied with and the previous grant of planning permission is a relevant material planning consideration in determining this.

Furthermore the regeneration of Woodside is well underway, evident by the new Park Lane Community Centre and residential development currently under construction. This, combined with the prior notification for the demolition of 40 dwellings surrounding the site demonstrates the regeneration mechanisms the Council is taking to enhance this area. Subsequently it is considered that the opportunity to develop the site should be encouraged especially with regard to the timing of the surrounding regeneration program.

With regard to the Parish Councils concerns, these are noted, however the application was previously approved, and this proposal seeks to replace the extant consent. Whilst the Parish wish for development to commence within 1 year, this is not considered a reasonable condition for any planning condition bearing in mind the current market conditions; however it is considered that through the S106 agreement, time limits can be imposed to restore the building, meeting the Parishes and Councils desires for the Listed Building to be restored.

In conclusion as the application has previously been approved in this form, and planning policy has not significantly changed, it is recommended that the application in its present form would preserve the listed building, and provide enabling works to ensure the restoration and long term survival of the only remnant of an earlier historic development in a large area of 20<sup>th</sup> Century development.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Subject to the applicant entering into a S106 agreement relating to an agreed amount of restoration work on the Listed Building being

achieved within a certain period of time, and the timing of the construction of the new-build in relation to the restoration of the listed building, then delegate to Head of Housing & Planning to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. A3 Full with no reserved matters.
2. B15 Samples of external materials.
4. B17 Sample brick panel.
5. B18 Details of windows and doors.
6. C75 Protection of trees during construction.
7. C86 Car parking.
8. B34 Mud on road.
9. B23 Landscape design.
10. C80 Landscape implementation.
11. B44 Contaminated land.
12. C100 Foundation design - landfill gas.

#### Reasons for approval

The proposed development will reinstate the Grade II Listed building which is currently in a poor state of repair. The proposed application will replace an extant planning permission; there have been no significant changes to planning policy since this time nor have there been any significant changes to the surrounding environment. Subsequently the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area. Furthermore the proposal will support and promote the regeneration of the surrounding area.

TWC/2010/0260

Rough Park, Woodside Avenue, Woodside, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5PG  
Application to replace extant Listed Building Consent W2005/0295 for conversion of existing Grade II Listed Building to form 5 apartments and erection of 18 new apartments and associated parking , plus alterations to existing access and new boundary treatment

**APPLICANT**

Mr Gyan Ghuman

**RECEIVED**

15/06/2010

**PARISH**

Madeley

**WARD**

Woodside

**CASE OFFICER**

Valerie Hulme

MAIN ISSUES: Listed building in poor state of repair, long planning history including repairs notice and urgent works notice, context of site, enabling development, access and parking arrangements, amenity space, boundary treatments.

THIS APPLICATION SHOULD BE READ AND CONSIDERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH APPLICATION TWC/2010/0259.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Subject to the applicant entering into a S106 agreement relating to an agreed amount of restoration work on the Listed Building being achieved within a certain period of time, and the timing of the construction of the new-build in relation to the restoration of the listed building, then delegate to Head of Housing & Planning to GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT subject to the following conditions:

1. A4 Listed Building Consent.
2. C118 Development in accordance with submitted plans
3. Finishing materials for reconstruction to match, and to be agreed.
4. Submission of full details of windows and doors, to include 1:2 sections for new window elements, within one month of the date of consent.
5. Reconstruction works to include works illustrated and described in the submitted Schedule of Surviving Joinery dated January 2005, and other items as specified by the Council's conservation officer, and detailed in the Draft Section 106 Agreement

**Reasons for approval**

The proposed development will reinstate the Grade II Listed building which is currently in a poor state of repair. The proposed application will replace an extant planning permission; there have been no significant changes to planning policy since this time nor have there been any significant changes to the surrounding environment. Subsequently the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area. Furthermore the proposal will support and promote the regeneration of the surrounding area.

TWC/2010/0332

The Huntsman Inn, Wellington Road, Little Wenlock, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 5BH  
Erection of a two storey extension to provide restaurant with accommodation above,  
erection of 1 no. holiday let cottage, 3no. dwellings, associated access and a flag  
pole (Amended Plans and Additional Information Received)

**APPLICANT**

Mr P Morris

**RECEIVED**

18/06/2010

**PARISH**

Little Wenlock

**WARD**

Wrockwardine

**CASE OFFICER**

Anna Robinson

THIS APPLICATION IS A DEPARTURE FROM PLANNING POLICY.  
COUNCILLOR SEYMOUR HAS ALSO REQUESTED THAT IT IS CONSIDERED BY  
MEMBERS AT PLANS BOARD.

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of Development, Retention of Community Facility, Scale  
and Design, Character and Appearance, Impact on Adjoining Residential Amenity,  
Highway Safety.

**PROPOSAL:**

The Applicant is seeking to reopen 'The Huntsman' Public House which has been  
vacant for approximately 12 months and is the only Public House in Little Wenlock.  
This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey extension  
to the existing Public House to provide a restaurant and guest accommodation  
above, with a physical link to a new building to the rear comprising 1 no. holiday let  
and 3no. dwellings for rent with associated access; and a flag pole to the front of the  
Public House.

The scheme has been amended during consideration, and is now accompanied by a  
Section 106 agreement to ensure the residential units are linked to the Public House  
in perpetuity.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:**

'The Huntsman' is an established cream-rendered Public House located in a central  
position in the village of Little Wenlock with access on to Wellington Road. The pub  
has been extended with a variety of predominantly single storey ad hoc elements  
attached to the building at the sides and rear, including a restaurant/ function room  
area. Parking is located to the side, with overflow parking to the rear. The site is  
bounded by trees and hedgerows.

A narrow lane to the southeast boundary of the site serves residential properties, a  
playground and playing field to the north of the application site. To the southeast of  
the access lane is a Grade II Listed Building, The Stone House, and to the northwest  
boundary of the site is a modern property, No.5 Wellington Road, with field to rear  
and gated access on to overspill car park. Both of the adjoining dwellinghouses are  
located some 18 metres from the boundary of the application site. A locally listed  
property, No.7 Wellington Road is located opposite the existing lane access. There

are a variety of housing styles in the area, with traditional properties, including listed and locally listed buildings and modern detached properties in the area.

Little Wenlock is located in the rural area of Telford, 2km west of Horsehay and approximately 1.5km east of The Wrekin, which is designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

#### PLANNING HISTORY:

W79/0837 Proposal Erection of Extension to Premises to Provide Additional Beer Storage, Full granted (FG)

W80/0679 Alterations and Extensions to Provide Additional Lounge and Dining Room Facilities, FG

W2007/1577 Construction of A Smoking Shelter To Side Of Premises And Replacement Of Side Window With Double Doors (Retrospective), Full refused

The Local Planning Authority has had pre-application discussions regarding the proposed reopening of the Public House and new dwellings. The Applicant was advised that justification would be required to demonstrate that the dwellings constituted an exceptional reason to allow a departure from planning policy.

#### PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Policy:

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS3 Housing

PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth

PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

Local Development Framework Core Strategy:

CS1 Homes

CS7 Rural Areas

CS10 Community facilities

CS12 Natural Environment

CS13 Environmental Resources

CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan

UD2 Urban Design Criteria

H9 Location of New Housing

H10 Scale of Development

H24 Affordable Housing Rural Exceptions Policy

OL2 Designated Areas

#### CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Little Wenlock Parish Council initially raised concerns as to whether there would be adequate parking. However following consultation on the amended plans, the Parish Council considers the issues relating to parking and the movement of delivery lorries have been addressed and has withdrawn its objections.

Councillor Seymour supports the proposal.

Councillor Tonks has submitted a letter of support and states the proposal would be beneficial to the area as the plans are in keeping, the development will support the economy, provide employment, support tourism and reinstate a pub where others are closing (e.g. All Labour in Vain in Horsehay).

Property & Design have reviewed the viability report and assessed the figures and commercial argument. Whilst the figures are in their view a little on the negative side thus supporting the proposal, they are prudent, worst case scenarios in a difficult market. It is therefore considered that the evidence and assumptions provided make commercial sense and will aid the retention of the Public House.

Highways Engineers initially raised concerns that the proposed number of parking spaces in the main car park was insufficient, with substandard manoeuvrability. A redesign of the parking layout was requested to provide 32 spaces and provision of disabled parking. In addition the proposed layout made no provision for on site turning of delivery and service vehicles when using the new access. The applicants have now submitted amended plans and the Highways Engineer considers the revised parking layout is generally acceptable in highway terms subject to parking space No.6 being allocated as disabled space alongside No.5 and spaces 14 and 15 being combined to make just a single space to ensure ease of use. The layout of the parking for the residential units will have little or no effect on the safe operation of the public highway and there are now no objections subject to standard planning conditions C19 Car parking and C20 Parking, loading unloading and turning.

Drainage: no objection subject to Condition B33 Foul and Surface Water and a condition regarding Brownfield runoff rates.

Parks & Open Spaces have raised concerns that the proposal includes residential dwellings immediately adjacent to a children's equipped play area. They consider that although the development will increase the security of the existing provision, it also has the potential to create nuisance because of its close proximity, and may lead to requests for the removal of the play area. In order to avoid this potential issue Officers would accept an exception for holiday lets and have therefore requested that those proposed buildings within this curtilage buffer be holiday lets as opposed to residential dwellings. They are also prepared to accept an alternative which would move the play equipment more than 20m away from the development of permanent residential properties.

In response to Parks & Open Spaces' comments, a verbal response has been received from Little Wenlock Village Hall & Playing Field Committee and Little Wenlock Parish Council who do not consider the relocation of play equipment to be a viable option. They believe the proximity of the new dwellings would aid security by providing natural surveillance and that the level of use is such that there will not be a significant impact from the users of the play area on future occupants of the dwellings.

Ecologist: originally raised concerns as the development involves works to the existing roof space, therefore a survey was initially requested relating to bats and birds. However following further discussions and submission of additional information, the proposal is acceptable subject to informatives.

Arboriculture: no objection to the proposal as there are no trees considered to be worthy of retention within the site. The application appears to show that parking areas about the existing hedges which will have an impact on the rooting zones of these hedges, therefore care should be taken and hand digging undertaken where necessary.

Shropshire Fire Service: no objection subject to informatives.

Original Consultation:

Approximately 50 local residents have made representations, of which 23 support the proposal, with many considering the reopening of the Huntsman PH as a great benefit to the village. Summary of support letters:

- PH has been empty since last Christmas and in boarded up state is poor advert for the area – proposed plans provide long-term future for PH and would be great asset to village
- PH helps keep community together and village life alive
- B&B and Manager's accommodation acceptable
- PH within heart of village and within walking distance of The Wrekin and near to Gorge – tourism opportunities
- Almost unanimous support for proposal at Parish meeting in village
- New housing is acceptable if it ensures viability of PH
- Affordable housing will benefit the local community
- Revenue generated solely from PH is unsustainable
- Should encourage renewable energy elements to dwellings in keeping with national and local policies and aims of Little Wenlock Carbon Reduction Group

Supportive letters have also been received from Wellington Town Council in respect of the proposal and the 'Walkers are Welcome' scheme, stating that walkers and ramblers will benefit from the accommodation and restaurant facilities; and 'The Wild Wednesday Wheelers' (off road cycling group) has pledged its support for the reopening of the PH and houses for rent.

The majority of the 28 objection letters state there is support for the extension to and reopening of the public house but not the erection of the 4 dwellings. Many consider the 2 elements of the proposal should be considered in 2 separate applications. The objections are summarised below:

- proposal conflicts with planning policy – not a suitable settlement or an infill site
- unsuitable access and conflicting residential and commercial use
- proximity of access to existing play area access – child safety
- proposal will exacerbate existing highways safety issues – need traffic calming measures
- lack of parking provision, particularly with regard to area given over to staff parking, functions at the PH and loss of parking to accommodate dwellings
- erection of new dwellings

- question how new dwellings will ensure long-term viability of PH
- work on renovating PH commenced prior to submission of application – questionable whether business reliant on revenue from new dwellings
- queries over local housing needs survey
- question why properties are not all holiday lets
- confusion as to whether properties would be for sale or rent
- properties for short-term lease could adversely impact community spirit
- houses should be low-cost and for local people
- design and scale of properties
- 2 dwellings rather than 4 more appropriate
- impact on adjoining residential amenity
- impact on character
- setting a precedent for residential development and if the pub fails it could be demolished and replaced by further housing
- new dwellings must be for local people and the properties and pub must not be sold separately – income from the housing must remain with the Huntsman Inn in perpetuity
- safety of children being overlooked by occupants of new properties
- at public meeting, applicant stated that PH could not be financed without housing; there was no true debate and concern raised over Parish Council's stance
- should consider Option 3 of Planning Statement – return site to residential use – 2 dwellings with modest PH
- Flagpole unacceptable

Following the receipt of amended plans the Council carried out a second consultation:

4 further letters of support have been received with the following additional comments:

- Little Wenlock has suffered loss of facilities and proposal provides opportunity to re-establish viable PH
- Proposal will enhance village and strengthen local community
- Impact on traffic, parking, noise not significantly different from last time PH open
- Additional facility/ meeting place to village hall
- Employment and tourism opportunities
- Support the proposal but want consideration given to safety at entrance to children's play area

4 additional letters of objection have been received with the following additional ground of objection:

- Support proposal for reopening of PH but not dwellings – contrary to policy and contradicts previous refusals in the village
- With loss of All Labour in Vain, Horsehay for housing, the proposal cannot be justified on basis of local need

- No financial linkage – rental income from houses required to ‘prop up’ PH business
- Design is more in keeping but no justification for housing
- Orientation of dwellings to PH
- Density, urban style and outlook of the dwellings with small amenity space inappropriate to setting
- Not infill site – creation of backland development
- Revised scheme introduces 2no. 4-bed (larger) units thus insufficient parking and only option to park in PH car park
- Houses being built on PH car park – impact on parking, especially if functions at PH and village hall
- Extension of PH and raising roof height – impact on light and outlook of The Stone House
- Applicant will not be resident at the PH as manager

#### PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

As outlined in the Applicant’s Planning Statement, the scheme comprises two elements – the extensions and alterations to the Public House to provide bars, restaurant and first floor guest accommodation, and the erection of 4 dwellings, 1 of which would be a holiday let and 3 market houses for rent.

#### Retention of Community Facility

PPS4 asserts proposals which deliver sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit rural businesses, communities and visitors should be supported by Local Planning Authorities, with careful consideration of financial viability and protection of landscapes and environmentally sensitive sites. Tourist and visitor facilities should be located in or close to service centres and villages. In this regard the site is within close proximity to The Wrekin and the reopening of the PH with additional holiday let accommodation, together with improved bar and restaurant facilities is considered to respond to its context and provide facilities that will meet the needs of tourists as well as the local community.

Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy outlines the provision of new or improved community facilities to meet the needs of local residents will be supported; furthermore the loss of such facilities will be resisted. Public houses are listed as community facilities along with churches, schools and village halls. Such community facilities in rural areas often form a focus for community life. The Huntsman is the only Public House in Little Wenlock and has been vacant for more than 12 months. The reinstatement of the PH is important for the village as there are limited other community facilities. Furthermore there is a duty to support such facilities to prevent its loss.

#### Principle of development

There are no planning policy issues in refurbishment of ‘The Huntsman’ Public House and the design of the development is considered in more detail later in this section; however the proposed residential development in Little Wenlock is a departure to planning policy contained in the Core Strategy.

The Planning Statement submitted with the application considers the options available for the owner are:

1. to continue to operate at a financial loss
2. to use the first floor living accommodation only with closure of the public house
3. to change the use to an alternative business use
4. to redevelop the entire site; and
5. the proposal as submitted which would reinstate the Public House with improved facilities, and include additional residential units.

Core Strategy Policy CS1 states that housing needs in the rural area will be met by approximately 170 new dwellings over the period from 2006 – 2016. At the current time, the threshold has been met from dwellings already built or having received planning permission. Furthermore, Policy CS7 states that development within the rural area should be limited to meet the needs of the area, and be focussed on the 3 key settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Outside these settlements development will be limited and within the open countryside strictly controlled. The local policies are based on national guidance contained in the Planning Policy Statements. This is supported by national policy which outlines new development shall be located in or on the edge of existing settlements and service areas where housing, employment, services and other facilities are provided close together, in order to create sustainable communities.

Little Wenlock was listed as one of the 13 suitable settlements in policy H9 of the Wrekin Local Plan. H9 has now been superseded by Policy CS7 in the Core Strategy in 2007, which removed this village. Within the suitable settlements in the rural area Policy H10 of the Wrekin Local Plan states that development will be permitted where the proposal involves one or two dwellings on a suitable infill plot within the existing built up frontage and would not lead to the loss of open space or an extension of the village into open countryside.

The principle of open market residential development on this site in Little Wenlock would therefore be contrary to the aims of the Core Strategy Policy CS7 and would also propose more than 2 dwellings on a site to the rear of the prevailing built up frontage along Wellington Road, contrary to Policy H10; although there is not a definite building line. Therefore, officers considered the proposal should constitute affordable housing in accordance with policy H24, or all units should be holiday let accommodation.

The Applicant has subsequently submitted a Viability Report to address these alternatives. The report has considered the proposed scheme and holiday lets and affordable housing. The Viability Report outlined the 3 dwellings for rent would provide additional housing choice and affordable accommodation for local people so that they can remain in the rural area. The assessment was that if all the units were holiday lets, the income would be marginally lower than the projected income if the properties were rented, and the provision of affordable housing would not generate any significant long term income to support the business. Furthermore, it is asserted that many banks would not support and provide funding for such a business proposal. There have been a number of failed efforts to make the PH a successful venture and the report outlines that the additional revenue from the properties would ensure that the Applicant would have sufficient income generation to support a successful business at The Huntsman. Therefore, the report concludes the best

option for the Applicant is the current proposal. This has been corroborated by the Council's Property & Design Department, having scrutinised the financial projections in the report.

There must also be regard to the current economic climate and the closure of many Public Houses and other facilities like village shops within the rural area which are sometimes the sole facility in villages. The retention of the Huntsman is considered to be a benefit to the local community and the revenue from the proposed dwellings will help to sustain the business.

Local concerns have been raised that the dwellings could be sold off if the Public House closes in the future, and that in permitting housing, a precedent will be set that would enable redevelopment of the site for further residential development.

The Council has thoroughly evaluated the revised application and concludes that the submitted evidence adequately demonstrates how the long term survival of the Public House would be achieved by the proposed development of 3 rented and 1 holiday let units. While this new build element of the application would be a departure to the Core Strategy Policy CS7 the principle of the development is supported by officers subject to the Applicant entering into a Section 106 agreement to control the development and ensure that the dwellings are tied to the Huntsman in perpetuity, and if the Public House was to close, it has been agreed that the 3 dwellings would revert to holiday let accommodation which would comply with existing policies.

#### Design Issues & Impact on Adjoining Residential Amenity

Core Strategy Policy CS15 outlines how the design of development will create and sustain safe places and strengthen local identity, positively influencing the appearance and use of the local environment. Wrekin Local Plan Policy UD2 asserts that development must respect and respond positively to the context, and enhance the local environment through high quality design, and it will be assessed in relation to its scale, form, proportions, materials and access etc.

The application comprises extensions and alterations to The Huntsman Public House, replacing existing modern ad hoc elements to the side and rear which will be demolished. The floor area of the Public House will be increased; with additional first floor accommodation providing 3 bedrooms adjacent to the Manager's flat; however the ground floor area would be slightly reduced in size. Whilst the scale of the building has increased, the roof of the two-storey element is lower than the ridge of the original building, reducing the overall mass and ensuring this element is not overly prominent in the street scene. The single storey elements to the side elevations comprise a new glazed entrance from the car park and repositioned kitchen and cellar. The overall design of the extensions and alterations is acceptable and in keeping with the character and appearance of the building. Materials and detailing can be dealt with by planning condition. The development includes window openings to the side elevations of the 2-storey element, particularly on the west elevation facing The Wrekin. These alterations will not have an adverse impact on adjoining residential amenities of No.5 Wellington Road or The Stone House in terms of light, outlook and overlooking due to the separation distance between the buildings and the retention of the existing boundary treatments.

The parking layout to the PH has been redesigned to address initial highways comments and ensure sufficient provision and manoeuvring space within the site. The garden areas to the proposed dwellings have been reduced in size and the garden boundary treatments revised to accommodate the required parking and turning space. The plans indicate delivery vehicles have adequate turning space within the separate access leading to the dwellings.

The initial plans of the dwellings proposed two pairs of semi-detached stone-clad cottages with steep roof pitches that were more than 10 metres in height. The design and form of the cottages and in particular the height was not considered to be in keeping with the character of the area, and the roofs of the dwellings would have been visible above the roofline of the PH. Moreover, in addition to the lack of supporting information to identify why the houses were suitable in this location, the layout of development did not demonstrate any link between the PH and dwellings, giving the appearance of 2 distinctly separate elements to the site.

The revised design proposes a single building, linked to the rear of the Public House and is of the form of a converted barn with hipped, lowered roof. The position of the dwellings remains the same as the cottages, with additional revisions to amenity space and parking provision. A separate access from the PH car parking is proposed to serve the dwellings. The 2 central units are now 4-bed properties with first floor accommodation above the archway (covered parking for units 2 and 3). The design includes simple proportioned doors, windows and small dormer windows to the front and rear with first floor windows on the side elevations. The amended design of the dwellings is considered to be a more appropriate and cohesive form of development in relation to the PH extensions and the rural setting.

The roof of the building is lower than the roofline of the PH and whilst it will be visible in the streetscene, it is at the rear and follows the building line of the PH, thus it will not be overly prominent. The lowered roof height of the dwellings and the orientation of the building to the north of adjoining dwellings will ensure that there is not a significant impact on light or outlook on adjoining properties. Given this separation distance, the position of the dwellings and retained landscaping, the development will not have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Listed Building.

The parking layout to the units is not ideal; however it is considered there is sufficient provision with 2 parking spaces per unit, and there will be no adverse impact on highway safety.

The rear garden areas are relatively small in relation to the surrounding properties in Little Wenlock; however they are considered to be of an adequate size and include external storage facilities for each unit to enable control over domestic paraphernalia in a visible location, given the gardens adjoin the car parking area of the PH.

The proposed boundary treatment is 1m post and rail fencing as officers considered the urban 1.8m high close-boarded fencing in this location would be highly visible and not appropriate in this rural location. The screening to the boundaries of the PH site are to be retained in addition to the sufficient separation distance between the proposed dwellings and adjoining properties; therefore despite the position of the

first floor windows; the proposal will not lead to loss of privacy or overlooking of existing residential properties.

#### Impact on Surrounding Area

In terms of the proximity of the dwellings to the play area and playing field and the Council's Parks & Open Spaces' concerns, the dwellings are orientated with the side gable of the holiday let property facing the playing field and the properties overlooking the play area to the front. Whilst the concerns are noted and the separation distance is not 20 metres as outlined in the guidance; it is not considered that the erection of dwellings in this location will lead to the loss of the community facility, in this instance play and recreation facilities. Given the relative proximity of the development, the dwellings will provide natural surveillance of the play area and playing field.

#### Other Issues

As already iterated, the majority of neighbour objections related to the proposed dwellings rather than the extensions and alterations to the PH, with the residential development being contrary to planning policy and concerns that the Huntsman would close, the dwellings would be sold off, and eventual redevelopment of the site. However the developer has demonstrated through the submission of the viability report and in entering into a Section 106 agreement that the dwellings are appropriate in this instance and that the Local Planning Authority can control the development.

With regard to concerns that the introduction of a new access and the erection of dwellings on the overspill car park will have a detrimental impact on highways safety, the Highways Engineer has confirmed that the access arrangements are acceptable and that there is a satisfactory level of parking provision for the PH and dwellings, although the layout is not ideal.

It is noted that other public houses in the vicinity have closed; however with regard to the All Labour in Vain, this is located in Horsehay, within the urban area of Telford and there are other Public Houses in the vicinity. The All Labour in Vain is not one of the only community facilities in the area, whereas the loss of The Huntsman in Little Wenlock would have a greater impact on the vitality of the village. Furthermore, Policy CS10 has been tested at appeal and the Planning Inspector considered the policy is to support rural facilities rather than urban.

The concern that the development of dwellings in the car park would introduce a conflict of uses and adverse impact on future occupants' amenities is noted; however occupants renting these properties or staying in the holiday let accommodation will be aware of the location adjacent to the PH prior to moving in.

The properties are a higher density and with smaller garden sizes than the prevailing development in Little Wenlock; however this is a self-contained development that is intended to provide modest residential accommodation for holiday let and the rental market which is intended to be 'affordable' and enable local people to remain in the village and rural area.

With regard to the flagpole, located at the front of the site, Highways have no objection to its location and it will not impact on highway safety. Neighbour concerns have been raised regarding the proposed flagpole in relation to noise and disturbance from ropes rattling, and that a simple pub sign would be more appropriate; however it is considered that the flagpole and flag are of an acceptable design, visually appropriate, and in keeping with the character of the building, and will not have a significant detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenity. The applicant would require separate advertisement consent if the flag displayed on the flagpole is not a National flag and for the signage on the building.

### Conclusion

The principle of the development has been demonstrated through the financial report and is considered to be acceptable. Additional information has been submitted to establish that the proposed dwellings within the grounds of the Public House are an appropriate exception to justify departure from planning policy, and will help to sustain and ensure the viability of the Public House. The amended design and appearance of the dwellings is now considered in keeping with the context of the site, the physical link accompanied with the Section 106 agreement will ensure the Public house and dwellings are not leased or sold separately.

The extension and alterations to the Public House are considered acceptable in scale and design, in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing building.

Neither the proposed holiday let, residential units or alterations to the Public House will have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities by reason of the separation distance and existing screening to the boundaries.

The proposal will reintroduce and support a valuable community facility to the settlement, providing tourist accommodation and residential properties for rent, complying with Policy CS10.

**RECOMMENDATION:** to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the Applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to tie the proposed market dwellings to The Huntsman Public House and then delegate to Head of Housing & Planning to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

- |    |          |   |
|----|----------|---|
| 1  | A04      | Time limit – Full with no reserved matters                                      |
| 2  | B06      | Samples of materials  |
| 3  | B07      | Sample brick panel  |
| 4  | B11      | Details of doors and windows  |
| 5  | B13      | Details of enclosure  |
| 6  | B14      | Landscaping design  |
| 7  | B33      | Foul and Surface Water  |
| 8  | B custom | Drainage condition  |
| 9  | B custom | No development shall commence until revised details of parking layout submitted |
| 10 | C10      | Hedge protection  |
| 11 | C19      | Car parking   |
| 12 | C20      | Parking, loading unloading and turning  |

- 13 C38 Development in accordance with deposited plans
- 14 D01 Removal of Permitted development rights
- 15 D04 Garage – restriction on use in rural area
- 16 D09 No windows on rear elevation of Public House

**REASON FOR APPROVAL:**

The Local Planning Authority considers the principle of the development has been adequately demonstrated to ensure the long term survival of the Public House. The proposed development shall be retained in perpetuity by the Public House, and shall not be sold as individual residential units. The scale, design and form of the development is considered acceptable and in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing Public House and context of the site and area, with sufficient parking provision, amenity space to the dwellings and retention of landscaping. The development will not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities or highway safety.

TWC/2010/0521

Telford Millennium Community, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire,  
Erection of 83no. dwellings with associated roads , sewers and infrastructure

**APPLICANT**

Taylor Wimpey West Midlands

**RECEIVED**

20/09/2010

**PARISH**

Ketley

**WARD**

Ketley and Oakengates

**CASE OFFICER**

Kath Whitfield

KETLEY PARISH COUNCIL HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS APPLICATION BE  
CONSIDERED BY PLANS BOARD.

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

**MAIN ISSUES:**

Policy, compliance with outline approval, sustainability targets, design, access and landscaping including maintenance.

**PROPOSAL:**

This application is for Approval of reserved Matters for 83 dwellings and forms phase 2 of Ketley Village. The development comprises a mix of dwelling types including 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings and one small block of 2 bedroom apartments. The dwellings are mainly terraced fronting the Spine Road with a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings behind the Spine Road. There is a mix of on-street and on-plot parking and instead of garage blocks parking barns are proposed. 17 of the dwellings will be for social rent and 8 will be shared ownership forming 30% of the dwellings. These are 2 and 3 bedroom units.

The development also includes new roads and infrastructure including landscaping. In terms of drainage, the site connects into the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) constructed as part of the Reclamation and Infrastructure works for this site.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:**

Ketley Village lies within the wider area of Ketley which is a former mining settlement now within the boundaries of Telford. The site is bounded by the railway to the north, Holyhead Road to the south, Wombridge Road to the east and Waterloo Road and the housing in Broadway to the west.

Phase 1 of the development is almost complete with access off Holyhead Road. The park has also been completed. Phase 2 lies to the north of phase 1 beyond the former school site. There is open space between the site and the railway line north of the site including one of the swales constructed as part of the Reclamation and Infrastructure works. Badgers Mound lies to the south of the site, with Rose Mound and the former school site to the west with the back of the dwellings in Broadway. The 'Rabbits Ears' and 'Rabbits Head' which are areas of retained landscaping form the eastern boundary. The Spine Roads crosses through the middle of the site.

The site slopes down to the north and east – a fall of some 10m following the re-grading of the development platforms that was carried out as part of the Reclamation and Infrastructure works.

#### PLANNING HISTORY:

Outline planning permission W2004/0980 for up to 750 dwellings and ancillary small scale employment, leisure retail and community uses granted Feb 2006. This set out the Regulatory Plan and Design Statement as a framework for the development of the site.

An application for Remediation and Reconstruction (W2005/0487) was approved in late 2005. This provided the development platforms, new spine road, and SUDS and landscaping including the transfer of and retention of important ecological areas.

Phase 1 of the development W2006/0463 for 103 dwellings was approved in March 2007 and has largely been built out.

An amendment to phase one W2008/0620 was approved in August 2008 to take account of the changing economic climate and is nearly complete.

#### PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Guidance  
PPS 1 –Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS 3- Housing  
PPS25 – Development and Flood Risk

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies  
Policy UD2 – Design Criteria  
EH7 & EH8 Contaminated land and its remediation

LDF Core Strategy  
CS15 Urban Design  
CS1 Homes  
CS9 Accessibility and Social Inclusion

#### CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Ketley Parish Council has raised some concerns outline below:

- Loss of trees at the rear of Broadway that were promised would be retained, to permit an extra dwelling. These trees should be protected.
- It was originally planned that the NEAP would be overlooked by houses and an apartment block and the PC strongly object that this is not the case.
- Original construction access was to be off Wombridge Way. On no account should it be via the western access.
- Residents have not been consulted on plans for the open spaces even though they will be responsible for future maintenance.
- The Parish is supporting request for a skate park to be provided as part of the NEAP – it is noted that many facilities were lost as the TMC project commenced.

Highways Section: No Objections in principle subject to conditions.

Environmental Engineer: No objections

Fire Service: No objections but need access for emergency vehicles and adequate water supplies

Drainage Section: The design is acceptable in principle but the following details are required:

1. Design calculations to demonstrate that the existing swale system is capable of limiting the site to Greenfield run-offs.
2. A plan showing routes for excess water
3. Evidence that the receiving system is in place and has the capacity to deal with the flows

Pollution Control/Land Contamination: Some of the top soils may not be suitable for garden use. Similarly some of the colliery spoil may not be suitable for use as top soil. It will be necessary to import clean, validated top soil for the garden areas. He therefore recommends the imposition of the contaminated land condition.

Leisure Services: Recommend that the play provision is provided before the dwelling overlooking the site is occupied.

#### Neighbour consultation responses

There have been 4 letters of objection. The main points of concern relate to:

- The erection of one dwelling (plot 186) close to the back of the dwellings in Broadway – nos 48 & 49. In particular has concerns about the windows on the east and west elevations and that the dwelling is sited differently from the dwellings. If it is there for security reasons why is there overlooking of the MUGA
- There is no access to the village from the bridle path that exists behind Broadway which will isolate the new dwellings from the existing development.
- Local views have not been listened to even though comments were made at the public exhibitions.
- Loss of trees along the path at the rear of Broadway and other trees which should have been protected

#### PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The form of the development for Phase 2 was set out in the Regulatory Plan and Design Statement as part of the Outline permission W2004/0981. The original concept for Ketley Village was to explore new approaches to the design and construction of new housing and neighbourhoods. The development was intended to be innovative and sustainable; that it should meet aspirations for regeneration and remediation whilst safeguarding areas of ecological importance: the intention was that it should create a socially inclusive community with extensive consultation and provide links to the wider Telford area.

In addition, specific targets were set to reduce energy consumption, water consumption, meet HCA (SDS) standards, improve daylighting and achieve eco-homes excellent etc. Unfortunately these standards were set in 2003 and changes to Building Regulations mean that some of the targets are not as innovative as originally envisaged. Nonetheless the size of all the dwellings comply with SDS standards and are, therefore, generally larger than normal private housing and sustainability criteria has been considered.

The Design Statement in the outline permission set out a concept masterplan for Ketley Village that set out three character areas. Phase 1 fell within the 'Park View' character area and the current application falls within the 'Ecoville' character area. This is a central area adjacent to the most sensitive ecological and landscape areas on the Ketley Village site. Within Ecoville it was envisaged that development would be more informal with lower densities to create a positive interface with the ecological and landscape areas. It would retain the perimeter block structure but development would be more informal with a mix of detached, semi-detached and linked dwellings. The development adjacent to the ecological areas to the north was to be villas looking onto the open areas. Most development would be 2 & 3 storeys with most 3 storey buildings along the spine road. It was envisaged that wildlife corridors would be provided linking the ecological areas to the north to Badgers Mound and the Rabbits Head. Many dwellings will have on-plot parking with some communal parking within courtyards. One small apartment block was proposed up to 5 storeys high.

Members may be aware that the developers have carried out a 'lessons learnt' exercise for phase 1 to establish what aspects of the Village design are essential to the character of Ketley Village and where change would be appropriate having regard to the changes in the economic climate whilst remaining compliant with the Regulatory Plan and Design Statement.

Phase 1 has a distinctive contemporary character. Visual interest is created through a limited number of architectural typologies and there is consistency in treatment of the different buildings in terms of massing and design. This has made Ketley Village a distinct and unique place.

Phase 2 retains much of the contemporary approach to design based on perimeter blocks and terraces. Standard house types are proposed and it is intended to use traditional methods of construction. The house types have, however, been given a contemporary appearance to reflect the designs in phase 1. Some of the detailing has changed to reflect the current economic climate. For example the recessed galvanised rainwater pipes have been omitted and less timber facing is proposed. In addition there has been a reduction in the number of 3 storey properties with gable frontages. Those remaining are concentrated along the Spine Road with 2.5 and 2 storey dwellings to the rear. The dwellings adjacent to Broadway will be detached and semi-detached to reflect existing development. Housing adjacent to the ecological area will be villa type looking onto the open space. Greater account has been taken of future maintenance of the buildings so there will be less timber on the frontages. All the buildings will turn corners to avoid blank gables and walls towards the public realm and provide interest and passive surveillance. The location of the

social rented and shared ownership housing has been agreed providing a range of 2 and 3 bedroom accommodation.

The streets have been designed on home zone principles with shared surfaces where pedestrians are given precedence. They incorporate on-street parking and informal areas of seating and planting. It is proposed to increase parking provision with an average of 2.3 parking spaces per dwelling, including visitor parking. Some on-plot parking is proposed together with parking barns (to discourage their use for storage) and on-street parking. No parking courtyards are proposed in this phase.

Greater emphasis has been placed on landscaping in the public and semi-public realm to provide a transition from the formal planting in phase 1 to the ecological areas to the north. This is intended to provide a diverse habitat and provide the ecological connections between the open areas required in the original Design Statement. No formal play space is to be provided within this phase as set out in the Master Plan. Hard surfacing will include block paving to reflect the palette of materials in phase 1. Maintenance of the public realm will be undertaken by the Community Trust established to maintain the open areas of the site as part of the outline permission.

It is intended that the roads and shared surfaces will be adopted.

The applicants have submitted evidence from an independent consultant that suggests that the development will meet the requirement for Ecohomes Excellent as required by the outline permission and also the Millennium Community targets.

There have been 4 objections from local residents. The main concern relates to plot 186 which is close to the back of the dwellings in Broadway and faces the footpath that runs along the back of Broadway. This footpath is being retained and there are links from this footpath into the new development at the rear of plot 186. This dwelling is intended to provide passive surveillance of the footpath and due to its orientation should not give rise to undue overlooking and loss of privacy to the existing dwellings in Broadway as there are no windows on the west elevation. There is also a link from the development to the bridleway along the northern boundary of the site. Along the back of Broadway it is proposed to fell one tree, a sycamore, which is in the garden of plot 188 and its loss will improve this garden and improve views of the oak tree behind. In addition an Alder tree is to be crown lifted. Whilst there was widespread tree clearance as part of the Reclamation and Infrastructure Works this did not preclude the felling of further trees as necessary. It is also intended to plant many more trees as part of the landscaping works both within the landscaped areas and along the shared surface streets.

Ketley Parish Council has also raised some concerns. The loss of the tree along the back of Broadway has been dealt with above. The Parish queries the lack of surveillance over the NEAP and that the Master Plan showed an apartment block on the opposite side of the footpath. Plot 117 has been designed to overlook the NEAP area. Looking at the Design Statement, it is clear that the building shown was never intended to be an apartment block and this is confirmed by Jon Rowland, the original designer. The Parish has also requested that the construction access for the development of this phase should be either from the Wombridge Way access or via

the eastern access of Beveley Road. The western access should not be used for any construction traffic once phase 1 is completed. This can be covered by condition.

Ketley Parish Council's main concern is that local residents within Ketley Village have not been consulted on the plans particularly the landscape proposals. This is a particular issue as these residents contribute to the Community Trust that will be responsible for the future maintenance of the landscaped open area and any areas of the development that do not fall within the adopted highway. The normal planning consultations have taken place and there have been two exhibitions held at the beginning of June and early August in the Ketley Community Centre.

It is considered that the proposals for phase 2 of Ketley Village complies with the requirements set out in the approved Regulatory Plan and the parameters set out in the Design Statement approved as part of the Outline planning permission. The design of the development will carry forward the contemporary design approach of phase 1 whilst at the same time meeting the requirements of the 'Ecoville' character area set out in the Design Statement. The development should also comply with the sustainability targets set out for this development. The density and mix of house sizes including 30% affordable housing is acceptable. The scale, mass and design of the new dwellings reflect the contemporary style of dwellings in phase 1 of the development of this site. Furthermore the development should not adversely impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

**RECOMMENDATION: GRANT APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS** subject to the following conditions:

- |     |          |  |
|-----|----------|--|
| 1   | A02      | Time Limit – Approval of reserved matters      |
| 2   | B06      | Samples of materials                           |
| 3.  | B19a     | Highways new access                            |
| 4   | B Custom | Highways                                       |
| 5.  | B Custom | Highways                                       |
| 6.  | B30      | Land Contamination                             |
| 7.  | B73      | Tree protective fencing                        |
| 8.  | B74      | Tree Services Root Protection                  |
| 9.  | B80      | Site Environmental Plan                        |
| 10. | C12      | Landscape management                           |
| 11. | C19      | Car parking                                    |
| 12. | C16      | Crown Lifting of Tree                          |
| 13. | C28      | Drainage Prior to Occupation                   |
| 14  | C38      | Development in accordance with deposited plans |
|     |          | Informatives                                   |
|     | 132      | Fire Authority                                 |
|     | 134a     | Outline Conditions                             |
|     | 140      | Conditions                                     |
|     | 143      | Reasons for Reserved Matters Consent           |
|     | 117      | Minerals Area                                  |

**REASON FOR APPROVAL:**

This application is for phase 2 of the development at Ketley Village and it is considered that it broadly complies with the requirements of the Regulatory Plan and

Design Statement set out in the outline planning permission W2004/0981. The density and mix of house sizes including 30% affordable housing is acceptable. The scale, mass and design of the new dwellings reflect the contemporary style of dwellings in phase 1 of the development of this site. Furthermore the development will not adversely impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. These proposals should also meet the landscaping and sustainability targets set out for this development.

TWC/2010/0566

Telford International Centre, St Quentin Gate, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 4JH  
Application site comprises existing landscaping and car parking areas

**APPLICANT**

Southwater Event Group

**RECEIVED**

18/10/2010

**PARISH**

Great Dawley, Hollinswood  
and Randlay

**WARD**

Malinslee, The Nedge

**CASE OFFICER**

Emma Green

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: None.

MAIN ISSUES: Regeneration, Ground conditions, parking and residential issues.

**PROPOSAL:**

This application seeks Reserved Matters approval for the access and landscaping elements in relation to the construction of a new southern entrance on the western elevation of the TIC building, and a new conference and event suite (Event Box) to the southern elevation.

The proposal includes the temporary layout of parking provision for the new events box, including a pedestrian route to link the Town centre to the adjacent hotels and links to further afield. This is a temporary solution as the existing car park areas are identified for development in the outline application (W2009/0914) and a permanent parking solution i.e. multi storey car park, undercrofting etc, is to be forthcoming in future phases of development.

In addition the application is for landscaping and retaining structures to complement the building.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:**

The site comprises the surrounds to the existing TIC building which is cut into an embankment and its associated car park which is at first floor level at this point. The building at this point comprises a two storey glazed curtain wall facing the car park; access to the car park is at the southern entrance but there is a flight of steps supported by a gabion retaining wall in this general location. These will be removed as part of an earlier permission for the North Entrance under TWC/2010/0113 to provide a new retaining structure and glazed entrance foyer.

**HISTORY:**

W2000/1061 – Erection of extensions to form additional floorspace and supporting accommodation and modification to external works – relates to first two phases of larger 4 phased development - Conditional Permission February 2001

W2000/1060 – Outline application for Phases 3 & 4 for extension to TIC to provide conference/exhibition hall, car park etc.

W2004/0154 – Reserved Matters application for above granted April 2004

W2004/0141 – Extension of Time Period for commencement of development

W2008/0141 – Variation of pre-commencement conditions of outline permission  
W2004/0154

W2009/0914 – Outline permission for Mixed Use etc development at Southwater (i.e. the “enabling” outline permission for this application)

TWC/2010/0113 – Full Planning Permission for North Entrance Foyer

TWC/2010/0256 – Reserved matters permission for Events box (scale, layout and appearance)

#### PLANNING POLICY:

National Planning Guidance

PPS1 Delivering sustainable developments

PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth

PPS 25 Development and Flood Risk

PPG13 Transport

Core Strategy DPD:

CS15 Urban design

Wrekin Local Plan (relevant “saved” policies):

UD2 Urban design

#### CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Great Dawley Parish No comments

Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council: Commented on lack of detail visible on electronic plans. Only part of comments visible and further details are awaited.

Drainage Engineer : Awaited

Highways Authority: Awaited

Geotechnical Engineer: Support

Archaeology: No comment

#### PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The proposed development forms an integral part of a wider scheme that has been supported by the Council under the recent Southwater Core outline planning permission, which approved the principle of development. The TIC is a key leisure facility and economic development generator that attracts a large number of visitors to the Borough. This proposal is of the access and landscaping details for the proposed events box extension to the existing TIC development.

The previously approved building uses contemporary materials including white render, transparent and tinted curtain glazing to create a sleek but bold extension to the TIC. The landscape planting is for determination on this application is considered to complement the building and have a softening effect to the retaining structures. The landscaping respects and integrates with the surrounding area and will positively enhance the visual amenities of the area and therefore accords with policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan

The access element of the scheme is a mix of temporary and permanent solutions, to allow for the phasing of development over the wider Southwater area. The layout and configuration of the car parking is a temporary feature, before the permanent long term parking solution is brought forward. This may be in the form of a multi storey car park. A number of the car parks are identified as building zones for a mix of uses within the Outline application. The drawings submitted demonstrate that there is sufficient parking provision on site to support the existing centre and the new extension.

With regards to pedestrian movements, the new building incorporates a central concourse, which is an important link between the TIC and the proposed Events Box, and can be used as a route from the Town centre to the hotels and areas beyond. This is to be a managed route, similar to the ICC in Birmingham and will therefore not be available when the centre is closed. This route is an extension of Main Street, which will be the backbone of pedestrian movements through Southwater and links the town centre, the existing TIC and facilities and Town Park

In the long term it is anticipated that the vehicular route, with associated pedestrian route will run adjacent to the new events box to link the proposed hotel/residential development in zone 6 with the St. Quentin's roundabout. This will create an attractive and legible route for pedestrians 24 hours a day. This road is anticipated to come forward with the development in zone 6. Therefore in the short term a temporary 24hour solution for pedestrians to link with the wider surroundings is necessary and is to be a delineated route through the car park to link with existing access points. The width and siting of this route has been amended through the application process to be accessible to a wide range of users, and create an easily identifiable route for use.

Ground conditions are covered under the outline permission and will be dealt with later as required by the outline conditions.

There is no impact on any residential property.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Reserved Matters Approval subject to following conditions:

1. A02 Time Limit
2. C38 development in accordance with deposited plans
3. I40 Conditions
4. I43 Reasons for reserved matters consent

**Reason for approval**

The proposed scheme in terms of landscaping and access is in keeping with the existing building and surrounding context. The proposal will complement the overall aspirations for the wider Southwater development. The development will not impact on neighbouring properties.

TWC/2010/0596

69 Haybridge Road, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 5JL

Single storey front and side extensions and first floor extension to rear

**APPLICANT**

Mohamed Butt

**RECEIVED**

04/10/2010

**PARISH**

Hadley and Leegomery

**WARD**

Hadley and Leegomery

**CASE OFFICER**

Elizabeth Attwood

HADLEY AND LEEGOMERY PARISH COUNCIL HAVE REQUESTED THAT THE APPLICATION IS DETERMINED BY MEMBERS OF PLANS BOARD.

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES: The impact upon the character and appearance of the property and residential amenity.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is a for the erection of a single storey front and side extension to replace the existing garage, a first floor rear extension above the existing flat roofed ground floor rear extension, and a tiled roof above an existing flat roof rear extension on a semi detached dwelling.

**HISTORY:**

W2004/0148 single storey rear extension FG

Informal enquiries regarding a loft conversion.

**POLICIES:**

The following policies are considered relevant in determining this application;

Wrekin Local Plan:

UD2 Design Criteria.

Core Strategy:

CS15 Urban Design.

National guidance:

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

**SITE AND LOCATION:**

The application site is a traditional semi-detached two-storey dwelling situated on a separate access road fronting the highway on Haybridge Road. The property is finished in red brick on the ground floor with cream painted rough cast rendering on the first floor front elevation. The windows and doors comprise white Upvc and those to the lounge and front bedroom are bow windows.

There is a concrete driveway to the front of the property and a ramped access with black railings. There is a lean to timber garage running the whole length of the side of the property and it is attached to a brick and tile outbuilding in the rear garden. The rear garden is bounded by walling and well established privet hedging. The

property has a loft conversion and an existing small ground floor rear extension which projects the same distance as the adjoining dwelling no.71. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and a single storey rear extension has recently been approved (W2009/0327) at the adjacent property (no.67).

#### CONSULTATIONS:

Nine direct neighbour notification letters publicised the application; no representations have been received.

The Council's Highway Engineer supports the proposal.  
The Council's Drainage Engineer has no adverse comments.

Parish Council: objects to this application and considers that the proposed extension to the front of the property is completely out of character and context with the adjoining properties and will have an adverse effect on the street scene in that part of Haybridge Road. The Parish Council advises that the application property is one of a series of properties of a common style with bow windows to the front elevation and the proposed extension to the front would look completely out of place, and would set a precedent for further unsympathetic development in the row. They consider that the proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and saved policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

#### PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

Policy UD2 provides guidance to assess whether or not proposals are of an appropriate design quality and relate positively to their context. It advises the Council to assess proposed development in relation to its scale, massing, form, density, orientation and layout, proportions, materials, landscape elements, access, parking and spatial quality. Development is expected to respect and relate to any adjacent buildings.

Policy CS15 of the adopted Core Strategy states that the design of development will assist in creating and sustaining safe places, strengthening local identity and projecting a positive image, which will positive influence the appearance of the local environment.

National guidance contained in PPS1, states that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to improve the character and quality of an area, should not be accepted.

The proposed development comprises several elements as listed above and will provide an enlarged living room, hall, kitchen and dining room on the ground floor. On the first floor bedroom 3 will be converted into a bathroom and the existing bathroom will be enlarged and become bedroom 3; Bedroom 2 will also be enlarged.

The proposed front extension to which the Parish Council objects will project forward just over 1.1m and will be finished in a hipped tile roof to match the main roof of the dwelling. The ground floor bow window will be removed; however the first floor bow window will be retained, which ensures that the design style of the original dwelling is preserved. Furthermore, it should be noted that the adjoining property no.67 has a forward projecting flat roofed garage with a jack roof at the front of the extension and

a porch with a mono pitched roof, although the bow window has been retained, no.73 has a hipped roofed porch and no.77 has a flat roofed porch with an attached white painted flat roofed garage.

Moreover, of the three pairs of semi in the row one pair has white/cream render with white windows, one pair has white/cream render with brown doors and windows and one pair has white/cream render and the left hand property has white doors and windows and the right hand property has brown doors and windows. The pair which is located on an angle at the entrance to the service road is different again as the bow windows are finished with a small gable roof. Both of the properties are finished in white/cream render and white windows and the left hand dwelling has a conservatory attached to the side elevation and the right hand property has a detached flat roofed single garage.

Therefore, whilst there is a general symmetry in the street alterations have occurred over the years which are to be expected given that the properties are some 50-60 years old. The changes and alterations listed above are considered a normal evolution of houses in any street. Furthermore, given that the houses are set back almost 40m from the main part of Haybridge Road behind an established hedgerow and beyond a service road the proposed development (including the loss of the ground floor bow window will not be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the property or the streetscene which could be successfully argued at any subsequent appeal.

The proposed brick and tiled hipped roof side extension is considered an improvement to the existing lean-to timber garage which currently is built right up to the common boundary with no. 71. The design and materials are sympathetic to the main house and the reduction in the width compared to the existing garage will also provide pedestrian access to the rear garden. The removal of the existing garage will also result in a reduction of the overall footprint of the property. There is a new side facing kitchen window proposed however, this will look towards the gable wall of no.71. Therefore, there will be no loss of amenity by way of over-looking.

The proposed first floor rear extension will only be half the depth of the existing ground floor rear extension. The proposed development is a typical style of rear extension to this type of house. The materials, windows and roof match the main dwelling house and thus will have no adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the property of the area. The proposal complies with the Council's 45 degree code and there will be no detrimental impact on residential amenity by way of over-looking

The remaining flat roof of the existing rear extension will be re-roofed with a pitched tile roof to match the roof of the main dwelling. This is considered an improvement to the existing flat roof and thus will have a positive impact on the appearance of the property.

The amount of private amenity space available will be slightly increased by the proposed development and adequate off street parking is retained.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable and will not have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the dwelling or the streetscene. The proposed development will not result in any detrimental impact on residential amenity or parking. Accordingly, the proposal complies with both local and national policy and therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

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

1. A04 - Full with no reserved matters.
2. C01 – materials to match.
4. C38 - Compliance with approved plans.
7. I40 - Informative - Conditions.
8. I41 - Informative - Reasons for the grant of planning permission.

The proposed development is acceptable and will not have a significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the dwelling or the streetscene. The proposed development will not result in any detrimental impact on residential amenity or parking.

TWC/2010/0652

Donnington Recreation Ground, School Road, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 8HT

Provision of a new children's ball court on former tennis court and erection of 3.5m high fencing

**APPLICANT**

Telford and Wrekin Council

**RECEIVED**

04/11/2010

**PARISH**

Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton

**WARD**

Donnington

**CASE OFFICER**

Phil Baker

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: No.

MAIN ISSUES: Design, Appearance, Impact on residential amenity

**PROPOSAL**

The proposed development comprises a children's ball court on the site of a former tennis court, and the erection of 3.5 metre high boundary fencing, at Donnington Recreation Ground, School Road, Donnington.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application site lies within the existing Donnington Recreation Ground, which is situated on the eastern side of School Road in Donnington. The Recreation Ground, which extends to 5.44 hectares, is surrounded by existing residential development. To the north of the Ground is Coronation Drive, and to the east and south is The Fields.

The Donnington Recreation Ground at present contains two bowling greens, a BMX track, a play area, three football pitches, four tennis courts, and general grassed areas.

**PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT**

LDF Core Strategy

CS9 Accessibility and Social Inclusion

CS10 Community Facilities

CS11 Open Space

Saved Wrekin Local Plan

LR1 Provision of Community Facilities

PPS17 – Planning for Open Space, Sport, and Recreation

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

The Parish Council has no objections to the application.

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

The Council's Highways Engineer has no objections to the application.

The Council's Ecologist has no objections to the application.

## PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed development involves providing a ball court on the site of one of the existing tennis courts. The new facility, which measures 29 metres long by 14 metres wide, is intended to be used predominantly by local children and young people, aged from 3 to 16, for football, basketball, cricket, and other ball games. The Council has drawn up the proposals for the ball court in close consultation with the West Mercia Police, Youth Services, and the Parish Council. Similar ball courts have been provided in Madeley, St Georges, Brookside, and Leegomery. The proposal includes litter bins but not seating, which would normally accompany this type of facility.

The proposal is part of a complete modernisation of the existing Recreation Ground. Future plans include a new children's play area and the refurbishment of the three remaining tennis courts.

It has been acknowledged by the Borough Council that Donnington has a high percentage of children and young people, yet it possesses few recreational facilities for children, and limited outdoor facilities for young people. Donnington has been identified as a part of Telford that is deficient in outdoor recreational facilities, as highlighted in the Council's Outdoor Recreational Strategy. It is considered that the provision of this ball court will help to alleviate this deficiency, and provide important community and recreational facilities for local children and young people.

National guidelines in relation to older children's play provision suggest a minimum set distance of 30 metres from the edge of the facility to the boundary of existing or proposed residential properties. In this particular case all the nearest dwellings exceed the recommended guideline distance apart from an isolated block of four one-bedroom flats at The Lodge, approximately 15 metres away.

However, it is understood that there are no other sites available within the Recreation Ground that meet the '30-metre rule' or are not earmarked for other future activities. Moreover, the bowling club was adamant during the pre-submission period that the ball court could not be located at the other end of the tennis courts, closer to the bowling greens, because of increased security issues, and the Lawn Tennis Association wished to ensure that the three remaining tennis courts were kept all together.

It should be acknowledged that the '30-metre rule' is guidance only, and there are numerous locations across the Borough which are significantly closer than this proposal. (For instance in Freestone Avenue, St Georges the play area is only 3 metres from the nearest residential property). The applicant has stated that the proposal has been thoroughly thought out and widely consulted on, and that there are no realistic alternative sites where the ball court could be located. Furthermore, no objections have been received from the occupants of the adjacent flats, or from the landlord, a local housing association.

The neighbouring flats are already adjacent to the existing tennis courts. The proposal will not be introducing a brand new public recreational facility, but changing the use of a tennis court to a ball court.

The existing tennis courts are currently underused and although one court would be lost, the adjoining three courts will be refurbished and improved. The new ball court will enhance the public recreational facilities on offer in Donnington and widen their general appeal and usage for the overall benefit of the wider community.

It is considered, on balance, that the proposed ball court would be acceptable in its intended location, particularly taking into account that it would be situated within an existing tennis court. It is believed that the advantages of providing this facility for the children and young people of Donnington more than outweigh any possible problems of noise and disturbance that may be experienced by local residents.

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

1. A04 – Full permission
2. C38 – Submitted plans

#### **REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

The scale and design of the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposed ball court respects the context of the site and would provide an important community and recreational facility for children and young people.

The existing tennis courts are currently underused and although one court would be lost, the adjoining three courts will be refurbished and improved. The new ball court will enhance the public recreational facilities on offer in Donnington and widen their general appeal and usage for the overall benefit of the wider community.

TWC/2010/0745

Highway Verge, Priorslee Avenue, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9TG  
Determination under Part 24 of the GPDO for the erection of a 14.8m high telecommunication pole with antennae and erection of equipment cabinet

**APPLICANT**

Vodafone (UK) Ltd & Telefonica O2 (UK) Ltd

**RECEIVED**

18/11/2010

**PARISH**

St. Georges and Priorslee

**WARD**

Priorslee

**CASE OFFICER**

Phil Baker

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

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES: The siting and appearance of the telecommunications installation and its visual impact on the surrounding area.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

This is an application for a determination as to whether prior approval will be required in relation to the siting and appearance of a 14.8 metre high slim line telecommunications monopole.

This is a site sharing facility for Vodafone and O2. The Vodafone antennae are situated within the monopole at a height of 13.23 metres above ground level and the O2 antennae are situated at a height of 13.88 metres. All the antennae are contained within a smooth circular sheath.

There would also be a ground equipment cabinet at the base of the pole measuring 1.89m in length, 0.79m in width and 1.65 metres in height. The monopole and the equipment housing would both be coloured green.

The applicants have stated that the proposal is required in order to increase 2G network capacity to the Priorslee area and also provide 3G coverage.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:**

The site lies within the Priorslee residential area, although there is an area of public open space to the east. The installation would be situated on the grass highway verge on the eastern side of Priorslee Avenue, approximately 100 metres south of Abelia Way and 100 metres north of Glenbrook Road. The surrounding residential areas consist mostly of low-density detached dwellings.

**PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:**

Wrekin Local Plan Policy T21: Telecommunications.

This policy emphasises the requirement to balance the need for telecommunication systems with the need to minimise the proposal's visual impact on the surrounding area. Evidence should be provided to show that every effort has been made to erect

the apparatus on existing buildings, masts, and other structures, and to share apparatus with other operators.

#### Planning Policy Guidance Note 8: Telecommunications (PPG8)

This sets out the Government's policy for the planning of telecommunications development. PPG8 encourages local planning authorities to respond positively to telecommunications proposals while protecting the environment from visual intrusion.

#### ODPM: Code of Best Practice on Mobile Phone Network Development.

The Code provides practical advice on the siting and design of telecommunications development in order to minimise the environmental impact of installations.

#### CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The Ward Member, Ian Fletcher, objects to the proposal on the following grounds:-

- The pole would be in an area where children play and young people congregate
- The pole would be sited in a residential area and will be detrimental to the amenity value of the residents
- The pole would be situated where two traffic accidents have occurred, and to site a pole and box there will increase the risk of injuries.

To date 74 letters and e-mails have been received objecting to the proposal, the grounds of objection summarised as being:-

- Would be detrimental to a beautiful residential area
- Health implications for young children playing on the adjacent playing field, and all children living locally
- Effects on health due to harmful emissions
- Too close to houses
- This is a poor choice of location
- It will be an eyesore
- Should not be located within a densely populated area
- There are better sites available on higher ground away from residential areas
- Detrimental effect on property values
- Highway safety would be jeopardised
- Existing signal strength for Vodaphone and O2 is not a problem in this area

One e-mail in support of the pole has been received.

#### PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

This is a telecommunications determination application and therefore the decision whether to give or refuse prior approval must be based on the siting and appearance of the installation.

The proposed monopole and its associated ground equipment cabinet would be situated on the open grass verge adjoining the highway. There are high banks of vegetation beyond the highway verge on both sides of the road. There are

numerous 10 metre high street lights along Priorslee Avenue and the nearest residential property is approximately 40 metres from the proposal site.

The applicant states that they have explored existing telecommunications installations, buildings, and other structures within the required coverage area, but all have been discounted, mainly for contractual reasons, and that the chosen site has been identified as the most suitable option that balances technical and operational requirements with local planning policies and national planning policy guidance, and also the need to minimise visual impact. The applicants state that careful consideration has been placed into finding a site that pulls the facility as far as possible away from any housing.

Although the monopole would differ in appearance from the existing angled street lighting columns, it would be in effect an additional item of street furniture and as such it would not be an alien feature to the street scene nor significantly visually intrusive. Its location within the grass highway verge will not form an incongruous or unduly prominent feature on the skyline or on the street scene. In addition the monopole will be viewed in relation to the trees located beyond the grass verges and on the open space to the east of the site. There is no fenced compound proposed, and it is normal to find various types of electrical equipment cabinets and relay boxes alongside urban roads. Therefore the overall impact of the installation on the street scene is considered to be acceptable.

There is much public concern concerning the possible adverse health impacts of telecommunication development. However consideration of this application should follow the advice given in PPG8. Paragraph 98 states: "...it is the Government's firm view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards. It remains central Government's responsibility to decide what measures are necessary to protect public health. In the Government's view, if a proposed mobile phone base station meets the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure it should not be necessary for a local planning authority, in processing an application for planning permission or prior approval, to consider further the health aspects and concerns about them."

The requisite ICNIRP certificate has been submitted with this application which confirms that the site and the proposed emissions would comply with the appropriate guidelines. Recent High Court and Court of Appeal decisions in relation to planning appeals for telecommunications equipment have established that when evidence is submitted to confirm that an installation falls within the ICNIRP guidelines, that a perception of fear or concerns about health issues do not provide justification for a Council to refuse an application.

Therefore, the proposed monopole is considered an acceptable installation in this urban residential area, where the appearance of a slimline monopole would not detract from the character of the area. The siting and design of the proposed development will ensure that there is no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the locality and the general street scene. Furthermore, proximity to dwellings is not a planning issue provided that the application includes an ICNIRP Declaration regarding emissions, which this application does, and that the installation satisfies normal planning considerations regarding the siting and appearance of development.

DETERMINATION:

The proposed 14.8 metre high slim line telecommunications monopole does not require a full planning application, and therefore **prior approval is given** for the siting and appearance of the telecommunications installation and its permitted development rights are hereby confirmed.