

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 5th January, 2011 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

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

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor J.M. Seymour (for planning application TWC/2010/0332)

PB-63 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the Plans Board held on 8th December, 2010 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PB-64 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

PB-65 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

PB-66 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

PB-67 SITE VISITS

None.

PB-68 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

(a) TWC/2010/0259 – Rough Park House, Woodside Avenue, Woodside, Telford, Shropshire

This proposal sought to renew the recently expired planning permission W2005/0294 to restore the fabric of the building, convert it into 5 one-bedroom flats, with 2 flats on each of the ground and first floors, and a further single flat at second floor level. It was also proposed to demolish a single storey flat-roofed addition at the rear and replace it with an additional 2 storey gabled element to complement similar gabled structures alongside and to erect 2 blocks of 2 bedroom apartments to provide an additional 18 units, which would be split between 12 apartments in a block to the east of Rough Park House, extending towards the rear of the site, and 6 in a block to the west. Some car parking spaces would be provided to the site frontage with most of the car parking provision and a bin store enclosure being located to the rear of the site. Rough Park House was Grade II Listed detached 18th century former farmhouse, which formed part of a 19th Century parkland landscape. The application was considered in conjunction with planning application TWC/2010/0260 relating to

Listed Building consent.

The vacant house and its grounds had been the subject of vandalism, arson and fly-tipping for many years and the applicant had erected a solid boarded fence on the boundary as a temporary measure to prevent any further damage to the site. Behind this boarding the site now had a very poor visual appearance, although the house itself, despite its condition, was still regarded as being worthy of restoration and re-use by English Heritage, as set out in the report.

Despite the previous planning consents the property had changed hands several times and no development had commenced on the site despite discussions with the current owner. Urgent Works Notices under Urgent Works Notices pursuant to Section 54 of the of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 had been served on the owner and had resulted in some degree of roof protection and site security, but the condition of the structure and the site continued to deteriorate further to the detriment not only of the listed structure but also to the amenity of the surrounding area. In 2010 Members of the Plans Board had approved a formal Repairs Notice, which had been served on the owner and required him to undertake the works set out in the report. If the owner did not either undertake these works or enter into discussions with the Council regarding its acquisition of the property by agreement then, after two months, the Council could commence a Compulsory Purchase Order for the property under Section 48 of the Act.

Madeley Parish Council had strongly objected to the proposal, as summarised in the report, and one local letter of objection had been received on the grounds of disturbance from building works, in combination with the building works for the adjacent redevelopment of Woodside.

The proposed development, as previously approved, sought to respond to the site characteristics as detailed in the report. When planning application W2005/0294 was approved, it had been considered that the proposal represented both a unique opportunity and a challenge due to future of the site having been undetermined for over a decade. There were unknown quantities relating to the development in particular the costs of the works required on the Listed Building and the difficulty of accurately predicting the selling price of the apartments given this particular site and the uncertainty in the housing market. It was noted that W2005/0294 had been approved subject to a S106 Agreement relating to the timed restoration of the Listed Building.

Members were advised that the granting of any further planning permission on the site would not prevent the Council commencing Compulsory Purchase Proceedings if the Repairs Notice was not complied with and the previous grant of planning permission was a relevant material planning consideration in determining the current application. Furthermore, the regeneration of Woodside was progressing and that, combined with the prior notification for the demolition of 40 dwellings surrounding the site, demonstrated the regeneration mechanisms that the Council was undertaking. Therefore, it was considered that the opportunity to develop this site should be encouraged.

The concerns raised by Madeley Parish Council had been noted but the current proposal sought to replace a previously approved consent. Whilst the Parish Council wished the development to commence within a year, this was not considered to be a reasonable condition for any approval given the current market conditions. However, by means of the S106 Agreement, time limits could be imposed to restore the building, thus meeting the Parish Council's and this Council's wish for the Listed Building to be restored.

In conclusion, as the application had previously been approved in this form and planning policy had not significantly changed, it was recommended that the application as submitted 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 20th century development.

Councillor G.M. Green requested further information on the option for a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and the Planning Officer explained that the planning and Listed Building applications before Members would have no bearing upon the process. The Council's Solicitor added that the CPO was currently being progressed and stated that planning permission subject to a S106 Agreement was necessary to control development on the site. In response to a question from Councillor D.R. Chaplin, the Planning Officer confirmed that the proposal had not amended the design of the approved application W2005/029. However, an updated Section 106 Agreement was required to take account of the current condition of the site and the work required by the Repairs Notice.

In conclusion, the Head of Housing & Planning explained that the refurbishment and development of this site was an important part of the overall regeneration of Woodside in which the Council had been involved for many years and it could intervene if necessary. Members welcomed the applications as, if no work was commenced on Rough Park House in the near future, its survival could be threatened.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0259 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission 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, and to the conditions as set out in the report.

(b) TWC/2010/0260 – Rough Park House, Woodside Avenue, Woodside, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application to replace the extant Listed Building Consent W2005/0295 for the conversion of this Grade II Listed Building to form 5 apartments, the erection of 18 new apartments and associated parking together with alterations to the existing access and a new boundary treatment. The application was considered in conjunction with planning application TWC/2010/0259

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0260 the Head

of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant Listed Building Consent 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, and to the conditions as set out in the report.

- (c) TWC/2010/0332 – The Huntsman Inn, Wellington Road, Little Wenlock, Telford, Shropshire

The applicant wished to reopen 'The Huntsman' which had been vacant for approximately twelve months and sought planning permission for the erection of a 2 storey extension to the existing building to provide a restaurant with guest accommodation above, a physical link to a new building to the rear comprising 1 holiday let and 3 dwellings for rent with associated access, and a flag pole to the front of the Public House. Councillor J.M. Seymour, Ward Member, had requested that the application be considered by the Plans Board.

Following concerns expressed by both the Council's Highways Engineer and Little Wenlock Parish Council, an amended parking design to provide 32 spaces and disabled parking had been submitted. This was considered to be acceptable subject to parking space No.6 being allocated as a disabled space alongside No.5 and spaces 14 and 15 being combined to make a single space to ensure ease of use. The layout of the parking for the residential units would have little or no effect on the safe operation of the public highway and there were now no objections subject to standard planning conditions.

The Council's Parks & Open Spaces Section had been concerned that it was proposed to site residential dwellings adjacent to a children's equipped play area and to avoid any potential issues, officers had accepted an exception for holiday lets and requested that the proposed buildings within this curtilage buffer be holiday lets rather than residential dwellings. Alternatively, they had been prepared to accept the relocation of the play equipment more than 20m away from the proposed permanent residential properties. In response, Little Wenlock Village Hall & Playing Field Committee and Little Wenlock Parish Council had verbally stated that they did not consider this to be a viable option but that the proximity of the new dwellings would aid security by providing natural surveillance and the level of use would be such that there would not be a significant impact on future occupants of the dwellings.

Approximately 50 local residents had made representations to the original consultation, of which 23 supported the proposal, including Wellington Town Council and Councillor V. Tonks, as set out in the report. 28 letters of objection, as summarised in the report, had been submitted, the majority of which supported the proposed extension and the re-opening of the public house but not the erection of the proposed dwellings. Following receipt of the amended plans the Council had carried out a second consultation and 4 letters of support and 4 of objection, all providing additional comments, had been received, as summarised in the report.

As set out in the report, the application complied with PPS4 and Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy. However, while there were no planning policy issues relating to the

refurbishment of the Public House, the proposed residential development in Little Wenlock was a departure from planning policy, as detailed in the report. In particular, Core Strategy Policy CS7 stated that development within the rural area should be focussed on the three key settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton and, therefore, the principle of open market residential development on this site would be contrary to its aims. Therefore, officers had advised that the proposal should constitute either affordable housing in accordance with Policy H24 or that all the units should be holiday let accommodation.

To address these alternatives the applicant had submitted a Viability Report, which stated that the 3 dwellings for rent would provide additional housing choice and affordable accommodation for local people. If, however, all the units were holiday lets, the income would be marginally lower than the projected income from all the units being for rent and the provision of affordable housing would not generate any significant long term income to support the business. Furthermore, it asserted that many banks would not provide funding for such a business proposal. There had been a number of unsuccessful attempts to operate this Public House profitably and the Viability Report stated that the additional revenue from the properties would provide sufficient income generation to support a successful business venture. It, therefore, concluded that the preferable option was for 1 holiday let and 3 for rent, as corroborated by the Council's Property & Design Department following scrutiny of the financial projections.

Regard also had to be given to the current economic climate and the closure of many public houses and other community facilities in rural areas. Local concerns had been raised that, if approved, the proposed dwellings could later be sold if the Public House were to close and a precedent would have been set for further residential development on the site. However, following thorough evaluation of the revised application, it was considered that the long term survival of the Public House would be achieved by this scheme. Subsequently, officers supported the application subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to ensure that the dwellings were tied to 'The Huntsman' in perpetuity and, if it were to close, it had been agreed that the 3 rented units would revert to holiday let accommodation to comply with existing policies.

The proposed extensions and alterations to the Public House would replace the existing modern ad hoc elements to the side and rear following their demolition. The floor area of the Public House would be increased with additional first floor accommodation providing 3 bedrooms adjacent to the Manager's flat but the ground floor area would be slightly reduced in size. Whilst the scale of the building had increased, the roof of the 2-storey element was lower than the ridge of the original building, thus reducing the overall mass and ensuring this element was not overly prominent in the street scene. The single storey elements to the side elevations were a new glazed entrance from the car park and a repositioned kitchen and cellar. The overall design was acceptable and in keeping with the character and appearance of the building. In addition, it was considered that the window openings to the side elevations of the 2-storey element, particularly on the west elevation facing The Wrekin, would not have an adverse impact on the adjoining residential amenities of either No.5 Wellington Road or The Stone House.

The initial plans, comprising 2 pairs of semi-detached cottages had not been considered acceptable, as set out in the report. The revised design before Members proposed a single building, linked to the rear of the Public House, in the form of a converted barn with a hipped, lowered roof but in the same position for the cottages but with revisions to amenity space and parking provision. A separate access from the Public House car park was proposed to serve the dwellings. The two central units were now 4-bed properties with first floor accommodation above the archway, which provided covered parking for units 2 and 3. The design included simple proportioned doors, windows and small dormer windows to the front and rear with first floor windows on the side elevations. The amended design was considered to be a more appropriate and cohesive form of development in relation to the Public House extensions and the rural setting.

The roof of the building was lower than the roofline of the Public House and, whilst it would be visible in the streetscene, was at the rear and followed the building line of the Public House and, thus, would not be overly prominent. The lowered roof height of the dwellings and the orientation of the building to the north of adjoining dwellings would ensure that there was not a significant impact on their light or outlook. Given the separation distance, the position of the dwellings and retained landscaping, the development would not have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Listed Building. The rear garden areas were relatively small in relation to the surrounding properties, but were of an adequate size and included external storage facilities for each unit to enable control over domestic paraphernalia as the gardens would adjoin the car park of the Public House. The proposed boundary treatment was 1m post and rail fencing and the screening to the boundaries of the Public House site would be retained in addition to the sufficient separation distance between the proposed dwellings and adjoining properties.

Concern had been expressed that the development of dwellings on the car park would introduce a conflict of uses and an adverse impact on future occupants' amenities but it was considered that people renting these properties or staying in the holiday let accommodation would be aware of this prior to moving in.

With regard to the flagpole located at the front of the site, the Highways Engineer had no objection to its location as it would not impact on highway safety. Neighbour concerns had been raised with regard to noise and disturbance from the ropes rattling, but it was considered that the flagpole and flag were of an acceptable design, visually appropriate, in keeping with the character of the building and would have no significant detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenity. The applicant would require separate advertisement consent if the flag displayed on the flagpole was not a national flag and for the signage on the building.

The update report tabled at the meeting summarised the comments made in 3 further letters of objection that had been received including the public not having had an opportunity to consider the information contained in the Viability Report and the Section 106 Agreement. In response, the update report stated that Viability Reports, which contained confidential commercially sensitive information, were not normally available in the public domain; this request was then being considered under the Freedom of Information Act as a separate matter. With regard to the Section 106 Agreement and the conversion to holiday lets in the event of the public house

closing, the Council's Legal Department was still in negotiation with the developer's Solicitor to agree the details and the Local Planning Authority would ensure, amongst other things that, if the Public House closed, all units would revert to holiday let accommodation. In conclusion, the Local Planning Authority considered that this has been a democratic process as local residents and Little Wenlock Parish Council had been consulted, and re-consulted following submission of amendments, and the application was being considered by the Council's Plans Board.

The update report also informed the Board that an additional condition was required to control the use of the proposed holiday let by stating that no one individual or family/group should occupy it for more than 4 consecutive weeks in any calendar year. The Council had been seeking to agree the Section 106 Agreement with the developer's Solicitor and, consequently, a revised recommendation was set out in the update report.

John Marsham, Clerk to Little Wenlock Parish Council, and Councillor J.M. Seymour. Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the application. Both referred to the loss of community facilities in rural areas and the vital role of The Huntsman at the heart of the community, as an important social hub, provider of employment and tourism opportunities. They also stressed the need for the operator of a public house to diversify in order to survive by responding to community needs and expanding into alternative businesses. Neil Blackie of Manby Bowler, the applicant's agent, added that this was a very important proposal for the local community. The applicant was committed to the retention of the public house and the proposal would support economic development, leisure and tourism in line with the Core Strategy and PPS4.

Keith Harris, owner of the adjacent Stone House, spoke against the application and, in particular, the proposed housing units and S106 Agreement. He considered that many of the issues relating to the proposal were too marginal to be acceptable and that the grounds for granting planning permission for 3 rental units was not a justified departure from policy.

Members commented on the number of public houses that had closed down and welcomed this opportunity to retain and develop The Huntsman. Councillor G.M. Green asked what action would be taken to ensure that the rental units would be maintained as short term lets and the Council's Solicitor responded that the S106 Agreement would be monitored and, if necessary, appropriate Notices served.

RESOLVED - that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0332 the Head of Housing & Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the owner of the development land entering into a Section 106 Agreement to ensure that the 4 dwellings and the Public House remain in the same ownership, to ensure that none of the 4 dwellings shall be occupied until the Public House is completed and open to the public for business, to ensure that one of the 4 dwellings is holiday let only and the other 3 are rented on suitable short term tenancies or holiday lets to ensure that an appropriate obligation is imposed to require that all 4 dwellings be holiday lets only in the event of the Public House failing, and subject to the conditions as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

(d) TWC/2010/0521 – Telford Millennium Community, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought Reserved Matters approval for 83 dwellings as Phase 2 of Ketley Village. The development comprised 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings and a small block of 2-bedroom apartments. They would be mainly terraced fronting the Spine Road with a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings behind with a mix of on-street and on-plot parking and parking barns. 30% of the dwellings, all of which were 2 and 3-bedroom units, would be affordable housing with 17 for social rent and 8 for shared ownership. The development also included new roads, infrastructure and landscaping and the site would be connected into the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) constructed as part of the Reclamation and Infrastructure works for the site.

The Design Statement included within the outline planning permission had set out a concept masterplan for Ketley Village of three character areas, of which this application was the 'Ecoville'. It was a central area adjacent to the most sensitive ecological and landscape areas on the site and it was envisaged that it would be a lower density development to create a positive interface with these areas. It would retain the perimeter block structure of Phase 1 but would be more informal with a mix of detached, semi-detached and linked dwellings with those adjacent to the ecological areas to the north being villas looking onto the open areas. Most development would be 2 and 3 storeys with most of the 3 storey buildings being along the Spine Road. Wildlife corridors would be provided linking the ecological areas to the north to Badgers Mound and the Rabbits Head.

The developers had carried out a 'lessons learnt' exercise for Phase 1 to establish what aspects of the design were essential to the character of Ketley Village and what change would be appropriate in the current economic climate whilst remaining compliant with the Regulatory Plan and Design Statement. Standard house types were proposed using traditional methods of construction but they had been given a contemporary appearance to reflect the designs in Phase 1, some of the detailing had been changed to reflect the current economic climate, and greater account had been taken of the future maintenance of the buildings by using less timber on the frontages. All the buildings would turn corners to avoid blank gables and walls towards the public realm and provide interest and passive surveillance. The streets had been designed on home zone principles, as set out in the report, and parking provision would be increased to an average of 2.3 parking spaces per dwelling, including visitor parking, together with parking barns and on-street parking. No parking courtyards were proposed in this phase.

Greater emphasis had 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, which would provide a diverse habitat and the ecological connections between the open areas required in the original Design Statement. No formal play space would be provided, as set out in the Master Plan. Hard surfacing would include block paving to reflect the palette of materials in Phase 1 and maintenance of the public realm would be undertaken by the Community Trust established for this purpose as part of the outline permission. However, the roads and shared surfaces would be adopted. The applicants had submitted evidence from an independent consultant which suggested that the development would meet

the requirement for Ecohomes Excellent as required by the outline planning permission and the Millennium Community targets.

Ketley Parish Council had raised concerns and 4 letters of objection had been received, as summarised in the report. The main concern of local residents was the position of Plot 186, which was close to the back of the dwellings in Broadway and faced the footpath that ran along their rear boundaries, and the loss of trees. In response the report stated that the dwelling on Plot 186 was 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 would be no windows on the west elevation. To the rear of Broadway it was proposed to fell one sycamore in the garden of Plot 188 which would improve both the garden and views of the oak tree behind. In addition one Alder tree was to be crown lifted.

Ketley Parish Council had queried the lack of surveillance over the NEAP and the existence on the Master Plan of an apartment block on the opposite side of the footpath. In response it was stated that Plot 117 had been designed to overlook the NEAP area but the building shown on the masterplan had never been intended as an apartment block, as confirmed by the original designer. The Parish Council had also been concerned that residents in Ketley Village had not been consulted on the plans particularly the landscape proposals, which was an issue as these residents contributed to the Community Trust that would be responsible for the future maintenance of the landscaped open area and any areas that did not fall within the adopted highway. The Board was informed that the normal planning consultations had taken place and two exhibitions had been held at the beginning of June and early August in the Ketley Community Centre.

It was considered that the proposals for Phase 2 complied 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 would 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 and comply with the sustainability targets set out for this development.

Since the report was prepared the applicants had submitted some minor changes to the layout of the site and the house types as outlined in the update report tabled at the meeting. However, none of these would adversely affect the form and character of the proposed house types. The update report also recommended the imposition of an additional condition relating to all construction traffic for the development being required to use either the eastern access off Beverley Road or the access off Wombridge Way with none accessing the site via the Holyhead Road.

Cllr Martin Young, on behalf of Ketley Parish Council, thanked all those concerned for the work they had done on preparing the application but expressed concern regarding the future maintenance of the open spaces in the development. Normally, these would be the responsibility of Telford & Wrekin Council but, for this scheme, it would be the responsibility of the residents and, therefore, they needed to be fully informed in the process. He also raised concerns regarding the retention of trees on

the site and the issue of security for the proposed NEAP. He did not wish to see the application refused but requested that it be deferred to allow the residents to discuss the implications and take them to the Millennium Management Committee.

Jon Rowland, on behalf of Taylor Wimpey, the applicant, responded that considerable consultation had been undertaken with new and existing residents and with the Steering Group for the past 18 months, including 4 public consultations in June, from which the proposed layout and design had emerged. With regard to the concerns raised on the trees, he informed the meeting that only one tree had been removed, the sycamore at Plot 188, as it had previously been vandalised. 2 trees with Protection Orders had been retained and 200 new trees would be planted. With regard to security for the NEAP, this would be provided by Plot 117 in line with secure by design planning.

In presenting the report, the Planning Officer explained that a Community Trust had been set up to maintain the open spaces rather than a commuted sum as used in the past. The Council was not a member of and had no involvement with the Trust but the developer and the Registered Social Landlord were both committed to retaining the open spaces.

Councillor H. Rhodes said that, although she wished to see the development progress, she was concerned at the issues raised by Ketley Parish Council and suggested that the application be deferred to allow for further consultation with the residents. This was supported by Councillor R.T. Kiernan.

In response the Head of Housing & Planning advised the Board that consultation had previously taken place which had informed the proposal before them. This was an important scheme for both the Council and the HCA and was consistent with the approved outline application. He further emphasised the importance of this application which, at 30%, would provide a higher level of affordable housing than a number of other recent applications and would give support to the housing market in difficult circumstances. Whilst the Community Trust was a new approach to the maintenance of open spaces, it had been discussed throughout development of the scheme and had the potential for greater local involvement than in the past. In conclusion, he said that he could not recommend deferring the application, as sufficient assurances had been given on the issues raised and, as the most affected residents were not yet occupying the 83 new properties, they would not be able to participate in any further consultation process.

Councillor H. Rhodes proposed, seconded by Councillor F.R. Picken, that determination of the application be deferred for one cycle but, on being put to the vote, this was not agreed. Councillor G.M. Green stated that she would wish to see a method by which the interested parties could resolve the issues raised and the Head of Housing & Planning responded that the developer, the HCA, and the Local Planning Authority would ensure that all those involved were kept fully informed and given an opportunity to make their views known.

RESOLVED - that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0521 approval of reserved matters be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the

report and to the additional condition relating to access to the site for construction traffic as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

- (e) TWC/2010/0566 – Telford International Centre, St. Quentin Gate, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought Reserved Matters approval for the access and landscaping elements relating to the Events Box extension, as clarified by the update report tabled at the meeting, including the temporary layout of parking provision, the pedestrian route to link the Town Centre to the adjacent hotels and links to further afield, and the retention of structures to complement the building. The proposed development formed an integral part of a wider scheme under the recently approved Southwater Core outline planning permission and the landscape planting would complement the previously approved building, have a softening effect upon the retained structures, and respect and integrate with the surrounding area and positively enhance its visual amenities in accordance with Policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council had commented on the proposal, as set out in the main report, and had submitted further comments on the relocation of the coach parking area, the additional landscaping and tree planting, and the potential for noise pollution should coaches travel through residential areas particularly at unsocial hours as summarised in the update report. In response the planning officer stated that these issues had been considered at the outline planning stage and alternative arrangements agreed.

The access element of the scheme was a mix of temporary and permanent solutions to allow for the phasing of development over the wider Southwater area. A number of the car parks had been identified as building zones for a mix of uses within the Outline application but the drawings submitted demonstrated that there was sufficient parking provision on site to support the existing Centre and the new extension. The update report tabled at the meeting informed Members that the Council's Highways Engineer supported the revised parking layout and level of provision as detailed in the amended plans, subject to it being available prior to the occupation of the new extension. In addition, there was provision within the site for coach parking and drop off as per the existing arrangement together with a coach drop off on St. Quentin Gate, which would be available for TIC use if necessary. The interim footway/cycleway was now along an acceptable route but should be marked out prior to occupation and two further conditions relating to this were recommended in the update report.

With regards to pedestrian movements, the new building incorporated a central concourse, which would be an important link between the TIC and the proposed Events Box and could be used as a route from the Town Centre to the hotels and areas beyond. This would be a managed route, which would not be available when the Centre was closed, and would be an extension of Main Street, the backbone of pedestrian movements through Southwater linking to the Town Centre, the existing TIC and its facilities and the Town Park

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

Fergus Mitchell on behalf of the applicant, the Southwater Event Group, stressed their commitment, together with that of the TIC, to this development as part of the ongoing programme for the Southwater Regeneration.

RESOLVED - that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0566 Reserved Matters approval be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the main report and to the two additional conditions as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

(e) TWC/2010/0596 – 69 Haybridge Road, Hadley, Shropshire

This was an application 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. The application site was a traditional semi-detached two-storey dwelling in a predominantly residential area and was sited on a separate access road fronting the highway on Haybridge Road. Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council had requested that the application be considered by the Plans Board and had objected on the grounds that the proposed extension to the front of the property was completely out of character and context with the adjoining properties and would have an adverse effect on the street scene.

The proposed development would provide an enlarged living room, hall, kitchen and dining room on the ground floor. On the first floor bedroom 3 would be converted into a bathroom with the existing bathroom being enlarged to become a new bedroom 3 and Bedroom 2 would be enlarged. The proposed front extension would project forward just over 1.1m and be finished in a hipped tile roof to match the main roof of the dwelling. The ground floor bow window would be removed but the first floor bow window would be retained to preserve the design style of the original dwelling.

The report drew the Board's attention to the changes and differing exterior treatments that had been made to a number of properties in the vicinity of the application site. Therefore, whilst there was a general symmetry in the street, alterations had been made to properties over many years. Not only were these considered a normal evolution of houses in any street but, given that the houses were set back almost 40m from the main part of Haybridge Road and behind an established hedgerow and beyond a service road, it was considered that the

proposed development would not be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the property or the streetscene.

The proposed brick and tiled hipped roof side extension was considered an improvement to the existing lean-to timber garage built against the common boundary with no. 71 and its design and materials would be sympathetic to the main house. In addition, the reduction in width compared to the existing garage would provide pedestrian access to the rear garden and the removal of the existing garage would result in a reduction of the overall footprint of the property. A new side facing kitchen window was proposed but this would look towards the gable wall of no.71 and, therefore, result in no loss of amenity. The proposed first floor rear extension would be only half the depth of the existing ground floor rear extension.

The remaining flat roof of the existing rear extension would be re-roofed with a pitched tile roof to match the roof of the main dwelling, which would have a positive impact on the appearance of the property. The amount of private amenity space available would be slightly increased by the proposed development and adequate off-street parking would be retained. Overall, the proposed development was a typical style of rear extension to this type of house. The materials, windows and roof would match the main dwelling house and would have no adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area. The proposal complied with the Council's 45 degree code and, therefore, would have no detrimental impact on residential amenity by way of over-looking

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0596 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

- (f) TWC/2010/0652 – Donnington Recreation Ground, School Road, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire

This application by Telford & Wrekin Council was for a children's ball court and the erection of 3.5m high boundary fencing on the Recreation Ground which currently contained two bowling greens, a BMX track, a play area, three football pitches, four tennis courts, and general grassed areas. Litter bins would be provided as part of the proposal but not the seating which would normally accompany this type of facility.

The proposed development, which would be sited on one of the existing tennis courts, would provide a ball court measuring 29m long by 14m wide mainly for the use of local children and young people aged from 3 to 16 for a range of ball games. The proposals had been drawn up in consultation with the West Mercia Police, Youth Services, and Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council. Donnington, which had a high percentage of children and young people, had been identified in the Council's Outdoor Recreational Strategy as an area deficient in outdoor recreational facilities. The proposal was part of a complete modernisation of the existing Recreation Ground, the future plans for which included a new children's play area and the refurbishment of the three remaining tennis courts.

National guidelines for older children's play provision suggested that they should be sited a minimum set distance of 30m from existing or proposed residential

properties, which would be exceeded in this instance apart from an isolated block of 4 one-bedroom flats at The Lodge, approximately 15m away. However, there were no other sites available within the Recreation Ground that met the national guidelines or had not been earmarked for other future activities and the bowling club had stated that the ball court could not be located at the other end of the tennis courts due to increased security issues and the Lawn Tennis Association wished to ensure that the three remaining tennis courts were kept together. The '30-metre rule' was for guidance only and there were a number of other facilities within the Borough which were significantly closer than this proposal, which had been carefully designed and widely consulted on and would only be changing the use of a tennis court to a ball court rather than introducing a new facility. No objections had been received from the occupants of the adjacent flats or the landlord, a local housing association.

RESOLVED – that with regard to planning application TWC/2010/0652 be granted planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(g) TWC/2010/0745 – Highway Verge, Priorslee Avenue, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for a determination as to whether prior approval was required for the siting and appearance of a 14.8 metre high slim line telecommunications monopole shared between Vodaphone and O2. The Vodaphone antennae would be situated within the monopole at a height of 13.23 metres above ground level and the O2 antennae situated at a height of 13.88 metres, all within a smooth circular sheath. In addition there would 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. Both the monopole and the equipment housing would be coloured green. The applicants had stated that the proposal was required in order to increase 2G network capacity to the Priorslee area and to provide 3G coverage. The installation would be situated on the grass highway verge on the eastern side of Priorslee Avenue, approximately 100m south of Abelia Way and 100m north of Glenbrook Road. The surrounding residential areas consisted mostly of low-density detached dwellings.

Councillor I.T.W. Fletcher, the Ward Member, had requested that this determination be considered by the Plans Board. He had submitted objections to the proposal and 74 letters and e-mails of objection had also been received, as summarised in the report. One e-mail in support of the proposal had been received.

The Chairman reminded Members that this was a telecommunications determination application and, therefore, the decision whether to give or refuse prior approval had to be based solely on the siting and appearance of the installation.

The applicant stated that they had investigated existing telecommunications installations, buildings, and other structures within the required coverage area but all had been discounted, mainly for contractual reasons. The chosen site had been identified as the most suitable option that balanced technical and operational requirements with local planning policies, national planning policy guidance, and the need to minimise visual impact. Careful consideration had been given to identify a site that placed the facility as far away as possible from any housing.

Although the monopole would differ in appearance from the existing angled street lighting columns it would, in effect, be an additional item of street furniture and not an alien feature to the street scene nor significantly visually intrusive. Its location within the grass highway verge would not form an incongruous or unduly prominent feature on the skyline or on the street scene and would be viewed in relation to the trees located beyond the grass verges and on the open space to the east of the site. There was no fenced compound proposed and it was 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 was considered to be acceptable.

There was much public concern relating to the possible adverse health impacts of telecommunication development. However, Members were advised that consideration of the application should follow the advice given in PPG8, paragraph 98 i.e. "...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, which had been submitted with the application, confirmed 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 had established that, when evidence was submitted to confirm that an installation fell within the ICNIRP guidelines, a perception of fear or concerns about health issues did not provide justification for a Council to refuse an application. Therefore, the proposed slimline monopole was considered an acceptable installation in this urban residential area, where its siting and design would not detract from the character of the area or the general street scene.

The update report tabled at the meeting informed the Board that, since publication of the main report, 100 additional letters and e-mails objecting to the application on similar grounds to those previously submitted, had been received. In addition, a petition signed by 147 people had been received objecting to the proposed scheme and St. George's & Priorslee Parish Council had objected on the grounds that the proposed site overlooked an area used by children for recreation. In response to the comments made regarding accidents at the proposed site, the update report informed Members that the Council's Highways Engineer had stated that there had been no recorded incidents at the specific location of the proposed monopole. In addition, the equipment would be situated far enough away from the bend in the road not to cause concern. The update report also drew the Board's attention to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on 'Telecommunications Development', as adopted in May 2009 and outlined its key points, and summarised the additional information submitted by the applicant in support of the application.

Councillor I.T.W. Fletcher spoke against the application and drew the Board's attention to the Stewart Report which advised that Local Planning Authorities should

take a precautionary approach towards telecommunications masts by not siting them near to schools, houses, or vulnerable people. The application site was close to numerous family homes, a play area, a picnic area, and was an area where young people congregated. In addition, that particular section of road had had a high number of accidents, as witnessed by the replacement railings visible on the presentation. Councillor Fletcher also made reference to the fact that the application contained a number of inaccuracies. PPS8 stated that there should be local consultation and the application form referred to '3 local councillors' where there were only two, himself and his wife, neither of whom had been consulted on this application. Finally, the proposed structure at 14.8m high would be 50% higher than the adjacent lamp posts and, therefore, visually intrusive.

Samantha Lane spoke against the application on behalf of local residents. Whilst the residents understood Government support for telecommunication masts, the applicant should still follow the guidance within PPG8. In addition, the applicant had failed to reduce the visual impact of the mast, which would be highly intrusive and would not be mitigated by being painted dark green as it would not be sited near to any trees. She also stressed that the siting of the mast near homes and a play area was not acceptable.

The applicant's agent, Damian Hosker, spoke in support of the application and stated that the need for the mast was driven by the increased use of smart phones, broad band and wi-fi which was placing the current G2 and G3 capability under strain. Due to the changes in technology the cell search areas were much tighter and, thus, the area covered by a mast had also changed resulting in an acute need for this type of monopole in residential areas.

In response the Planning Officer said that the site was not in a designated area and would be sited as far away as possible from housing and schools and the mast would be shared between Vodafone and O2 to help reduce the overall number. The monopole would be a slim structure with no antennae or other attachments and could be appropriately disguised depending on its location. Given the proposed site along a verge, disguising it as a lamp post would be the best option. Whilst it would be 5m higher than the adjacent lamp posts, it would be only one more structure among several.

Several Members expressed concern that the local Ward Councillors appeared to not to have been correctly consulted on the application and others expressed concern at the siting and height of the proposed mast. In response the Planning Officer explained that the error on the consultation had only applied at the pre-application stage and that the correct consultation had been undertaken, in accordance with PPG8, at the submission consultation stage.

The Head of Housing & Planning added that, whilst the consultation process had been correct, Members needed to consider whether, on balance, the application would have been any different if the Ward Councillors had been contacted at the pre-application stage. He advised Members that they needed to decide if the proposed site was suitable or whether an alternative would be preferable and whether the design was appropriate. Monopoles were common in urban areas and generally fitted into the roadside context but the decision was for Members to make based

upon the information before them. He reminded Members that if they did not make a decision at the meeting, the application would automatically succeed. However, if they decided to reject the application, the applicant had the choice of either going to appeal or submitting an alternative proposal.

DETERMINATION:

The proposed 14.8 metre high slim line telecommunications monopole not be granted **prior approval**.

Reasons for Refusal.

1. **The proposed mast will be visually intrusive in this location due to its height.**
- 2 **In all the circumstances and noting that there had been inadequate pre-application consultation with local Ward Councillors, alternative sites have not been fully explored and the siting in this location was not considered suitable.**

The meeting ended at 8.22 p.m.

Chairman:

Date:

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

PLANS BOARD

26TH JANUARY 2010

Schedule 1 - Planning applications for determination by Board

TWC/2010/0009 Land adjacent to, The Shires, Shifnal Road, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9NN Erection of 5no. detached dwellings with detached garages to include access (Outline Application)	2
TWC/2010/0585 42 High Street, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 5NG. Change of use from a Van rental Storage facility into a used car sales area	6
TWC/2010/0627 Ironstone Square, Lawley, Telford, Shropshire, Erection of a Foodstore, Nursery and Retail/Commercial units to the North of West Centre Way to comprise phase 1 of the new centre (Reserved Matters) ...	10
TWC/2010/0638 Pigeon Box Inn, Priorslee Road, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9HD Demolition of existing public house and erection of 27no. new dwellings with associated highways and landscaping arrangements (Amended Application Number)	16
TWC/2010/0705 Land at Wildwood, Woodrows, Woodside, Telford, Shropshire Construction of additional on-street parking spaces and additional lay-by parking.....	24
TWC/2010/0778 30 Haygate Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1QE Change of use of retail unit (A1) to community boxing club (D2)	27
TWC/2011/0013 Land at Old Park Road, near Mossey Green roundabout, Old Park Way, Old Park, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 5DA Prior Notification under Part 24 for erection of a 14.8m high telecommunications monopole with 6no. antennae and equipment cabinet to replace existing 14m high monopole with 3no. antennae	31

26th January 2011

TWC/2010/0009 Land adjacent to, The Shires, Shifnal Road, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9NN
Erection of 5no. detached dwellings with detached garages to include access (Outline Application)

APPLICANT

Huntley Wood Investments Limited

RECEIVED

12/03/2010

PARISH

St. Georges and Priorslee

WARD

Priorslee

CASE OFFICER

Phil Baker

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

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of development, TPO Protected trees, Green Network

THE PROPOSAL:

This outline application relates to the erection 5 detached dwellings on land between Glendale and The Shires in Shifnal Road, Priorslee. Approval is also sought for site access, but matters relating to layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping are reserved to the reserved matters stage.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site, which has an area of approximately 0.4 hectare, lies within Priorslee Village, approximately one mile north east of Telford Town Centre. To the north of the site is Shifnal Road (the former A464 Telford to Shifnal road), to the east and west are existing residential properties, and to the south is the wooded embankment that runs down to the M54 motorway. A footpath/cycleway that runs around the eastern and southern boundaries of the site leads to the Stafford Park Industrial Estate.

The site is almost regular in shape, and is currently vacant but covered by scrubby vegetation, with several clusters of mature trees, some of which are covered by Tree Preservation Orders. The site slopes gradually from a high point in the north west corner to a low point in the south east corner.

PLANNING HISTORY:

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

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Guidance
PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

26th January 2011

PPS3 – Housing
PPG24 – Planning and Noise

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
H6 – Windfall Sites in Telford and Newport
UD2 – Design Criteria
OL3 – Green Network
OL11 – Woodland and Trees

LDF Core Strategy
CS1 – Homes
CS5 – District and Local Centres in Telford
CS12 – Natural Environment
CS15 – Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

One letter has been received from a local resident who has concerns about the position of the septic tank, feeling that he would suffer from foul smells when the prevailing wind blows.

The Parish Council has no objections to the application subject to:- (a) the retention of the boundary wall, in order to retain the heritage of the site, and (b) the replanting of suitable trees to replace those that are felled.

The Council's Highways Engineer has no objections subject to conditions relating to visibility splays, off-site highway works, and a new raised table junction scheme.

The Council's Geotechnical Engineer has no objections subject to conditions relating to site stability; contaminated land; and ground investigation works to determine foundation design.

The Council's Drainage Engineer has no objections subject to conditions relating to foul and surface water drainage, the submission of soakaway test results, and the location of the proposed soakaways.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has no objections subject to a condition relating to land contamination.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer has no objections to the application.

The Council's Ecologist has no objections subject to the wildlife informatives.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

This is an application for outline planning permission to include access, but with matters relating to scale, appearance, layout, and landscaping all reserved.

Most of the site is shown as 'white land' on the Wrekin Local Plan where residential development is considered to be acceptable in principle. A small

part along the southern boundary is designated as Green Network on the Local Plan. The planning permission granted to Telford Development Corporation in 1985, which remains extant, also establishes the principle of residential development on this site.

The site, which lies within the built-up area of Telford, and within a predominantly residential area, is considered to be large enough to accommodate five detached dwellings. A notional layout plan was submitted with the application which shows five detached houses, with detached garages, spread across the site.

Although the site is covered by a Group Tree Preservation Order the Council's Arboricultural Officer states that many of the trees on this site are self set, and only a small number of them are worthy of retention. The notional layout plan shows the retention of all the significant trees which enhance the visual amenities of the area, and tree protection measures would be secured through the imposition of relevant conditions. Replacement planting to mitigate for the loss of those trees that would be felled would also be secured by a landscaping condition.

The vehicular access point would be located near to the north east corner of the site, where the ground level is at a similar height to the adjacent road. It is understood that this is in the same position as the 1985 permission. The Council's Highways Engineer is satisfied with the proposed access arrangements, subject to conditions relating to the provision of visibility splays; off-site highway works; and a new raised table junction scheme.

In view of the fact that the rear boundary of the application site is approximately 50 metres from the M54 Motorway a noise assessment has been carried out in accordance with the guidelines set out in PPG24 – Planning and Noise. This assessment concludes that noise levels from road traffic on almost all of the site, during both day and night, fall within noise exposure Category 'B' (as specified in PPG24), which is generally considered acceptable for residential development, albeit with appropriate mitigation measures to ensure adequate levels of protection. The report recommended that the dwellings should all have double glazed windows which incorporate a glazing specification of 4/16/4 29dB. This would guarantee a good standard of internal amenity in living rooms and bedrooms and ensure that the internal noise levels within the proposed dwellings comply with the guidance in BS8233:1999 'Sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings – Code of practice'.

To sum up, it is considered that residential development on this site is acceptable as the principle has been established by an extant planning permission granted in 1985. The site comprises a large infill site within a predominantly residential area which is capable of accommodating five detached dwellings. The important protected trees will be retained, and issues relating to access and noise can be controlled by appropriate planning conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT OUTLINE PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. A01 – Time Limit Outline
2. A02 – Submission of reserved matters
3. B02 – Standard outline – some matters reserved
4. B03 – General details required
5. B14 – Landscaping scheme
6. B30 – Land contamination
7. B33 – Foul and surface water drainage
8. B35 – Soakaway test and location
9. B73 – Trees: protective fencing
10. B74 – Trees: services root protection
11. Site stability
12. Contaminated land
13. Ground investigation works
14. Visibility splays
15. Off-site highway works
16. No development, structures and buildings within the part of the site designated as Green Network on the Wrekin Local Plan
17. Sound insulation and noise reduction
18. Double glazing specification

REASONS FOR APPROVAL:

Most of this unallocated windfall site is shown as 'white land' on the Wrekin Local Plan where residential development is considered to be acceptable in principle. The extant planning permission granted to Telford Development Corporation in 1985, which remains extant, also establishes the principle of residential development on this site.

The site, which lies within the built-up area of Telford, and within a predominantly residential area, is considered to be large enough to accommodate five detached dwellings. The position of the access is acceptable and the development will preserve those trees on the site which are important to the visual amenities of the area.

26th January 2011

TWC/2010/0585 42 High Street, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire. TF1 5NG
Change of use from a Van rental Storage facility into a used car sales area

APPLICANT

David Somerville

RECEIVED

05/10/2010

PARISH

Hadley and Leegomery

WARD

Hadley and Leegomery

CASE OFFICER

Phil Baker

THE PARISH COUNCIL HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS APPLICATION
SHOULD BE CONSIDERED BY THE COUNCIL'S PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES: Traffic Generation, Access, Parking, Highway Safety, Visual
Amenities

THE PROPOSAL:

This application relates to the change of use of the land at the side of, and behind 42 High Street, Hadley from a van rental storage facility to a used car sales area. When the application was first submitted the Block Plan showed a total of 25 cars to be parked on the site. An amended plan shows only 22 cars, including 4 visitor/staff spaces. The site is currently vacant. There is an office, a small kitchenette area and toilet, which is part of the building, but is only accessed from the yard itself. This would be used only by the staff on site.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site lies in the centre of Hadley, directly adjacent to the bus station, and situated between the High Street and a service road that leads to the health centre.

The site is a flat area of ground that is surrounded by a wall with palisade fencing above it along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries, and by plain palisade fencing along the western boundary. There are a number of trees and shrubs along the site boundaries.

The vehicular access is through existing gates in the north west corner of the site.

PLANNING HISTORY:

In 1992 planning permission (ref: W91/1024) was granted at appeal to change the use of the site to provide hire and storage area for cars and light commercial vehicles.

In 1993 planning permission (ref: W93/0335) was given to erect an extension to form a vehicle servicing workshop.

In 2009 planning permission (ref: W2009/0101) was refused for a change of use of the land from van rental to car sales. The refusal reason stated:-

“The Local Planning Authority considers the Applicant has provided insufficient information to demonstrate that the number of vehicles proposed could be accommodated within the application site and would not lead to overspill parking/display of vehicles for sale on adjoining land, public highway, footpaths and car parks. The car sales business, by virtue of the current parking arrangement and proliferation of vehicles is considered unacceptable and detrimental to highways safety and the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the development is contrary to Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy DPD Adopted December 2007, Policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan 1995-2006 and national guidance contained in PPS1 and PPS6”.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

Wrekin Local Plan

UD2 – Design Criteria

LDF Core Strategy

CS5 – District and Local Centres in Telford

CS15 – Urban Design

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS6 – Planning for Town Centres

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The Parish Council objects to the application for the following reasons:

- This site, which is adjacent to the bus station and accessed from the service road to the health centre and bus station, is completely inappropriate for a use of this nature
- The use will generate traffic, both in respect of customers visiting the site and in respect of vehicle delivery and collection, and service vehicles
- The proposal will be detrimental to highway safety
- Access to the bus station may be obstructed
- Unacceptable pressure will be placed on the available parking for the shopping centre and health centre
- The use would detract from the proposed redevelopment of Hadley Centre where a new attractive setting is to be created for the local shopping centre
- There is no mention of how waste fluids would be disposed (in response, the applicants state that all repairs would be undertaken at a local garage)

No individual neighbour consultation responses have been received.

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

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

Following the appeal decision in 1992 allowing the application site to be used for the hire and storage of cars and light commercial vehicles it is understood

that this use was undertaken on the site for several years, with no particular problems being brought to the Council's attention.

However, by 2008 the Council had received complaints that there had been an unauthorised change of use to car sales. These complaints stated that cars were not just parking within the site boundary but overspilling onto the adjoining roads, pavements, grass verges, and car parks, creating all sorts of problems relating to highway safety. A subsequent planning application, which had generated over 70 individual letters of objection, was refused for the reasons stated above.

The current application has been submitted by the new site owner who is fully aware of the problems caused by the previous owner. He has stated that he would operate the site less intensively and do everything possible to avoid all these previous problems.

The Council's Highways Officer has no objections to the application. He feels that the principle of use as a form of car storage has already been established with the use of the site as a car and van rental facility, and therefore it would be difficult to argue that the proposed use would generate any significant increase in the vehicular use of the site.

The Highways Officer is also satisfied with the provision of 4 visitor/staff spaces within the site, particularly as there are a number of public car parks within the District Centre in close proximity to the site. He also states that the highway outside the site is adopted and yellow lined, and therefore any parking issues relating to it can only be enforced by the police, not the Local Authority.

The principle of allowing vehicles on this site has been established by the 1992 appeal decision to allow car and van rental, and the associated vehicle movements it would generate, and it is considered that car sales is an appropriate use within this District Centre location.

The amended Block Plan shows that a maximum of 22 cars, including 4 visitor/staff spaces, can comfortably be accommodated within the site without overspilling onto adjacent roads and pavements, and hence avoiding the previous problems of there being too many vehicles for the site. This layout, and number of cars, would be the subject of planning conditions.

It is believed that the proposed use would not adversely affect the visual amenities of the locality or generally be harmful to the character and appearance of this part of the District Centre. Furthermore, it is considered that the use would not detract from any proposed redevelopment of Hadley Centre. The site already contains a certain amount of screening by means of existing boundary planting.

There are likely to be only low levels of vehicular movements associated with the use in and around the site, and access into and out of the site entrance will not jeopardise highway safety. Furthermore, being located in a highly

26th January 2011

sustainable location adjacent to the bus station would enable potential visitors to travel to the site by public transport.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. A04 – Full permission
2. C38 – Submitted plans
3. Car sales and visitor/staff parking in accordance with amended Block Plan
4. Limiting number of cars for sale on the site to 18 at any one time
5. Lighting and security lighting

REASONS FOR APPROVAL:

The principle of allowing vehicles on this site has been established by the 1992 appeal decision, and it is considered that car sales is an appropriate use within this District Centre location.

The proposed use would not adversely affect the visual amenities of the locality or generally be harmful to the character and appearance of this part of the District Centre. Furthermore, it is considered that the use would not detract from any proposed redevelopment of Hadley Centre.

26th January 2011

TWC/2010/0627 Ironstone Square, Lawley, Telford, Shropshire,
Erection of a Foodstore, Nursery and Retail/Commercial units to the North of
West Centre Way to comprise phase 1 of the new centre (Reserved Matters)

APPLICANT

Henry Davidson DevelopmentsLtd/Ironstone Dev
Group

RECEIVED

20/10/2010

PARISH

Lawley and Overdale

WARD

Horsehay and Lightmoor,
Lawley and Overdale

CASE OFFICER

Kath Whitfield

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of development of a local centre, compliance with
outline approval and design codes, design and appearance, parking and
landscaping

PROPOSAL:

The proposals are for a mixed-use local centre consisting of a foodstore of
3,287 sq m gross (1828sq m net), a further 2875sq m gross comprising 12
small units that may be used for retail or other commercial uses such as
restaurants, café or offices, a stand alone retail unit east of the foodstore, a
day nursery, public house and 12 two bed flats above the shops adjacent to
the main foodstore, 11 duplex apartments and 16 houses with associated
landscaping and infrastructure works.

This application lies to the north of West Centre Way and forms part of a
larger scheme for the development of a local centre at Lawley. A separate
application has been submitted for the main infrastructure works including the
upgrading of Gresham Drive, the provision of the new access road onto West
Centre Way and diversion of a mains water supply. These works are
necessary to permit the current application to be implemented. In addition
further shops with apartments above are proposed to the north of the current
application site as part of phases 3 & 4 for Lawley. Again further
development, including a new primary school, is proposed south of West
Centre Way and will come forward at a later date.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

Lawley Square is approx 3.5 ha site located south of M54 and west of Lawley
Drive within Lawley Sustainable Urban Extension. The Centre will straddle
both sides of West Centre Way when it is completed. The current application
is for part of the area north of West Centre Way and bounded by Lawley Drive
to the west and Gresham Drive to the east. The site is currently a plateau that
was created as part of the Primary Infrastructure works for Lawley which
included the diversion of West Centre Way, creation of a new junction with
Lawley Drive and other reclamation works on an area of land previously used
for open cast mining. More recently the land has been used for grazing.

26th January 2011

There is existing residential development to the west of Lawley Drive, including Lawley Village and to the east, including Gresham Drive and south of West Centre Way around Martingale Way and the doctor's surgery. To the north, the land remains largely undeveloped up to the M54 boundary.

PLANNING HISTORY:

Outline planning permission W2004/0980 for Lawley Sustainable Urban Extension including 3,300 dwellings, employment/mixed-use commercial and leisure development, primary school and community centre, infrastructure works and recreational space and landscaping was granted in October 2005 following extensive consultation. This permission set out a development framework and design codes to guide future development on the site.

A reserved matters application, W2006/1414 application for Primary Infrastructure Works for new highways infrastructure, bulk earthworks, drainage and landscaping was approved in February 2007 and has been implemented. This application included the diversion of West Centre Way to its present location.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Guidance
PPS 1 –Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS 3- Housing
PPS 4 – Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies
Policy UD2 – Design Criteria

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

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Lawley Parish Council has queried why there is no planning application for a community centre for the Parish Council as they were originally promised.

Shropshire Fire Service has pointed out the need for emergency access for fire service vehicles, water supplies for fire fighting purposes and sprinkler systems within commercial buildings.

Engineering Services (Geotechnics) request a condition requiring the foundation design to be first submitted and approved prior to the commencement of development.

Highways comments awaited and will be reported to Plans Board.

Drainage comments awaited and will be reported to Plans Board

26th January 2011

Contaminated land officer states that the development may be affected by former uses on the site and is requesting clarification of the geo-environmental constraints on the site.

Environmental Health comments awaited.

HCA have no objections in principle but have requested some minor amendments to the layout and boundary treatments.

Cllr Mollet considers it good news that this development is moving forward.

Neighbour consultation responses - there have been no comments from local residents.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The outline planning permission for Lawley provided for a new local centre for Lawley Sustainable Urban Extension to serve the 3,300 dwellings to be constructed. As part of the planning proposals, a Development Framework Plan and Design Codes were prepared and approved. These set down principles for the design of Lawley SUE that have been adopted by the developers. The Development Framework set out areas for mixed use development around Lawley Square ie north and south of the re-aligned West Centre Way and along 'Main Street' a proposed road running almost parallel to Lawley Drive to the north and south of Lawley Square. In today's economic climate it is unlikely that all the areas allocated for mixed use development will come forward other than as housing. The current application is, however, the first phase for Lawley Square to provide a new local centre.

The Design Codes suggest that Lawley Square will be 'centred on an animated square' that will form the heart of Lawley and will be the main focal point for all of the four neighbourhoods. It should be a vibrant and active place for working, living and local shopping. The Design Codes suggest that Lawley Square will be based on perimeter blocks with active frontage on the ground floor and residential and commercial above. It requires that the perimeter blocks will be small and tight knit with active frontages onto Lawley Drive and West Centre Way. It will be designed as a pedestrian friendly place. The mix of uses should include community facilities, homes, employment space and retail facilities. There should be a wide variety of house types and range of tenures at high densities including apartments. The buildings in Lawley Square should be a minimum of 4 storeys in height. Landmark buildings and areas of key frontages were also required.

These proposals were put forward in 2003 and unfortunately the economic climate has changed considerably since then and the applicants have had to depart from the strict requirements of the Design Codes in order to make the development viable in economic terms and meet the requirements of the end users. Negotiations have been held with your officers over a period of 2 years to ensure that an urban structure can be provided that meets the key

principles of the Design Codes whilst taking account of the current economic climate and ensure that the scheme is viable to develop. For instance there is a demand for car parking for both residential and commercial users that needed to be addressed and was not apparent in the Design Codes. In addition the development has been reduced from four storeys to three storeys in height. Ward Members and the Parish Council have been kept informed of progress through regular Steering Group Meetings.

The floor space to be provided for the different forms of commercial and office use were set out in the Planning Statement accompanying the outline application but were not formally agreed as part of the permission. The applicants have provided a table that demonstrates that the foodstore is larger and there is more retail than originally proposed. In addition the proposed nursery is nearly half as large again than originally suggested. The amount of office space has been considerably reduced at this stage of the development. For comparative purposes the net sales area of the foodstore is approximately two thirds the size of the supermarket recently opened in Madeley.

The current application is the first phase of Lawley Square and is for the area north of West Centre Way. The food store is an essential part of the proposals and will be complemented by smaller individual retail/commercial units situated off a landscaped square. Apartments are located above these retail units. It has been difficult to address all the road frontages but the finalised scheme provides for a square with active frontages onto West Central Way and a well defined corner and frontage to Gresham Drive and West Centre Way to help screen the necessary service yard for the food store. The corner of Lawley Drive and West Centre Way is also addressed with mixed block of retail units and residential apartments. A children's nursery is proposed fronting Gresham Drive and partially screening the car park for the foodstore. A freestanding public house is also to be provided fronting West Centre Way and backing onto the park runs along the valley. It is felt that the site for the pub is visually separate from the main elements comprising the proposed local centre.

The whole development has been linked by a landscaping scheme to provide a high quality, sustainable and attractive environment and will incorporate high quality hard landscaping elements. The landscape design is inspired by the mining industry as a principle component of the area. It follows the discovery, geology and mining processes from Main Street and the Square, along the open space between the food store and its car park and on into the open spaces by Gresham Drive and to the north. The landscaped areas within the application site will be maintained by the developers.

The design of the buildings is contemporary in form and feel, designed to create a new modern high quality local centre. It will be constructed using a mix of brick, render and timber elements. Prominent roof pitches help to distinguish the buildings and together with glazing help to provide interest and an active frontage. First floor offices provide interest above the foodstore. The residential units have balconies overlooking the Square. It is unfortunate that the main entrance to the food store is off the car park but there is a

secondary entrance just off the Square. A small iconic building screens the service yard and turns the corner into Gresham Drive. The proposed nursery has a distinctive bright quality to reflect its use. Finally the public house is more traditional in its approach but with a contemporary twist. It has been designed to give the appearance of a building that has developed organically over time with the use of many smaller building elements.

In terms of access to the local centre, the principles were set out in the Development Framework and developed through the Primary Infrastructure works. It has, however, been decided to retain and improve the current temporary Gresham Drive link to West Centre Way. As the development is brought into use the traffic lights on the currently unused junctions on West Centre Way will be brought into operation.

In terms of sustainability the development has been designed to meet BREEAM Very Good and residential units to meet Code level 3 for Sustainable homes. The development should also meet the requirements of Secure by Design.

The outline permission requires 25% affordable dwellings and some have been designed to meet SDS standards as required. There is, however, an issue of the viability of the development having regard to the current economic climate that still needs to be resolved. The applicants have submitted a viability assessment that needs to be fully considered. This issue is covered by the S106 agreement for the whole of Lawley which is currently under discussion and any changes to this agreement will be brought back to Plans Board for consideration.

In relation to the comments of Lawley Parish Council it was agreed at the outline stage that community facilities will be provided as part of the primary school development that is likely to come forward in 2014/15 depending on building progress for Lawley as a whole. This could be similar to the facilities provided at Lightmoor.

It is considered that this is a high quality development that is broadly in keeping with the layout of the Development Framework and design and spirit of the Design Codes for Lawley SUE set out in the outline permission. Account has had to be taken of the current economic climate but it should still provide an attractive and vibrant local centre with active frontages that will be pedestrian friendly whilst accommodating the motor car. The design is modern and contemporary in appearance and addresses the main frontages of Lawley Square. Accordingly it is considered that this development should be supported.

RECOMMENDATION: to grant to the Head of Housing and Planning delegated authority to **GRANT APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS** subject to conditions to include the matters listed below. Details of conditions will be finalised at Plans Board:

1. Time limits

26th January 2011

2. provision of details of street lighting, bins, bollards, boundary treatments etc
3. All materials including hard surfacing
4. landscaping including implementation
5. Drainage
6. land contamination (clarification)
7. Construction management plan
8. retaining walls and structures
9. foundation design
10. Highway conditions

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

This development forms the first phase of the local centre for Lawley as set out in the Development Framework and Design Codes that formed part of the outline planning permission for Lawley Sustainable Urban Extension. The design and layout of the proposed development is broadly in accordance with the principles set out in the Design Codes but has had to be modified to take account of the current economic climate and to meet the requirements of future occupiers. It should provide a high quality, attractive and vibrant local centre designed to meet the future needs of Lawley.

26th January 2011

TWC/2010/0638 Pigeon Box Inn, Priorslee Road, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9HD
Demolition of existing public house and erection of 27no. new dwellings with associated highways and landscaping arrangements (Amended Application Number)

APPLICANT

Bromford Home Ownership Ltd, Mr Steve Davis

RECEIVED

03/11/2010

PARISH

St. Georges and Priorslee

WARD

Priorslee

CASE OFFICER

Valerie Hulme

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes.

MAIN ISSUES: Impact on residential amenity - existing and proposed; character of the area, highway safety, and drainage.

PROPOSAL:

Full planning consent for the erection of 27 dwellings and associated highways works

SITE & SURROUNDINGS:

The site is currently a vacant public house, which is the subject of fire damage, resulting in a roofless building. The site covers approximately 0.8 hectares, comprising of the public house fronting Priorslee Road, and its amenity and parking area to the rear which is accessed to the east of the public house. There are no rights of way through this amenity area. This area of land is relatively level.

A mature hedge acts as the sites rear boundary, bordering on to agricultural fields to the north of the site. A post and wire fence acts as the sites eastern boundary adjacent to Telford Way. A number of trees on border of the site are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (2008); the most significant group is located to the east of the public house.

Residential properties abut the site's southern boundary; this includes the units to the east and west of the public house. There are a several architectural styles on this road, which includes some mid 1800's gable cottages, some post-war hipped semis and a few new build plots located close to the junction of Priorslee Road.

The site is located in close proximity to the town centre, located approximately 1.2km to the east of Oakengates Centre, and approximately 900m to the west of Priorslee centre. Facilities including Priorslee Primary School, St Georges CofE Primary School, Telford Railway Station and Central Park lie within 900m radius of the site.

HISTORY:

W2008/0500 Erection of 31 dwellings and highways works. Considered by Members of Plans Board on the 20th May 2009; Members resolved to grant the application subject to a S106 agreement relating to the provision of

26th January 2011

££62,127.19 towards primary education; £600 per dwelling toward Leisure and Recreation; £15,000 towards a pedestrian crossing facility; the provision of 30% affordable housing; and any know off site drainage mitigation measures. This S106 has not been signed, and consequently the application has not yet been approved.

POLICIES:

Telford & Wrekin Core Strategy DPD 2007

CS1 Homes

CS3 Telford

CS11 Open Space

CS10 Community Facilities

CS13 Environmental Recourses

CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan 1995-2006 (Saved Policies)

H6 Windfall sites in Telford & Newport

H22 Community Facilities

H23 Affordable housing

UD2 Urban Design Criteria

T22 Planning Obligations

OL11 Woodland and Trees

LR6 Developers contributions to open space

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS3 Housing

PPG13 Transport

PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control

PPG24 Planning and Noise

PPS25 Development and Flood Risk

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Highways: has raised concerns with regard to some small elements – treatment of a service verge requires grass treatment rather than tarmac; corner plot 24 too close to highway, requires 0.5m set back; tight chicane arrangement between plot 7 and 17 requires amending. Awaiting amended plans

Geotechnics: has raised no objections subject to informatives

Drainage: Requests updated Flood Risk Assessment

Land Contamination: has raised no objections subject to conditions relating to land contamination.

Environmental Health: no comments

Arboriculture: Following receipt of an amended landscaping plan has raised no objection to the scheme subject to conditions; however concerns are made with regard to the hedgerow and post development ownership.

Ecology: No objection subject to informative

Sustainability: Requires a statement on how the proposal will be sustainable in terms of design solutions

Strategic Housing: has requested the provision of 30% affordable housing split between 20% social housing and 10% shared ownership, identifying an appropriate mix

Education: has requested a contribution of £53,292.8 towards primary education based on the revised scheme.

Leisure & Recreation: has requested a contribution of £600 per dwellings towards the upgrade of the nearest community used children's play / youth facility which would serve the development area.

Highways Agency: No objection

The Fire Authority: has raised no objections to the development subject to informatives

St Georges and Priorslee Parish Council: consider the original grounds of objection are still valid; these are:

- * Overdevelopment of the site
- * Lack of privacy
- * Access and egress considered difficult and dangerous
- * Concern over flooding from existing drainage system
- * Loss of green space
- * Environmental impact
- * Summer roost bat survey should be carried out

Five individual letters of objection have been received. These raise concerns on the grounds of:

- the existing sewer capacity is inadequate, causing flooding during periods of heavy rainfall;
- developer should take account of these problems and be accountable for any future problems / expenditure with regard to drainage
- the existing road is a cul-de-sac where on street parking occurs; this impedes on visibility the road is therefore unsuitable for additional traffic private or construction;
- width of existing highway in addition to parked cars impedes on highway safety
- existing highway in poor state of repair – development will aggravate this situation;
- Plot 1's parking considered dangerous;
- Increase in noise; whilst already noise from A5 as suggested by noise survey, the survey was considered at a quiet time of day rather than during peak periods, suggesting the noise situation is worse than assessed;

- treatment and maintenance of the northern boundary hedge – to reduce the size will impact of joint owners security and issues of maintenance if 1.8m high close board fence put in front;
- concern with regard to the demolition of the pub – dust and debris impacting on local health

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The principle of development has been established in 2009 following the resolution by Members of Board to grant planning consent for 31 residential dwellings subject to a S106 agreement. Unfortunately the owner has not signed the agreement and the consent has not been issued; however the resolution still stands and on the agreements completion, planning permission will be issued. Since 2009 the owner has marketed the site and this application is submitted by the prospective developer. Whilst it is noted that the developer is an Affordable Housing Provider, the proposed application is for 27 dwellings, of which 30% shall be Affordable Housing and the remainder open market housing. The proposed density has been reduced from the previous approval to 21 dwellings per hectare.

The site outlined for development has no formal allocation in the Wrekin Local Plan, nor is the building considered a building of local interest; subsequently the site can be considered for residential development in accordance with Windfall policy H6. The development site covers approximately 0.8ha within 220m of a regular bus route, and in close proximity to the town centre. It is therefore considered that the proposal is located in a sustainable area.

The proposal will replace the derelict public house, and develop the associated grounds which provided parking and amenity area for this use. There are no rights of way through the site, nor does its current condition provide any form of amenity to the surrounding area. The only note worthy elements of the site are a group of mature lime trees to the east of the public house and a sycamore tree to the rear of 1 Freestone Terrace, which are subject to TPO's. In addition a mature hedge provides a soft natural boundary to the development site. These constraints have influence the layout and design of the scheme, in addition to the areas of noise constraints, and the character scale and form of surrounding properties which adjoins the site as described in the following paragraphs.

The access to the site is via Priorslee Road, through the existing public house access. The location of the access has been dictated by the root protection area of the Lime trees, and the need for the development to have a presence on Priorslee Road, allowing the development to form part of the street scene through an active frontage provided by plot 1. A secondary access to the development from Telford Way is not required nor would be supported as this would prejudice the safety and free flow of highway users. The proposed access is considered acceptable. Amendments are awaited to amend plot 1 to a hipped unit, reflecting the character of the adjacent units on Priorslee Road.

Within the centre of the site, dwellings run east to west facing inwards, this provides a back to back relationship with the proposed dwellings plot 2-12

with the existing dwellings of Freestone Terrace, Priorslee Road. The scale and design of the proposed dwellings have taken into account of that of the existing units to ensure that the proposal respects and reinforces the character of the existing properties, and does not have an adverse effect on residential amenities by virtue of outlook, loss of light and overlooking. Amendments are awaited for plots 2&3, increasing the distance separation of the corner turner's rear elevation with the rear boundary, reducing the impact of overlooking. Amendments are also awaited for plot 12 and 13, providing additional windows to side elevations to ensure the adjacent car park is adequately overlooked.

Plots 19-26 run north to south adjacent to Telford Way; this is the main amendment to the previous scheme. The two blocks of apartments have been removed from the scheme, removing the three storey focal point around the central access. Furthermore the emphasis of the development to Telford Way has been reduced, by the detachment of plots, and the introduction of rear amenities bounded by brick walls for plots 22 and 23. The agent considers as there is no view or footpath crossing to Telford Way the previous approach was not warranted. Your officers do not agree with this approach, which was carefully considered and negotiated on the previous application; furthermore the adjacent development on the northern site is anticipated to link with this development forming an active street scene to Telford Way. Whilst officers do not agree with this approach, it is not considered sufficient to warrant a refusal.

The Acoustic Report submitted outlines the Noise Exposure Categories (NEC's) for the site. This indicates that 10m of site adjacent to the eastern boundary along Telford Way falls within NEC D; moving westward to the centre of the site, falls within NEC C; and the western half of the site falls within NEC B. PPG 24 specifies the criteria for development within noise sensitive areas. This considers that development in NEC B should take account of noise constraints and where appropriate impose conditions to mitigate against noise; within NEC C planning permission should not normally be granted, however where considered appropriate conditions for mitigation measures should be imposed; within NEC D planning permission should normally be refused. Consequently the submitted layout does not include any dwellings within NEC D. The Acoustic report recommends noise mitigation scheme for the submitted layout by Bromford Housing; this includes, acoustic glazing and acoustic ventilation to the units of appropriate specification dependent of the NEC. Acoustic fencing is also recommended to the rear and side boundaries of dwellings to protect external amenity areas. Such remediation is considered appropriate, in compliance with PPG24.

Concerns have been raised by your officers with regard to the established hedgerow and the proposed boundary fencing. It is considered that the fences on the western boundary for plots 13-14 and 27, are not required and the hedgerow should form part of the rear boundaries; again this is required for plots 15- 18, however the Acoustic specialist has suggested that an acoustic fence is required to rear amenities of these properties. As the proposal is to sit adjacent to a residential development to the north, it is

considered these are not required, but area subject to this development occurring. Subsequently it is recommended that this is controlled by condition, to instate the fence prior to occupation if the site to the rear has not been developed, and the ability to remove this if development has occurred, allowing the occupant to benefit from the established boundary hedge.

The previous application attracted a number of objections on the grounds of drainage, due to localised flooding from drains during heavy rainfall; this resulted in a resolution from Board to include offsite drainage alleviation measures in the S106. Following this resolution, Severn Trent Water discovered a collapsed manhole cover which had reduced surface water drainage by 60%, resulting in flooding to a number of properties. Subsequently it should be noted that the number of objections has greatly reduced. An updated Flood Risk Assessment has recently been received and further comments from the Drainage Engineer are awaited.

With regard to contamination, whilst the site has been previously developed, it is considered the level of contamination is relatively low. It is therefore accepted that remediation of any contamination issues can be adequately conditioned. In compliance with Policy H6 your officers are therefore satisfied that the development can be adequately accessed, provide sufficient parking, be adequately drained, remediated of any contamination, located in a sustainable area and would not have an adverse impact on the local environment by virtue of its use or the proposed design.

Policy UD2 and CS15 require developments to be of a high quality, respecting and reinforcing the character of the area surrounding. It is considered that the proposed development responds positively to the context, both visually and functionally and enhances the quality of the local environment. It is also considered that the proposed scale, layout, design, access, parking arrangements and landscaping will produce a positive spatial structure, integrating with the wider setting of the area. Consequently it is considered that the proposal complies with these policies.

Policy H22 requests contributions towards community facilities. A request for £53,292.80 towards primary education has been accepted by the developer.

Policy H23 specifies the criteria for affordable housing, on sites of 0.5ha or 15 units or more; the proposal meets this threshold. A request of 30% affordable housing has therefore been made to the developer, split between 20% Social housing and 10% shared equity. The developer has recently agreed to the provision of 30% affordable housing provision; however the mix and tenure of housing is yet to be agreed. This is to be confirmed at Plans Board.

Policy LR6 requests the provision of outdoor recreational play facilities on new residential development. The proposal does not meet the requirements to provide onsite play facilities; consequently a request for £600 per dwelling towards the upgrade of play facilities in the immediate area has been requested and agreed by the applicant.

Policy T22 requires developments where necessary; to provide the necessary improvements to meet the transport needs of the development. The need for a crossing has been identified on Telford Way, and subsequently a request for one third of the proposals estimated cost has been requested, totaling £15,000. This has been agreed by the applicant.

In conclusion it is considered that the proposal complies with the adopted Core Strategy, the relevant saved Local Plan Policies and relevant national planning guidance.

RECOMMENDATION: Subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 agreement to provide financial contributions for £53292.80 towards primary education; £600 per dwelling toward Leisure and Recreation; £15,000 towards a pedestrian crossing facility; and the provision of 30% affordable housing (of an appropriate mix and tenure), then delegated authority is granted to the Head of Housing & Planning to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

- 1) A4 Time limit full
- 2) B06 Samples of Materials
- 3) B07 Sample Brick Panel
- 4) B11 Details of Windows and doors
- 5) Non Standard Details of enclosures, including boundary wall to plot 22 & 23
- 6) B17 Landscape management plan
- 7) B18 Landscape Maintenance
- 8) Non Standard details of all road and footway construction, street lighting, drainage including longitudinal sections and a satisfactory means of draining the road before commencement
- 9) B23 On site Construction
- 10) B24 Mud on Road
- 11) B30 Contaminated land
- 12) Non standard Drainage details to be carried out in accordance with the FRA
- 13) Non standard Tree protection method to be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural report and amended plan
- 14) Non standard Noise mitigation measures to be carried out in accordance with the Acoustic report
- 15) Non standard Acoustic fence and hedge boundary to north
- 16) C10 Hedge Protection
- 17) C12 Landscape implementation
- 18) C20 Parking, loading and turning
- 19) C21 visibility splays of 2.4m x 40m
- 20) C38 Development in accordance with plans
- 20) D01 Removal of Permitted Development Rights.
- 21) D03 Domestic garages

Informative relating to S106 agreement, ecology, contaminated land

REASONS FOR APPROVAL:

The proposed housing development is acceptable as it constitutes the redevelopment of a previously developed site in the urban area. The traffic

26th January 2011

movements generated by the development can be accommodated without detriment to highway safety. The scale, mass, design of the proposal are acceptable and in keeping with the surrounding area. There will be no adverse impact on residential amenities. A section 106 agreement will ensure there is no adverse impact by virtue of flooding, and will secure the appropriate level of affordable housing provision, and adequate contributions towards education, leisure and recreation, and highways to mitigate against the increased population provided by the development.

26th January 2011

TWC/2010/0705 Land at Wildwood, Woodrows, Woodside, Telford, Shropshire Construction of additional on-street parking spaces and additional lay-by parking

APPLICANT

Telford and Wrekin Council

RECEIVED

24/11/2010

PARISH

Madeley

WARD

Woodside

CASE OFFICER

Valerie Hulme

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of change of use, Highways issues, Impact on residential amenity.

THE PROPOSAL:

This is a Council application which seeks planning consent for the creation of 40 additional parking spaces throughout Woodrow's, Wildwood and Woodside Avenue. The application is part of a larger regeneration scheme which seeks to enhance this residential area and includes the alterations to several footpaths in the area.

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site comprises of 7 smaller areas of land within the vicinity of Wildwood and Woodrow's. Each site is located in an area of open amenity, in close proximity to residential properties and existing parking facilities.

The residential estate is 'Radburn' in design, which is typified by the backyards of homes facing the street and frontages facing rear amenity areas. The majority of garages and parking facilities front the highway, dominating the street scene.

It is evident that a number of vehicles mount the pavements and park on grassed area to the front of their properties due to lack of parking facilities; causing considerable damage to the lawned surface which is maintained by the Council.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Madeley Parish Council: Supports the proposals for the second phase of Woodside North Regeneration.

Highways: Originally raised concerns with regard to the distance behind spaces; this has now been amended to provide 6m behind each space and subsequently supports the application.

Environmental Engineers: No Comments

Objections have been received from 3 neighbouring properties, which raise concern to the development on the grounds of:

26th January 2011

- Safety – proximity of cars to houses; cars set on fire in the area, moving these closer to dwellings is a safety concern.
- Parking spaces will create alleys; lead to areas of drug dealing;
- Noise disturbance;
- Proposed trees will reduce surveillance;
- People are lazy, provision of extra spaces does not imply these will be used;
- Loss of footpath;
- Car parking is adequate;
- Rather purchase land individually and erect own allocated garage;
- Is there sufficient room to manoeuvre in / out of spaces?

PLANNING HISTORY:

No relevant planning history.

POLICY CONTEXT:

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development

Core Strategy:

CS5 District and Local Centres in Telford

CS8 Regeneration

CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan:

UD2 Design Criteria

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The proposed development site mainly comprises of 'white land'; however the 4 parking spaces adjacent to Woodside Avenue is the only area protected by 'Green Network' designation.

The proposal, whilst providing 40 additional spaces overall, is scattered throughout the residential area, providing 3 -9 vehicle spaces in any one area.

The proposal will increase highway safety by allocating specific parking areas, and there by reducing the level of on street parking. The proposals are in close proximity to the proposed residential users relating well to the surroundings. Whilst it is noted one area of parking is protected by green network designation, the proposal will only pocket a small slither adjacent to the highway where on street parking is common; by reducing the level of on street parking the proposal will improve highway safety on this main access road and subsequently is considered acceptable.

Whilst neighbour comments are noted, planning cannot control the level of vandalism which currently occurs; however it can ensure that any proposal has natural surveillance to ensure that crime is designed out. In this regard the proposals are located in areas which are naturally overlooked by adjacent properties. The proposal does not include any fencing around these spaces, and therefore does not create any alley ways where anti social behaviour could occur. With regard to concerns over noise disturbance, the proposal

26th January 2011

forms small areas of additional parking which are located adjacent to existing parking area; subsequently the proposal will not increase the level of noise already associated with these areas. In this regard it is considered that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the surrounding properties.

In conclusion it is considered that the proposed development will improve the visual amenities of the surrounding area and improve highway safety by reducing on street parking. Furthermore the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding residential area. Consequently the proposal complies with and Core Strategy Policies CS8 & CS15 and Wrekin Local Plan Policy UD2.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

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

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The proposed parking will reduce the level of on street parking, increasing highway safety and the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area. The proposal will not have a detrimental impact on residential amenities.

26th January 2011

TWC/2010/0778 30 Haygate Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1QE
Change of use of retail unit (A1) to community boxing club (D2)

APPLICANT

Mrs Sherrel Fikeis

RECEIVED

13/12/2010

PARISH

Wellington

WARD

Haygate

CASE OFFICER

Valerie Hulme

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of change of use, Highways issues, Impact on residential amenity

THE PROPOSAL:

The application seeks planning permission for change of use of half of the existing vacant retail unit (use class A1, formerly Cartridge World) to a Community Boxing Club (use class D2) at 30 Alexandra Road in Wellington.

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site comprises a detached single storey modern flat-roofed red brick building with vehicular access off Alexandra Road and small parking area for approx. 5 vehicles. The building is set back from the highway and at a slightly lower level to Haygate Road. It is bounded by c.1 metre high metal railings and there are a number of established trees on the boundary of the site.

The site is located approximately 180 metres to the west of Wellington District Centre in a mixed residential and commercial area comprising various facilities: to the north a plumbing centre sits adjacent to the site on Alexandra Road and public house, social club, dry cleaners, hair salon, Telephone Exchange, carpet retailer and Tesco Express are located along Haygate Road towards the District Centre to the east. The application site is on the edge of the commercial area and Alexandra Road acts as the boundary separating the residential area to the west and the commercial premises. Haygate Road is on a main bus route and the site is accessible by a variety of transport modes.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Wellington Town Council objects on the grounds of:

- inappropriate use in a largely residential area,
- possible long opening hours causing disturbance to residents and
- lack of parking facilities due to the approval of the adjacent Martial Arts Centre.

Highways: On site observations suggest the existing car park can accommodate 6/7 vehicles. Using PPG13 parking standards, a reasonable amount of parking for these retail units could be 12/14 spaces. PPG13 parking guidance for a leisure facility as proposed and including the adjacent

26th January 2011

martial arts unit is 10/11 spaces. This is therefore in line with what should be expected as the existing permitted retail use. Subsequently no objection is raised to the proposal. It should also be noted that there are free public car parks within approx 300m of the site.

One letter from local consultation has been received; this raises objections on the grounds of:

- * Insufficient parking for the approved martial arts centre; proposal will further exasperate the problem,
- * Off street parking limited to 5 spaces, which will be shared by both clubs. Subsequently on street parking on Alexandra Road will be considerably exacerbated

PLANNING HISTORY:

W2002/0567 Provision of 5 No. Car Parking Spaces (Amended Plans Received), Full granted, dated 28.08.02

Attached unit:

TWC/2010/0409 Change of use of retail shop (Use Class A1) to Martial Arts Centre (Use Class D2). Approved by Members of Plans Board October 2010.

POLICY CONTEXT:

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development

Core Strategy:

CS5 District and Local Centres in Telford
CS10 Community Facilities
CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan:

UD2 Design Criteria

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The proposal comprises the change of use of the existing retail unit to a community boxing centre.

The Wellington Amateur Boxing Club is a 'community-led' organisation aimed at providing positive activities linked to Boxing, for Young People in Wellington. The Club has been formed following community engagement which identified that the College Ward lacked positive activities for young people within the area; the Club also identified a number of residents that currently travel outside of the Borough to train in similar facilities in Shrewsbury. The Club is supported by Richie Woodhall (Olympic and Commonwealth medal winner), who has been appointed as lead Coach and Chair of the Boxing Club. The club is applying for Charitable Status and as such will be a non profit organisation.

Through the use of Boxing, the Club aims to address issue relating to anti-social behaviour and community safety within the Wellington area. The use of positive activities and sports such as boxing, play a valuable role in providing

diversionary activities for Young People. It is anticipated that the discipline and training required to take part in Boxing will help to contribute to the health and wellbeing of those who participate within the Club.

The application form identifies there will be one part time employee; however it is envisaged that Local Residents will run the Club developing their skills in relation to running a community-led organisation, and developing their Coaching skills.

It is envisaged that the club will run 5 evenings per week with two morning sessions on a Saturday morning; there may also be some scope for training sessions during the school holidays, and consequently the proposed hours indicated on the application form state 10am to 9pm Monday to Friday, 10am to 2pm Saturday with no training Sunday or Bank Holidays catering for the occasional school holiday day sessions. It should also be noted that the adjacent unit hours of operation were 9am to 9pm Monday to Friday, 9am to 6pm Saturdays and 10am to 4pm on Sundays. Subsequently it is considered that the proposed hours of use are acceptable.

The Town Council and neighbour comments are noted; however the Council's Highways Engineer has raised no objections to the proposal as it does not alter the existing access nor reduce the car parking facilities and the site is a highly accessible location close to the District Centre and associated public transport, public car parks, and within walking distance of a bus route with a regular service. Haygate Road has a mix of residential and commercial uses, and whilst it is noted that this is a sensitive location close to established housing, it is considered that the proposed use will have no further adverse impact on adjoining residential amenity than the existing retail use which has no controlled hours of operation, in terms of vehicle movements, noise and disturbance.

In conclusion, it is considered the principle of the change of use from retail to a Boxing Club is acceptable in terms of the location of the unit and the scale of the activities, with the creation of a new community facility on the edge of Wellington District Centre. The proposal will not have an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties or with regard to highway safety. Accordingly the proposal complies with Policy CS5 & CS10 of the Core Strategy

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

3. A04 Time limit
4. C38 Development in accordance with plans
5. Hours of use
6. Restriction on alternative uses – Boxing Club only, no other uses within D2

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The principle of the change of use from retail to the Community Boxing Club is considered acceptable with regard to the location and scale of activities at the

26th January 2011

site, which will create of a new community facility on the edge of Wellington District Centre. The proposal will not have an adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenities or to other highway users.

26th January 2011

TWC/2011/0013 Land at Old Park Road, near Mossey Green roundabout, Old Park Way, Old Park, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 5DA
Prior Notification under Part 24 for erection of a 14.8m high telecommunications monopole with 6no. antennae and equipment cabinet to replace existing 14m high monopole with 3no. antennae

APPLICANT

Vodafone Ltd

RECEIVED

07/01/2011

PARISH

Lawley and Overdale

WARD

Lawley and Overdale

CASE OFFICER

Phil Baker

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: No.

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.

The application involves replacing the existing 14 metre high Vodafone monopole accommodating 3 antennae with a slightly higher 14.8 metre high monopole accommodating 6 antennae, which will provide 02 and Vodafone with coverage in the surrounding area. (When the application was first registered it was mistakenly stated that the existing monopole is 12 metres high). All the antennae are contained within a smooth circular sheath, which will be fatter than the existing sheath to accommodate the additional antennae.

There would also be a new ground equipment cabinet measuring 1.58m in length, 0.38m in width and 1.35 metres in height. The monopole and the equipment housing would both be coloured grey to match the existing equipment.

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

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site lies within the grass highway verge immediately to the south of the Mossey Green Roundabout on the eastern side of Old Park Way, Old Park.

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.

In May 2009 the Council adopted a Supplementary Planning Document titled 'Telecommunications Development' which provides guidelines relating to the Council's planning approach towards telecommunications development in the Borough. The key points of this document are as follows:-

- The Council should not question the need for the telecommunications system which the proposed development is to support.
- Operators are expected to undertake pre-submission discussions with the Council, Parish Councils, and other residential groups to discuss service objectives, technical constraints, and environmental implications. Discussions should also be held with schools and nurseries if they are within 200 metres of the proposed development.
- Mast sharing is encouraged and full consideration should be given to using existing buildings and structures.
- Telecommunications development should take into account the height of the site in relation to surrounding land, the existence of topographical features and vegetation, and the effect on the skyline or horizon.
- Monopoles and their associated ground equipment should be painted in an appropriate colour to mitigate the visual impact of the installation.
- All applications must include an ICNIRP Declaration that the electromagnetic emissions from a mast or monopole will be in compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure.
- 'Slimline' monopoles may be acceptable in residential areas, provided they are not unduly prominent in the street scene and are in keeping with the scale and appearance of the existing street furniture. The installation should not add significantly to the existing street 'clutter'.
- Operators will be expected to examine alternatives to establishing new masts, including the use of existing buildings.
- The proximity of telecommunications installations to residential property is not a material planning consideration unless it would have a significant impact, due to its siting and appearance, on visual amenity.

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:

To date no consultation responses have 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 existing monopole and its associated ground equipment cabinets are situated on the open grass verge adjoining the Mossey Green Roundabout. There are numerous 12 metre high street lights along Old Park Way and around the Mossey Green Roundabout, and the nearest residential property is approximately 65 metres from the proposal site.

The applicants have stated that when they look to provide a new or enhanced telecommunications facility they always look to upgrade the existing mast or pole before exploring other options. In this particular case the applicants established that from a technical point of view the existing O2 installation was a suitable location to provide the required level of 3G coverage for both O2 and Vodafone. (A pre-application consultation letter was sent to the Council in October 2010 but the applicants have stated that this consultation exercise was not extended to other interested parties because only a replacement pole was being proposed).

On the basis that the proposal was the replacement of an existing pole, and that it was a mast sharing opportunity, the applicants have confirmed that no other telecommunications installations, buildings, and other structures within the required coverage area were considered.

The proposed pole would be marginally higher than the existing structure, and it would need to be slightly wider than the existing installation in order to accommodate the three extra antennae. By utilising an existing installation, albeit with a fatter profile, the current proposal will reduce the need for additional street furniture, and prevent the proliferation and introduction of new masts into the wider area. The column will retain its slim-line profile, with its shrouded antennae, in order to minimise the visual impact of the development.

The replacement monopole would not be significantly visually different from the existing monopole, and therefore would not be an alien feature in 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. 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, taking into account that there is a similar structure in location already.

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 replacement 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, or be significantly different from the pole it will replace. 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, and the mast sharing will help reduce the need for more masts in the area. 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