

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 28 March 2012 at 6.00pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, V A Fletcher (as substitute for Councillor R T Kiernan), A S Jhawar, J Loveridge, S A W Reynolds, B J Thompson (as substitute for Councillor K R Guy) and C R Turley

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors M B Hosken (for planning application TWC/2012/0069) M G Ion (for planning application TWC/2012/0069) and A D McClements (for planning application TWC/2012/0069)

PB-092 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on 7 March 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

PB-000 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors K R Guy and R T Kiernan

PB-093 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

PB-094 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED – that planning application TWC/2012/0053 be deferred for consideration at a later date.

PB-095 SITE VISITS

None.

PB-096 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Board and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning applications TWC/2011/0632, TWC/2012/0069, TWC/2012/0053, TWC/2012/0081, and TWC/2012/0085.

- (a) TWC/2011/0632 Land At Audley Avenue, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 7BX

This was an application subject of an appeal to the Secretary of State against the failure of the Council to reach a decision within the statutory time period. The Council was, therefore, invited to express a view on the proposals, which would then be put to the Inspector at the appeal inquiry.

A new and near identical (twin-tracked) application had been lodged with the Council to allow the developer to obtain a decision from both the Council acting as Local Planning Authority and the Planning Inspectorate. That application would be presented to the Board at a later date.

This application was expressed in outline form but included a request for approval of Reserved Matters relating to access, layout and scale. It was proposed to demolish existing employment related buildings and replace them with a retail food store incorporating a café together with associated access, servicing and parking and highway improvements. There was no named food retailer behind the application.

A lengthy update report was tabled at the meeting, which included a comprehensive review of the impact of the newly announced National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Members took some time to read this in detail as well as receiving a verbal summary from the Planning Officer. In addition to summarising the content of the report and update report, the Planning Officer reminded Members of the site visit undertaken on 22 February 2012 which encompassed possible locations for development including Audley Avenue and Station Road.

Councillor T Nelson spoke, on behalf of Newport Town Council, in opposition to the application in terms of the proposals having a detrimental effect on the High Street. He challenged whether there was a need for the proposed supermarket and indicated local preference for a small discount store. He reminded the Board of Newport's designation as a conservation area due to its unique character and stated his belief that an additional supermarket would reduce footfall in the vibrant High Street, increasing the number of empty shops from one in ten to one in five. He considered that his objections were equally applicable to the Station Road site, which the report indicated was sequentially preferable, and he believed that the alleged merits of that site formed the basis of the officer's recommendation for refusal of this application.

Mr S McGrath, the applicant's agent spoke in support of the application in terms of need, job creation and the regeneration of the site which would shortly be vacated. He claimed that the proposals would not have any significant adverse impact upon Newport town centre and would provide greater consumer choice and competition. Referring to the report's conclusion that a sequentially preferable site was available at Station Road, he opined that the walk to Audley Avenue was better and that the sites were equal in terms of accessibility. He argued that the new NPPF favoured the Audley Avenue site above the Station Road site since planning policy preference was to build upon Brownfield sites, as opposed to Greenfield sites. He concluded that the Audley Avenue site was economically and environmentally preferable.

The Planning Officer advised Members of the implications of the NPPF with the emphasis on achieving sustainable economic growth and that the sequential test remained paramount and that the town centre first policy had been retained. He also advised that retail consultants had been commissioned to guide the Council on the retail assessment lodged by the applicants. He addressed the issue of retail capacity and expenditure leakage from Newport but advised that the application proposal would not provide the step change necessary to encourage local people to shop at Newport. He advised that a competing superstore proposal at Station Road

would be likely to come forward imminently, which was both sequentially preferable and of a scale that would help reduce retail expenditure leakage. He expressed confidence that outstanding issues to that application would be overcome sufficient to enable Members to reach a decision on site preference, particularly for the size of store proposed by the applicant. He considered that the fact that Audley Avenue was located on Brownfield land was an insufficient argument to overcome other disadvantages of the site and outlined the significant Highway and transport improvements that would be required if the proposals were approved. He summarized the advantages and disadvantages of the application site but that the proposals for Audley Avenue could not be reconciled with NPPF, the Regional Spatial Strategy and the Core Strategy as the site was considered to be a relatively inaccessible out of centre location that would not encourage alternative sustainable modes of travel or linked shopping trips.

Members expressed concern regarding a number of issues presented by this application. Councillor A S Jhavar considered that whilst a store was undoubtedly needed to prevent retail leakage, despite being Brownfield land, this site did not offer sustainable transport options. Councillor V A Fletcher agreed with the sentiment that residents would not undertake their bulk shopping from the proposed store on foot or by bicycle and, therefore, car travel would prevail. She considered that a small discount retailer would better complement existing supermarket provision on the High Street and added that the proposals would have a significant adverse affect on the specialist shops located in the High Street. Councillor I T W Fletcher considered that the proposals conflicted with Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS9 and also referred to the findings of sequential testing. He referred to his understanding of the NPPF's requirement to consider sustainable development and the inter-relation with the Local Development Framework. Referring to the Retail Planning Considerations set out in the report, Councillor I T W Fletcher, considered that the site would have a detrimental effect on the High Street. Councillor N A Dugmore also referred to Policy CS6 the Retail Impact Assessment and the impact of the NPPF but considered that retail leakage would be difficult to address. He also referred to Policy S9 regarding retailing from employment areas, the comments of Natural England and the extensive Highways improvements that would be required if the application was granted as the site was relatively inaccessible. Although Councillor Dugmore considered that some improvements could be made to the reasoning in the Officer's recommendation, on being put to the vote, all Members were in favour of the recommendation in the update report.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0632 the Inspector be informed that the Council will oppose the appeal proposals and invite that outline planning permission be withheld for the following Reasons:

1. It is considered that there is a sequentially preferable location which could accommodate the proposed development. The development would therefore be contrary to the Spatial Development Strategy for the Borough as set out in the Core Strategy. The proposal conflicts with Policies CS6 and CS9 of the adopted Core Strategy and with the sequential assessment requirements of paragraph 24 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. In the opinion of the local planning authority the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework, Regional Spatial Strategy Policy T2 and Core Strategy Policy CS 9 in that the site is located in a relatively inaccessible out-of-centre location and fails to make the best possible use of opportunities to reduce reliance on the private car.

(b) TWC/2012/0069 Ercall Wood Technology College, Golf Links Lane, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 2DT

This Council application was an outline application for the redevelopment of land at and adjacent to Ercall Wood Technology College, Wellington to create a new 900 place secondary school, community sports facility, two sites for residential development for approx 130 dwellings, associated accesses, car parking and works.

The proposals also involved the demolition of the existing school buildings on the site in a phased development, as well as an engineering operation to level out the land adjacent to the existing school for new sports pitches. This outline application related to the principle of development with consideration of access alone, all other matters were reserved.

Councillor M B Hosken spoke, as Borough Ward Councillor for Ercall, to oppose the proposals. He stated his opinion that the school could be altered and modernised without the loss of the playing field, and considered there would be a significant rise in the flow of traffic and parking along the road which would exacerbate dangerous conditions at the junction between Golf Links Lane and Holyhead Road. He further considered that the development would affect the quality of life of local residents and supported their objections.

Councillor A D McClements spoke, as Borough Ward Councillor for Arleston, in support of the proposals. Councillor McClements welcomed the proposals which she believed would create a better educational environment, praised the proposed location closer to Shortwood School and the extra recreational space to be created which would ensure that the school could be more proactive to community needs. To address traffic issues, she encouraged more active promotion of car sharing and walking to school, alongside a workable traffic management strategy. Referring to the additional consultation comments set out in the update report, she considered that the suggestions made by Councillor R Aveley regarding traffic management were unworkable.

Councillor M G Ion, as Borough Ward Councillor for College, also spoke in support of the application which he considered to be a once in a generation opportunity due to the current economic climate. He acknowledged the concerns of local residents but urged the Committee to seek a balance between the competing priorities and views set out in the report.

Mr J Kearns, a local resident spoke against the proposals regarding the loss of Green Network and open space, the resulting increase in the size of the community, traffic impacts and the perception of a detrimental affect on the wellbeing of residents.

Mr R Pagett, also a local resident spoke against the proposals in terms of sustainability and he also considered the development to be an inappropriate development of the Green Network.

In addition, Mr G Smith, another local resident, spoke against the proposals seeking protection for the Green Network, increased traffic and the effect on safety at the junction of Holyhead Road and Golf Links Lane, the loss of the School's character and the quality of life of local residents.

Mr G Kershaw, the Project Director for the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Project, spoke in support of the application which he considered represented a wonderful opportunity for local children, the community and residents alike. He noted that the school was in poor physical condition and would be replaced by a modern building with improved disabled access. He drew attention to the increased access to sports facilities that this would provide and improvements to traffic access. He explained that whilst the project was funded by central government, additional funding was required from the land sale to complete the development. He advised that refurbishment, as opposed to rebuilding, would be costly, significantly disrupt the operation of the school for up to four years and would not deliver the improvements required or offer any relief to traffic congestion in the area.

The Planning Officer then drew Members' attention to the update report tabled at the meeting which related the application to the principles of the NPPF and highlighted the Planning Considerations set out in the report

During the ensuing debate, Councillor N A Dugmore raised concerns regarding increased traffic and congestion, the likely success of sustainable transport initiatives and the reduced contribution for Affordable Housing. He considered that the application should be deferred to further clarify the traffic implications. Councillor V A Fletcher echoed these concerns and added her concerns regarding the use of Green Network, loss of playing fields and whether a developer for the proposals had been identified. Councillor I T W Fletcher also raised the issue of the loss of playing fields and traffic congestion.

In response to questioning by Councillor S A W Reynolds, the Planning Officer confirmed his understanding that the proposals would result in increased parking provision and a dedicated drop-off and collection point within the site. He further advised that the Highways Engineer had suggested that a Traffic Regulation Order could be sought to restrict waiting in Golf Links Lane at the start and end of the school day to further alleviate congestion. In addition, he confirmed that the anticipated capacity of the school roll would be 900 places whether the school was rebuilt or refurbished.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist advised Members that this was a significant educational opportunity and the housing development would not only contribute to local housing needs but also make the proposed scheme possible. The level of Affordable Housing was considered to be viable and appropriate. He confirmed that the capacity of the school upon rebuilding or refurbishment would be 900 pupils but the proposals to rebuild included improved access and layout to assist

in traffic management at the site which would not be available through refurbishment. He advised that the Highways Authority was satisfied with the proposals. He further advised that Officers considered the use of open space was acceptable and conformed to guidance. He concluded that the change had significant benefits and, although there were concerns regarding the proposals, each had been addressed and, where necessary, could be mitigated by condition.

Councillor N A Dugmore proposed, seconded by Councillor V A Fletcher, that the application should be deferred to further consider traffic implications but, on being put to the vote, this was not agreed.

During the continued debate, whilst some Members continued to express their opposition to elements of the application and noted local opposition to it, the majority of Members considered that the proposals represented an excellent educational opportunity, supported by the School Governors, and which would mirror other opportunities and building elsewhere in the Borough. Noting that the rebuilding of the school and the associated development had to be considered together for successful implementation, the majority of Members supported the Planning Officer's recommendation.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0069, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement for 15% affordable housing and further subject to the Council as landowner agreeing to provide a satisfactory Memorandum from the Assistant Director: Development, Business and Housing agreeing that the Council as landowner will provide 15% affordable housing and will pay the commuted sums for maintenance of LEAP, allotments and TRO works, either upon the sale of any of the development land or upon commencement of the development whichever is the sooner to authorise the Assistant Director: Planning Specialist to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the update report.

(c) TWC/2012/0081 Overdale Playing Field, Rock Road, Overdale, Shropshire, TF3 5BX

This was a Council proposal for a replacement children's equipped play facility (designed to Fields In Trust, Local Equipped Area of Play standard) to be used by local children (predominately aged between 3 -15). An update report was tabled at the meeting which highlighted the implications of the NPPF.

Members welcomed the proposals.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0081 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(d) TWC/2012/0085 Telford Ice Rink, St Quentin Gate, Telford, Shropshire, TF3 4JQ

This was a Council application for the refurbishment and extension of the existing Telford Ice Rink building to be a mixed use facility and erection of a new single

storey restaurant/bar building in front of the existing Bowling and Bingo premises. An update report was tabled at the meeting which addressed the implications of the NPPF.

The Planning Officer noted objections from the Tenpin Bowling Alley which stated that the proposal would obscure the building's frontage and further limit the scope for customers to locate their facilities. However, the Planning Officer considered that the proposed restaurants and hotel in the nearby vicinity would greatly enhance footfall in the area and mitigate this. He advised that the proposal was generally in accord with the Masterplan previously adopted for Southwater and also with CTAAP.

Whilst Members understood the concerns of Tenpin, which were supported by Councillor V A Fletcher, the majority were minded to agree that increased footfall in the area would negate these concerns. Councillor B J Thompson was delighted that the Ice Rink remained in the ownership of the Council but considered that improvements to wheelchair access should be made and Councillor S A W Reynolds encouraged the use of adequate signage to facilities in the area. The majority of Members were, therefore, able to support the proposals.

RESOLVED – that subject to receiving a satisfactory memo from the Assistant Director: Development, Business and Housing dealing with financial contributions in respect of the provision of a sum of monies comprising a contribution of £45,269.62 for highway works and £5,000 for Travel Plan monitoring either upon the sale of any of the development land or upon commencement of the development in respect of the highway sums or occupation in respect of the other sums whichever is the sooner, to authorise the Assistant Director: Planning Specialist to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 9.00pm

Chairman:

Date:

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

PLANS BOARD

11th April 2012

Schedule 1 - Planning applications for determination by Board

TWC/2011/0746 Riverview, 27 Stars Lane, Cold Hatton, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 6PZ	
Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a 4-bed detached dwelling and detached garage (Amended plans received).....	2
TWC/2011/0959 Isombridge Farm, Isombridge, Shropshire, TF6 6NF	
Conversion of 2no. Redundant agricultural buildings to a combined live/work unit.....	12
TWC/2012/0046 The Hedges, Rowton, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 6QY	
Erection of 1no dwelling with free standing garage and the creation of a menage area with lighting *****Amended Description*****	20
TWC/2012/0102 6 Hillside East, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9GZ	
Erection of single storey side extension and a pitched roof dormer garage extension and conversion. *****Amended description*****	27
TWC/2012/0147 Sundip, Somerwood, Rodington, Telford, Shropshire, SY4 4RF	
Conversion of garage to a granny flat and retention of existing door and windows	31
TWC/2012/0157 39 New Street, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1LU	
Advert Consent for illuminated signage.....	35
TWC/2012/0158 39 New Street, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1LU	
Change of use from retail shop (Use Class A1) to betting office (Use Class A2), alterations to the shopfront, installation of a satellite dish and air conditioning unit to the rear	38

TWC/2011/0746 Riverview, 27 Stars Lane, Cold Hatton, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 6PZ

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a 4-bed detached dwelling and detached garage (Amended plans received)

APPLICANT

Mr Ian Hardy

RECEIVED

06/03/2012

PARISH

Waters Upton

WARD

Ercall Magna

THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED AT PLANS BOARD ON 7TH MARCH 2012 TO ENABLE OFFICERS TO DISCUSS MEMBERS' CONCERNS AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS WITH THE APPLICANT

Following Plans Board on 7th March and an earlier Members' site visit, officers have discussed the concerns raised by Members and the Clerk of Waters Upton Parish Council at the meeting, namely the scale of development, particularly the garage and impact on adjoining amenity, and the potential that the garage could become an independent dwelling. Officers have sought to negotiate a reduction in the size of the garage to a single storey building. The Applicant has been advised that the options available are to amend the design and height of the garage, or if the proposal is retained in its submitted form, Members are likely to refuse the development.

The Applicant's Agent has confirmed that his client does not wish to amend the plans. He would however be prepared to enter into a Section 106 agreement to tie the detached garage and ancillary accommodation above to the main dwelling to ensure the development does not create a separate unit of accommodation in the rural area. Officers previously proposed conditions to restrict the use of the garage and ancillary accommodation and officers maintain that this is still appropriate. If the application is refused, the Applicant intends to appeal the decision.

Officers would reiterate that prior to 7th March Plans Board, the Agent resurveyed the site to accurately measure the position of the rear boundary and the location and block plans were amended accordingly, with revisions to the red line site area. The scale and design of the development were unchanged.

Following these amendments, officers maintain that the site area is still of a sufficient size to adequately accommodate the proposed dwelling, garage and amenity space.

Officers consider the proposal is still acceptable in its present form and would be in keeping with the character of the area. The adjoining property has a detached garage with accommodation above. Furthermore the dwelling and garage can be accommodated without adversely affecting adjoining residential amenities. Accordingly, the proposal is considered acceptable and the recommendation to approve is unchanged.

The Applicant does not wish to amend the scheme therefore the proposal would still comprise the detached double garage with accommodation above. The garage is relatively modest, and could be sufficiently controlled by conditions. The officer recommendation is still to grant planning permission subject to conditions. Following publication of the 7th March Plans Board, additional drainage comments were received proposing conditions regarding soakaways, which would also be imposed.

However officers would reassert that if Members deem it necessary, the Applicant would be willing to enter into a Section 106.

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

1. A04 Time limit
2. B11 Samples of materials
3. B12 Sample panel
4. B19 Door and window details scale 1:10
5. B121 Landscape design
6. B61 Foul and surface water drainage
7. B64 Soakaway tests
8. B65 Soakaway – minimum 5m distance from site boundaries
9. B74 Brownfield runoff rate
10. B130 Trees - protective fencing
11. C14 Visibility splays of 2m x 25m
12. C38 Development in accordance with plans
13. C73 Retention of trees and hedgerows
14. Ccustom Erection of nest boxes
15. Ccustom Within one month of first occupation of the dwelling, caravan shall be removed from site
16. D01 Removal of Permitted Development Rights
17. D02 Domestic garages: no business use
18. D04 Domestic garages: restriction on residential use in rural areas
19. D08 Windows obscure glazing – side elevation of garage. No further windows to dwelling or garage on side elevations facing Sandstone Cottage or Highfields.

Informatives

- | | |
|-----|------------------------|
| I11 | Highways |
| I22 | Ecology |
| I32 | Fire Service |
| I40 | Conditions |
| I41 | Reasons for Conditions |

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The proposed replacement dwelling with detached garage are considered acceptable in terms of the scale, design and form, and is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and will not adversely affect the street scene. The proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties nor highway safety.

The previous officer reports of 22nd February and 7th March Plans Boards are attached for information.

THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED AT 22ND FEBRUARY PLANS BOARD MEETING TO ENABLE MEMBERS TO UNDERTAKE A SITE VISIT.

Since preparation of the officer report, a further consultation response with new information has been received with regard to the Land Registry deeds of the application property. Following discussions between the Agent and the planning officer, amended plans have been submitted so that the red line on the location and block plans match the Applicant's land ownership. The location and block plans now show a reduced red line site area. The elevations and floor plans are unchanged.

Following receipt of the amended plans, officers have reconsulted statutory consultees and local residents for comments. Any comments will be presented in an update to Members.

Officers consider the revised plans indicate that the development can still be accommodated within the amended red line site area with access, parking and sufficient amenity space, and without detriment to neighbouring amenities or the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal is considered acceptable and the recommendation and conditions remain as per the previous officer report.

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

1. A04 Time limit
2. B11 Samples of materials
3. B12 Sample panel
4. B19 Door and window details scale 1:10
5. B121 Landscape design
6. B61 Foul and surface water drainage
7. B74 Brownfield runoff rate
8. B130 Trees - protective fencing
9. C14 Visibility splays of 2m x 25m
10. C38 Development in accordance with plans
11. C73 Retention of trees and hedgerows
12. Ccustom Erection of nest boxes
13. Ccustom Within one month of first occupation of the dwelling, caravan

- shall be removed from site
14. D01 Removal of Permitted Development Rights
 15. D02 Domestic garages: no business use
 16. D04 Domestic garages: restriction on residential use in rural areas
 17. D08 Windows obscure glazing – side elevation of garage. No further windows to dwelling or garage on side elevations facing Sandstone Cottage or Highfields.

Informatives

- | | |
|-----|------------------------|
| I11 | Highways |
| I22 | Ecology |
| I32 | Fire Service |
| I40 | Conditions |
| I41 | Reasons for Conditions |

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The proposed replacement dwelling with detached garage are considered acceptable in terms of the scale, design and form, and is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and will not adversely affect the street scene. The proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties nor highway safety.

WATERS UPTON PARISH COUNCIL HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS APPLICATION IS DETERMINED BY MEMBERS AT PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of development, Scale and design, Character and appearance, Impact on adjoining residential amenities, Existing use of the site

THE PROPOSAL:

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a 4-bedroomed two-storey detached dwelling and detached garage with games room above following demolition of the existing modern bungalow, Riverview. Access would be to the south of the replacement dwelling, with a new driveway leading to the garage and turning space to the front of the dwelling. Amenity space would be to the east, and the orientation of the building would remain as the existing bungalow, with the front elevation facing the highway. The replacement dwelling would be positioned centrally in the application site, with the garage to the southeast corner.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site comprises a rectangular area with an existing modern but dilapidated brick and tiled hipped roofed bungalow located centrally within the site. The bungalow is uninhabited and there is a mobile home/caravan to the east (rear) of the property, where the Applicant resides. The front garden area is open and both the garden area and driveway are currently occupied by a significant number of vehicles, related to an unauthorised business use.

The land slopes down from Stars Lane to the eastern boundary of the site, and also slopes down towards the southern boundary. There is an existing tree screen to the southern boundary, which adjoins a narrow access track with an adjoining Duke of Sutherland property, 'Highfields' beyond. There are further trees and shrubs to the rear of the bungalow and on the opposite side of the road. To the north of the site is a traditional sandstone property, 'Sandstone Cottage', which is in an elevated position to the application site, with first floor windows on the side elevation facing the application site. Both the neighbouring properties have been extended.

The application site is located on Stars Lane, a narrow road in Cold Hatton at the northern extent of Telford, and is in a rural location, with the surrounding area being predominantly open countryside. There is no defined character or style of property in Cold Hatton. In this part of Stars Lane, there are three dwellings located close to one another; however the other properties in Stars Lane and the wider area of Cold Hatton are more sporadically spaced and set back further from the highway, with greater distances between each property. The nearest village, Waters Upton is some 2750m to the south of the development, along the main highway, A442.

PLANNING HISTORY:

W2002/0952 Demolition of Existing Bungalow, Removal of Mobile Home and Erection of Two Replacement Dwellings with Attached/Detached Garages and Construction of a New Vehicular Access, Full refused

W2003/0569 Demolition of Bungalow, Removal of Mobile Home and Erection of a Replacement Dwelling and Detached Garage, Full refused

W2005/1286 Demolition of Existing Bungalow, Removal of Mobile Home and Erection of a Detached Dwelling and Garage, Full refused

TWC/2010/0186 Demolition of existing bungalow, erection of new 4 bed detached house and detached double garage with games room above, Withdrawn

The 2010 planning application was withdrawn to enable the Applicant to address planning issues and to undertake an ecology survey.

Both the 2003 and 2005 planning applications were refused as whilst the principle of a replacement dwelling was considered acceptable; the scale and mass of the previous proposals were not; and the applications were refused against policies UD1, UD2 and H17 of the Wrekin Local Plan. Policy UD2 remains a saved policy and is relevant to the current proposal; however the others have been deleted.

Various enforcement cases, including Unauthorised Siting of Mobile Home and Being Used as Residence, and the Alleged Use of the Site for Storage of Commercial Vehicles

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National planning guidance:

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS3 Housing

PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

National Planning Policy Framework (draft)

Core Strategy:

CS1 Homes

CS7 Rural Area

CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan:

UD2 Design Criteria

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Waters Upton Parish Council: Strongly objects and green cards the application if recommended for approval. Telford & Wrekin Council was minded to refuse previous requests and there is little difference in this application. Whilst there is a wish to 'tidy' the site by development, any permission granted must be suitable for the plot. This proposal exceeds the size suitable for the site and questions the plans, layout and dimensions included in the application. The objections include access, drainage, height, position and size of the proposal.

Highways: No highway objection in principle subject to a condition regarding visibility splays and the standard highways informative (I11).

Drainage: Supports the application subject to Conditions regarding Foul and surface water drainage (B61) and Brownfield runoff rates (B74).

Geotechs: no comment

Ecology: Initial objection as an update to the submitted bat survey to include appropriate mitigation measures was required. Following submission of the additional information, there are no objections subject to a condition regarding Erection of nest boxes, and informatives regarding Natural England EPS Development Licence, Lighting, and Update survey.

Shropshire Fire Authority: Advice regarding Access and Sprinkler systems

One neighbour letter received with the following comments:

- general massing and height of dwelling reduced from previous design, and detailing over windows improved
- slab level of dwelling must be the same as the existing bungalow to ensure it does not appear dominant

- discrepancy in rear boundary to proposed development, and if inaccurate may affect the ability to drain the site adequately via soakaways
- mature trees and hedging to south boundary must be retained and protected during construction to maintain character of area
- Proposed double garage with games room above is sited against shared boundary and difference in ground levels will have impact of 3 storey building. Proposed games room should be omitted
- any lighting for the garage and drive area should be directed away from adjoining properties and replacement fencing should be added to the boundary in addition to the existing trees
- Imposition of S106 to control future development of the garage to protect privacy and any sound or light pollution

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The application site is located in Cold Hatton which is not identified as a settlement in Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy where new development will be focussed; however the erection of a replacement dwelling would not constitute an increase in rural housing numbers.

Guidance in PPS7 states replacement dwellings that are suitably located and of appropriate design and construction, or would improve the local environment can be acceptable. The Local Planning Authority should also outline in its own documents the circumstances where replacement buildings are acceptable and the scale of such replacements. The relevant Wrekin Local Plan policy H17 (Replacement Dwellings in the Rural Area) was not been saved; therefore there are few restrictions on the erection of replacement dwellings within the rural area. However there must be regard to scale and design of the proposal and its relationship to adjoining properties, in terms of its compliance with national and local policies.

The existing building is in a poor state of repair and is a modern dwelling with little character. Given that there are limited planning policies with regard to replacement dwellings in the rural area, the principle of development is considered acceptable.

The application is a resubmission of a similar scheme TWC/2010/0186 which was withdrawn to enable the Applicant to address concerns regarding the scale of the development. In this regard, it is considered that the overall development has been reduced in size. Whilst the footprint, the eaves and ridge height of the proposed replacement dwelling would be larger than the modest-sized bungalow; the current scheme is an amendment and reduction to the previous submission. The footprint of the dwelling is more than 20sqm smaller than the previous withdrawn scheme TWC/2010/0186 and more than 35sqm smaller than the refused scheme subject of W2005/1286. There is a very slight reduction in the eaves height and approx. 1m reduction in the ridge height. The replacement dwelling is proposed to be set lower in the site. The overall mass of the roof has been reduced and one of the balconies to the rear has been omitted. The inglenook chimney has also been omitted.

With regard to the design of the frontage, the windows have been simplified, with the omission of the small windows and a reduction to four rather than five lights wide at first floor. The central multipane dormer window has been modified and gablets have been added which reduces the dominance of the dormer. The double door entrance to the front is not ideal; however the solid timber panelled door and the omission of the stone-cladding surround enhances the appearance of the building.

Whilst the balcony to the northeast of the dwelling is only 5 metres from the shared boundary with Sandstone Cottage, it is located some 9 metres from the adjoining dwelling. Sandstone Cottage is in an elevated position and the rear garden areas of both properties comprise various planting including trees. It is considered that the position of the balcony will not cause undue overlooking or loss of privacy to the adjoining property. There are no windows on the side elevation of the dwelling facing Sandstone Cottage, and only one window at first floor facing Highfields, which is obscure glazed. To ensure privacy is maintained, a condition to provide details of landscaping and trees/hedge to be retained on site is required.

The detached double garage with games room above is unchanged in scale and design from the previous scheme. It is relatively large, but is considered to be in proportion to the proposed dwelling. The position of the garage set back towards the southeast corner of the site will ensure that the development appears subservient to the main dwelling and it will also be adjacent to the trees along the southern boundary thus the development will not be overly prominent in the area. The building is at an angle to the northeast of Highfields and it is considered that the mass of the building will not have an adverse impact on light or outlook. There is a window on the side elevation of the garage facing Highfields. The separation distance is approx. 12 metres and the new garage would be in an elevated position above the adjoining property. Whilst there is existing mature planting along the boundary of the application site and the track with Highfields beyond, it is considered that this window should be obscure glazed to maintain mutual privacy, as this is not a habitable room and is ancillary to the main dwelling. Accordingly, it is considered that the replacement dwelling and garage can be accommodated without detriment to adjoining residential amenities, subject to conditions regarding obscure glazing and a restriction on further extensions and alterations/additional windows.

Officers consider the amendments to the previous scheme are acceptable to ensure that the development is of an appropriate scale and design, and it is considered this will be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. Materials and door/window details can be conditioned to ensure the appearance of the building is appropriate. The site can accommodate the dwelling and garage with sufficient space for private rear amenity and access/parking, subject to a highways condition regarding visibility splays. Drainage of the site can be dealt with by appropriate conditions.

In order to control the site and ensure that the residential character of the area is maintained, but no additional dwellings are created, conditions shall be

imposed to control the use of the garage and games room above, so that it does not become a further residential unit and to ensure no commercial business is run from the premises. In this instance, it is considered that conditions shall be sufficient to control the development due to the proposed size and location of the garage, and it will not be necessary to control it through S106.

The Design & Access Statement asserts that the caravan that is located at the rear of the existing bungalow would be removed from the site along with the vehicles that are located to the front. The site is located in the rural area and is predominantly residential; therefore it is considered that this site is not suitable for a commercial business and this is currently under investigation. With regard to the siting of the caravan at the rear of the dwelling, a condition can be imposed to ensure this is removed prior to first occupation of the replacement dwelling.

In conclusion, the proposed replacement dwelling with detached garage are considered acceptable in terms of the scale, design and form, and is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and will not adversely affect the streetscene. The proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties nor highway safety. It is considered that the proposal accords with national and local planning policy.

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

1. A04 Time limit
2. B11 Samples of materials
3. B12 Sample panel
4. B19 Door and window details scale 1:10
5. B121 Landscape design
6. B61 Foul and surface water drainage
7. B74 Brownfield runoff rate
8. B130 Trees - protective fencing
9. C14 Visibility splays of 2m x 25m
10. C38 Development in accordance with plans
11. C73 Retention of trees and hedgerows
12. Ccustom Erection of nest boxes
13. Ccustom Within one month of first occupation of the dwelling, caravan shall be removed from site
14. D01 Removal of Permitted Development Rights
15. D02 Domestic garages: no business use
16. D04 Domestic garages: restriction on residential use in rural areas
17. D08 Windows obscure glazing – side elevation of garage. No further windows to dwelling or garage on side elevations facing Sandstone Cottage or Highfields.

Informatives

I11	Highways
I22	Ecology
I32	Fire Service
I40	Conditions
I41	Reasons for Conditions

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The proposed replacement dwelling with detached garage are considered acceptable in terms of the scale, design and form, and is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and will not adversely affect the street scene. The proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties nor highway safety.

TWC/2011/0959 Isombridge Farm, Isombridge, Shropshire, TF6 6NF
Conversion of 2no. Redundant agricultural buildings to a combined live/work unit

APPLICANT

Brian Evans

RECEIVED

07/11/2011

PARISH

Rodington

WARD

Wrockwardine

COUNCILLOR SEYMOUR HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS APPLICATION IS DETERMINED BY MEMBERS AT PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of Development in the Countryside, Historic and Architectural Merit, Commercial Viability, Design, Character and Appearance

THE PROPOSAL:

The application seeks planning permission to convert two agricultural buildings located at either end of a small field on the edge of Isombridge Farm to a live/work unit.

The Applicant's Agent has submitted a number of reports with regard to the historic and architectural merits of the buildings and has amended the design of the development.

Despite discussions between the Applicant's Agent and officers, no information has been provided to outline the type of business which would occupy the work element of the live/work unit. The original submission states that the business would fall within Use Class B1 which includes offices, research and development and light engineering.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site comprises 2 linear red brick and tile agricultural buildings. The buildings comprise a small barn (stables or implement shed) which abuts and fronts the farm access road and dates back to approx. early 20th Century and a mid-19th Century four-bay open cartshed set back within the field. The roof trusses are constructed of an assortment of timbers from other buildings and machine-cut clay tiles. A brick boundary wall links the southernmost corner of the cartshed to the southwest corner of the barn.

The application site is located approx. 50 metres to the north of the farm house at Isombridge Farm, and the buildings subject of this application are isolated from the rest of the farm, with agricultural land to the north, east and west of the site. There are a number of residential properties within the farm complex including a row of 17th century timber-framed cottages adjacent that are Grade II listed, with 2 modern detached properties located opposite. The site is located in the open countryside; with the nearest settlement, Longden-on-Tern located some 1.5km to the north of the application site.

PLANNING HISTORY:

W2004/0050 Change Of Use Of Agricultural Land To Residential Use, Conversion And Extension Of Existing Farm Building To Form New Dwelling, Conversion Extension To Existing Farm Building To Form Garages & New Vehicular Access, Full refused for the following reasons:

The site was located in the open countryside where new development would only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. The barn was not of sufficient architectural or historical merit to warrant its retention; there was no structural survey and the proposal was contrary to Policies H9, H11 and H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan Furthermore, no information had been submitted to demonstrate that the development could be satisfactorily drained, thus contrary to Policy EH2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

W2008/0420 Conversion of Barn to form 1no. 2 Storey Dwelling, Withdrawn

W2010/0017 Conversion of redundant farm building into dwelling house and garaging, Approved at Plans Board. Members considered the farm building was of sufficient architectural merit to accord with Policy H18 and an exception to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Policy Framework

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies

UD2 Design Criteria

E6 Rural Employment General

H9 Location of New Housing

H18 Conversion of Non-Residential Buildings to Residential Use in Rural Areas

H24 Affordable Housing Rural Exceptions Policy

LDF Core Strategy

CS1 Homes

CS2 Jobs

CS7 Rural Areas

CS15 Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Rodington Parish Council supports this application. The buildings are redundant agricultural buildings which should be developed to improve the local area.

Conservation Officer:

Objects to the proposal and does not consider the two buildings are of any outstanding architectural merit or historical value. They are isolated farm buildings, disjointed, not forming part of any recognisable 'typical' farmsteads that may convey some element of historical agricultural development nor any model farm. The architecture is generic and commonly seen in many farms around the area. The quality of the building is rather poor too and this may

explain their decayed state. The proposal conflicts with saved Wrekin Plan Policy H18 which requires: *“In addition to the above criteria, elsewhere in the Rural Area, the conversion of non residential buildings to residential use will only be permitted where the building is, in the opinion of the Council, of sufficient architectural or historic merit or makes a significant contribution to the character of the local area.”*

Following submission of reports regarding the condition of the buildings and a site meeting, the Conservation Officer has assessed map data and notes that the small stable building was constructed post 1919, whereas the cartshed, and other structures that have since been demolished, appear on the 1843 map. Many of the roof trusses have been reused from other buildings, with some more modern machine cut timbers, and the use of machine cut clay roof tiles of the interwar years. The roof of the cartshed appears to have been rebuilt in the 20th Century. No information has been submitted by the agent as to the structural integrity of the roof and whether the existing roof timbers would meet building regulations standards or require any replacement.

The stable/shed are likely to be an early 20th Century construction using reclaimed materials including a possibly 20th Century tiled roof. The roof timbers are various and do not represent a singular roof structure but a combination of various different elements from various other buildings and of varying ages. Cannot therefore find that the building is of any particular age in itself or representative of a unified style or character that merits preservation through development. As regards the cart shed, this appears to be the older of the two buildings with some indication of a presence in the early Victorian period, though there is a question mark over what does survive from this period. Certainly the roof is a later reconstruction, possibly done at the same time as the building of the shed/stables as there is broad similarity in the way it has been constructed out of re-used materials and machine cut tiles. As with the stables/shed it does not stand out on its own merits a single readily identifiable period roof structure but rather ‘dogs breakfast’, to speak in the vernacular, of re-used timbers from other buildings, some 19th Century some 20th Century. We must therefore question what is being preserved here. These two structures do not represent any kind of complete or even near complete survival of historically significant farm structures. The historical integrity as a singular record of an agricultural building type is undermined by the significant re-building and/or re-use of parts from other buildings.

When Shropshire County Council carried out their farmstead characterisation survey of 1994 as part of an English Heritage Initiative, it is notable that these remaining structures were not deemed to be part of a readily identifiable dispersed historic farmstead, being omitted from the survey for the farm. The buildings sit some way away from the farm and according to the historical research these buildings may relate to constructions done under separate tenancies/ownerships. There is some suggestion both in the report by Jill Ming and the Shropshire County survey that Isombridge Farm may have at one time been two separate farmsteads that were later joined together. Therefore there must be some question of which farm these structures relate to. No evidence has been submitted to clearly indicate the historical

provenance of the structures as part of the main Isombridge Farm site. The buildings are largely comparatively recent 19th/20thC re-builds and there is limited survival of anything that could be argued to be original to the construction. They represent structures that are neither rare nor unique within the landscape, locally or otherwise. Therefore cannot find that it is of sufficient architectural or historic merit to warrant residential conversion to ensure its retention.

An amended plan has improved the design with more vertical emphasis to the windows; however it does not overcome any of the inherent concerns regarding historical value and the proposal is considered contrary to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

Highways: no objection subject to Condition C12 Car Parking and standard highways informative I11.

Drainage: No objection subject to condition B61 regarding Foul and surface water drainage details to be submitted and approved.

Geotechs: no comment

Ecology: Initial objection to the proposal as a further survey was required to establish whether great crested newts would be affected by the development. The results of the updated survey established that there were no great crested newts found in adjacent ponds; therefore there were no further objections subject to a Condition regarding Erection of nest boxes and Informatives regarding Bats, Lighting, Refuges and Update survey.

Shropshire Council: no comment

Shropshire Fire Service: Advice regarding Access, Water supplies and Sprinkler systems

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The proposal comprises the change of use of vacant agricultural buildings in the countryside to a live/work development. The smaller building to the east of the application site adjacent to the highway would become the one-bedroomed residential element and the cartshed would become a work unit with workshop, office and kitchen/w.c facilities. The live/work units would face into the courtyard/parking area, with designated parking to the north of the site.

In terms of national policy and guidance, Live/work development is not clearly defined; however Circular 03/2005 *Changes of Use of Buildings and Land* describes it as Sui Generis use, as it comprises both residential and business use. The *Taylor Review of the Rural Economy and Affordable Housing* in 2008 and subsequent Government response in 2009 have recognised the need for rural enterprise, and the option of home-based working to support the rural economy.

The broad principles of live/work development meet sustainable criteria in terms of living within or next to a place of work without the need to travel. Paragraph 28 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies should support sustainable economic growth in rural areas and promote diversification of agriculture.

As well as national studies of live/work development a feasibility study by Live/Work Network was commissioned to assess potential live/work developments in Telford & Wrekin. This was undertaken in December 2009. A shortlist of 8 sites within The Ironbridge Gorge, Lightmoor Village, Priorslee, Newport and its rural hinterland were appraised. All of the sites had some constraints to development such as Conservation Area designation and flood risk; however the opportunities were considered to be redevelopment of brownfield sites, good accessibility to local shops and services, links to existing local businesses and complementary to surrounding land uses. It was recognised that sites in the open countryside were constrained by planning policy, and the most suitable location was considered to be one of the sites in the Ironbridge Gorge.

There are currently no specific local planning policies for live/work units. Therefore it is considered that the proposal should be assessed against extant housing (barn conversion) and economic policies as well as design policies.

In this regard, Isombridge is not one of the suitable settlements identified in policy H9 of the Wrekin Local Plan or Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy where new residential development in the rural area would be permitted. The policy states that development within the rural area will be focussed on 3 key settlements, namely High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Beyond these settlements, development will be limited, and development within the open countryside will be strictly controlled. The application site is located on the edge of Isombridge Farm, in the open countryside. Therefore it is considered that there must be a clear justification for any new residential development. Furthermore, the feasibility study of potential sites for live/work development in Telford & Wrekin listed good accessibility and links to other businesses as important factors. Therefore, further justification is required for live/work development in this location in the open countryside.

With regard to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan, the conversion of non-residential buildings to residential use in the rural area will be strictly controlled. Any proposals for such conversion must meet criteria with regard to marketing for business reuse, be of permanent construction, not lead to dispersal of activity, scale and design appropriate to the surroundings, buildings capable of conversion without major reconstruction, conform to policies regarding pollution control and must conform with rural housing numbers in CS1, unless specifically for an agricultural or forestry worker's dwelling. In this regard, the application includes details of earlier marketing of the buildings between 2008 and 2010 for B1/B8 Use Class (business/storage and distribution) whereby the majority of interest was apparently for residential

conversion. The buildings are considered to be capable of conversion without major reconstruction and the buildings are relatively modest in scale.

The proposal is not strictly for a new residential unit alone as it is proposed to have a work unit linked to it. Another exception to the creation of residential development outside the key settlements in the rural area would be where the proposed development would create an affordable dwelling; however in this instance, the application does not propose an affordable dwelling. If the live/work development were deemed to be appropriate, in order to strictly control the development in the open countryside, the Applicant has been advised that to ensure a standalone residential unit does not result from any approval; it would be a requirement to tie the residential and work elements together with a Section 106 agreement.

In addition to the above criteria, Policy H18 sets out that where the proposal is located outside the suitable settlements in the rural area – in this case in the open countryside - the conversion of the buildings will only be permitted where the building is, in the opinion of the Council, of sufficient architectural or historic merit or makes a significant contribution to the character of the local area.

The Applicant's Agent has submitted additional information to seek to demonstrate that the buildings are of sufficient merit. Officers have thoroughly considered the condition and character of the buildings. The Planning and Conservation Officers have undertaken site visits and a site meeting with the Applicant and Agent, and have also assessed all the documentation submitted in this regard, such as the local history research, and updated report on the merits of the buildings. However, in the Council's opinion, the buildings are not considered to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit, nor contribute significantly to the character of the area to justify their retention and conversion. The Conservation Officer considers the buildings are 19th/20th Century and comprise substantial rebuild or construction with materials and timbers from other buildings. No definitive evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the buildings are of sufficient architectural or historic merit to warrant conversion. Accordingly it is considered that the proposal fails to comply with Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

In accordance with Policy E6 of the Wrekin Local Plan, employment development should be related to agriculture or forestry or assist in the diversification of the rural economy, including farm diversification. This should be achieved through the conversion of existing rural buildings, in or adjacent to a settlement, or within a farm unit for purposes of farm diversification, or enable expansion of an existing employment use. The development would constitute conversion of existing buildings; however this is outside a settlement and the Applicant has not demonstrated that the proposal would constitute farm diversification. Policy E6 also asserts that where development is in the open countryside, it will be strictly controlled.

Officers have requested that additional information is submitted to demonstrate the type of business proposed in the work element, B1 use class, is a viable business option, as in the Marketing Report submitted with the application the conclusions state that there was little or no demand for commercial use (including B1 use class) at the time that marketing on the buildings was undertaken. The report states that most enquiries were for residential rather than commercial use. Furthermore, officers have requested more information to clarify the types of businesses that have shown an interest in live/work development referred to in the letters from Barbers Rural (Estate Agents and Chartered Surveyors) which have accompanied the application, in terms of why this site and the buildings would be suitable, and that live/work development is essential in this open countryside location. This information has not been forthcoming.

Unfortunately, without more detailed information, it is not possible to assess the viability of a business in this location. It is possible that a compatible business for the farm's surroundings could be accommodated; however officers cannot consider the suitability of live/work development in this location without further information. Officers are concerned that without a strong economic justification and market demand for continued employment use, granting planning permission for the live/work development could result in the creation of a new residential dwelling in the open countryside, which would be contrary to the aims of the Core Strategy (policies CS1 and CS7). Accordingly, in its current form, there is a lack of information to demonstrate that the proposal conforms to Policy E6. Furthermore, the Applicant has failed to address the conclusions in the submitted marketing report which states B1 use class is not a viable option; thus the proposal cannot be recommended for approval.

Officers note the design of the development has been amended from the initial submission and the revised design is an improvement to the original design, maintaining the character of the agricultural buildings, with vertical boarding infill panels. However officers would still assert that the principle of live/work development in this open countryside location and the economic justification for the proposal has not been demonstrated, and the Applicant is not prepared to enter into a S106 legal agreement to tie the residential and employment elements together. Furthermore, the buildings are not of significant architectural or historic merit to justify their retention and conversion; and the amendments to the design will not overcome the fundamental policy issues.

RECOMMENDATION: to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

1. The Local Planning Authority considers the proposed conversion of the existing agricultural buildings to a live/work development is unacceptable because the buildings are not considered to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit and do not make a significant contribution to the character of the area to justify conversion to ensure

their retention. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

2. The application site is located outside the suitable settlements in the rural area and is within the open countryside where development will be strictly controlled. The Local Planning Authority considers insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that live/work development is required in this location in the open countryside. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy and Policy E6 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

TWC/2012/0046 The Hedges, Rowton, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 6QY
Erection of 1no dwelling with free standing garage and the creation of a
menage area with lighting *****Amended Description*****

APPLICANT
Andrew McPaul

RECEIVED
13/01/2012

PARISH
Ercall Magna

WARD
Ercall Magna

CLR BENTLEY HAS REQUESTED THAT THE APPLICATION BE
DETERMINED BY PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: YES

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of development in the rural area, rural housing
numbers, impact on the character and appearance of the area, design & eco-
credentials, highway safety, drainage and flooding.

PROPOSAL:

Planning permission is sought for a new dwelling, garage and ménage area
with lighting at land to the south of Rownton in the countryside. The house will
measure 15.5m wide, 6.4m deep, with an eaves height of 3.6m and a ridge
height of 7.4m. The dwelling would comprise of a pitched roof and 2 pitched
dormers in the front and 3 pitched dormers in the rear elevation. It would
comprise of a sizeable chimney stack, several window openings and timber
porch at its front.

The proposed garage would measure 2m to the eaves and 5m to the
ridgeline. It will comprise of a pitched roof, conservation roof lights and an
external staircase. The garage would provide some roof space that is
intended for storage purposes.

The ménage will measure 10m wide and 20m deep and will be enclosed by a
1.5m high timber post and rail fence. It is intended to light the ménage with 3
individual 10m high lighting poles.

The dwelling will be constructed using highly insulated softwood frame with
oak vertical cladding on a brick plinth with lime mortar. The proposed dwelling
will also utilize sustainable heating systems and water recycling systems to try
and achieve a code 3 home under the Code For Sustainable Homes. The new
house will have an extremely high level of thermal insulation which, combined
with an energy efficient heating system, will assist in minimising the strain on
natural resources. In addition to the sustainable and energy efficient
construction systems the building will also incorporate a chimney stack to
accommodate a wood burning stove, in order to reduce the property's carbon
footprint, wood burning being carbon neutral. The Applicant will also be
installing low energy lighting and water saving appliances throughout the new
house.

The site does not feature any trees therefore it is the applicant's intention to undertake planting at the site to give the site a more sympathetic appearance. It is proposed that a landscaping plan will be submitted prior to any works starting on site for approval. The roof would be constructed with hand made clay roof tiles. The materials to be used in the proposed building have all been chosen because they are natural, low, embodied energy, minimally processed or carbon neutral. Many are locally or UK made with minimal negative environmental impact. They are all responsibly sourced, sustainably produced and high performance products.

The site would be accessed, as it currently is, through an existing timber post and rail gate. Access into the site will be via a permeable gravel driveway and turning area in front of the proposed property and garage. A waste and recycling store will be sited close to the entrance and garage to allow safe access for collections.

It is stated that the proposed new dwelling will allow the applicants to monitor the well being and safety of their horses. The current stables have been broken into on several occasions and it is felt that the only sustainable way of ensuring the site is fully secure and that the well being of the animals is maintained is through the erection of a new house. The site will allow a small office above the garage which will allow the applicants the ability to work from home.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site is designated open countryside in the Wrekin Local Plan Proposals map and is situated approximately 10 miles north of Telford Town Centre and 2 miles west of Waters Upton. The site is accessed off a private track, 260m away from the centre of this small rural settlement. The area itself consists of around 20 - 30 dwellings and does not provide any local services or community facilities. The area does not provide any regular links to public transport, although there is the option to catch two buses (WR14 and WR15) that operate on a Monday, Wednesday or Thursday for a total of 6 journeys a week. Rowton is not in walking distance of any local shops or amenities. The nearest village to it is another small rural settlement called Ellerdine.

This area, otherwise defined as a hamlet contains two farms; Rock Farm is situated north west of the application site and Church Farm is located north east of the site. The application site is positioned approximately 260m from the centre of Rowton and 130m from the nearest property. Approximately 140m north of the application sits a group of converted barns that are currently 'for sale'.

The site area measures 1,216sq.m and is separated from the village by means of two open fields that lie north and northwest of the site. The field located to the north separates the application site from the village boundary by its 200m length. To the east, south and west of the application are more open fields.

The application site is currently used as a stable yard, known as The Hedges. The site is a sizeable green field which has a very open feel to it and consists

of a stable block for horses. The site is bound with timber post and rail fencing. The site is accessed via a single-track rural lane. The track extends off one of the main roads and is bound by a well established 1.5 – 1.8m high hedge. The track slopes downwards towards the application site somewhat and provides access to the Hedges and what appeared to be an electric substation.

PLANNING HISTORY:

TWC/2011/0252, erection of stable block and creation of associated yard and hard standing area (retrospective) granted 23rd May 2011.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Core Strategy:

CS1 Homes

CS7 Rural Area

CS9 Accessibility and Social Inclusion

CS12 Natural Environment

CS13 Environmental Resources

CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan:

UD2 Design Criteria

H9 Location of New Housing

H25 Affordable Housing Rural Exceptions Policy

National guidance:

National Planning Policy Framework published 27th March 2012

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Highways: no objection

Ecology: no objection subject to conditions and informative

Drainage: Standard condition B62 - Details on proposed sustainable drainage system are required.

Shropshire Fire Service: no objections subject to informative

Ercall Magna Parish Council: Outside the village development and on agricultural land with no proven need for such a development.

Three direct neighbour letters and site notice have publicised the application and no comments received.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

With regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, the Wrekin Local Plan and the Core Strategy new development shall be located in or on the edge of existing settlements and service areas where housing, employment, services and other facilities are provided close together, in order to create sustainable communities. Rownton does not have such services and facilities and would

therefore not be in accordance with the national planning guidance and sustainable principles.

The Core Strategy was adopted on 1st December 2007 and sets out the Spatial Development Strategy, alongside related policies for the Borough. The Core Strategy is based on the principle of concentrating development within Telford focussed on 'highly accessible' locations. Some development will be permitted in the rural area limited to that necessary to meet the needs of the area.

From a planning policy perspective, the scale, location, and nature of the development proposed are key considerations for this application, with Policies CS1 *Homes*, CS7 *Rural Area*, and 'saved' policy H9 of the Wrekin Local Plan being most relevant.

Core Strategy policy CS1 requires that the spatial distribution of new homes be consistent with the spatial development strategy stating that housing needs in the rural area will be met by approximately 170 new dwellings. This figure is derived from evidence provided by the Telford & Wrekin Housing Needs Study, with its inclusion in local policy also reflecting national planning policy framework requirements to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and limit the number of new dwellings in rural areas. At the current time, this threshold has already been met from dwellings already built or having received planning permission. This proposed development would therefore exceed the need identified for the rural area contrary to CS1 in terms of the scale of development proposed.

Within the context of the local rural policy framework, Policy CS7 holds that housing development within the rural area will be limited to that necessary to meet the needs of the area and will be focussed on the 3 settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Any development proposed outside of these settlements would be limited with the exception of affordable housing, agriculture/forestry workers dwellings or development related to a listed building. The development is not exceptional i.e. it is for small scale affordable housing, agriculture/forestry workers dwelling or development related to a listed building. There is no identified need for this type of house in this locality and the proposed would exceed the identified housing needs for the rural area, falling contrary to policy CS7.

In addition to the above, guidance contained within the recently published National Planning Policy Framework states that development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay – a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision. Furthermore, to promote sustainable development, housing in rural areas should not be located in places distant from local services. It states that Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:

- the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; or

- where such development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or
- where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting; or
- The exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling. Such a design should:
 - be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas;
 - reflect the highest standards in architecture;
 - significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
 - be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

The proposal includes and promotes the ambition to create as near a zero-carbon footprint including; high insulation, a ground source heat pump, compost bins and locally sourced highly efficient building materials. Whilst the 'Eco' credentials are a "sustainable" form of development, however they are not what the recently published National Planning Policy Framework intends as a sole factor in its presumption in favour of "sustainable development", as the definition of sustainable development has wider implications. Hence the LPA do not consider the 'Eco' credentials of the scheme to be a significant material consideration to justify a departure from policy. The majority of the 'Eco' issues presented with this development proposal are those which would be considered in all new development and everyday sustainable living and supported by policy CS13.

The new dwelling will comprise of a one and a half storey's with a lower ridge line to the eastern side of the house. The LPA believe that the scale, mass and form are sympathetic to the scale of the local area. The property would reflect some traditional period features found in the local area. The dwelling would have a rural like and high quality appearance that would in keep with many of the properties within the area. It is the applicant's intention to bring a valuable, quality and sustainable home to Rownton that would improve as well as enhance the area. Whilst the property would be of a good design it would be located off a private south sloping track, 100m south of the village centre therefore visitors or local residents would struggle to see or experience such benefits within the public realm. Although the proposal is considered good design it is not believed to be exceptional or innovative.

Whilst the provision of a low carbon, highly sustainable, good designed dwelling is welcomed by the LPA it must be noted that it would be positioned on a rural site, away from an identified settlement and by reason of its isolated position would fail to benefit the area as a local village and be contrary to rural housing policies. In addition to the above there is no proven local need for rural housing in Rownton. A new dwelling in this location is

considered inappropriate and out of character with the locality and would result in an adverse impact upon the rural and open appearance of this area.

It is understood that a new dwelling is required for the benefit of security for the site, however having said this application fails to produce evidence of such security breaches. Whilst the applicant has verbally stated that the premises has been broken into twice within a period of 12months the LPA do not believe this justifies the need to live permanently at the site. Whilst the LPA understand how much of a problem this may cause no information i.e. photographs, insurance letters have been submitted to show the degree of trouble this has caused. Furthermore the application has not shown whether alternative security methods have been trialled and tested to ascertain if a different approach could protect the site from further break-ins. The LPA also believe that the site could be protected with alternative security measures other than living permanently at the site. In addition to this it should be noted that the applicant currently lives in Rownton and near to the application site there is a property for sale, located 140metres north of the application site.

In addition, it is not claimed by the applicant that the dwelling is for any essential agricultural or forestry need. The applicant has not demonstrated an essential need or produced sufficient supporting documentation that would justify a departure from policy CS7.

Based on this the LPA does not attach significant weight to this reason that would justify a departure from local and national policies.

However in light of the proposed ménage the LPA do not have any objections however do consider the proposed 6No. 10m high lighting poles to be visually intrusive in this open area as well as unnecessary that does not contribute to the character of the surrounding rural area. The LPA acknowledge that lighting may be required for morning and evenings however feel the proposed scale to be excessive.

These 'Eco' details are noted and creditable, however these issues are considered insufficient to justify a new dwelling in the open countryside. In this regard the LPA deem that this position for a new dwelling is not sustainable due to its location in the rural area. Hence the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst the design is somewhat of high quality it is located and isolated in its position that would not only fail to protect the countryside but fail to enhance and have a positive impact on the character and appearance of the local area. To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

In conclusion, it is considered that the creation of a new dwelling and a garage on this site is unacceptable as it is a highly unsustainable location in the rural area and is outside the settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. The eco features and design associated with the proposed development are creditable; however no information has been submitted to demonstrate that this proposal should be an exception to general housing

policy. The proposal to create a new dwelling in the open countryside would exceed the maximum housing numbers permitted in the rural area and undermine the Core Strategy approach. Whilst the proposal is of a high quality and sustainable design it is not considered to be truly outstanding or innovative design that would justify a departure from these policies. The proposed development fails to respect or relate positively to its context and fails to enhance the quality of the local environment through exceptional and, innovative design. Therefore, the proposed development is deemed contrary to both local and national policy and guidance and there are no material considerations that outweigh the existing policies. Therefore the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reasons:

1. The Local Planning Authority considers that the erection of a new dwelling on this highly unsustainable site is unacceptable as it is outside the settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Furthermore, the special circumstances advanced fail to justify this proposal as an exception to general housing policy. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to 'saved' policies H10 and H24 of the adopted Wrekin local Plan 1995-2006 and policies CS1 and CS7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The Local Planning Authority considers that proposal to erect a new dwelling in the open countryside exceeds the maximum housing numbers permitted in the rural area and undermine the Core Strategy approach. Accordingly, the proposal is deemed contrary to policy CS1 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2007.
3. The Local Authority considers that the proposed lighting poles by reason of its location, scale and height would have a detrimental effect on the amenities of adjoining residential properties by virtue of visual impact and light pollution; furthermore the proposal would detract from the character of the predominantly rural open area. Accordingly, the development is contrary to saved policy UD2 of the Wrekin Local Plan and policy CS15 of the Local Development Framework Plan.

TWC/2012/0102 6 Hillside East, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9GZ
Erection of single storey side extension and a pitched roof dormer garage
extension and conversion. *****Amended description*****

APPLICANT

S Hampton

RECEIVED

09/02/2012

PARISH

Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton

WARD

Church Aston and Lilleshall

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: NO

MAIN ISSUES: Scale and design, character and appearance and amenity.

THE PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought to extend a dwelling house with a single-storey side extension and to convert part of an existing garage into habitable space (annexe) with the erection of a new dormer window.

The applicants would like to extend the existing dwelling with a single-storey side extension. The extension would be located on an area of garden patio, towards the southern side of the house. It would measure 5m wide, 4.5m high and 4m deep. The extension would provide the dwelling with a new kitchen and dining area. The west facing roof plane would feature 3 roof lights and 3 windows. The extension would feature a centralised rear section of glazing that would protrude an extra 1m into the garden. The extension will feature a pitched roof and will be constructed using materials to match with the existing dwelling.

Permission is also sought to convert part of the existing garage and provide a staircase that would provide access into the roof space. The garage would continue to provide a storage space, a WC and parking for one car within the ground floor. However the ground floor would partly be converted to provide a small games room and a bedroom/study at 1st floor providing small annexe accommodation. The garage would be extended with a pitched roof east facing, dormer window to allow for new habitable roof space. The dormer extension will extend up from the garage eaves line and measure 3m wide and 3m high. It would measure 3.7m deep and protrude off the east facing roof plane. Parking for a second car would be provided on the existing driveway.

Originally consent was sought for a flat roof dormer, however subsequent to officer concerns regarding the design of the dormer the plans were amended to show a pitched roof dormer.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

This site comprises of a house and a detached garage, located eastwards off Hillside in Lilleshall. The plot is large and well bound with landscaping and comprises a sizeable dwelling and a detached garage that both feature pitched and cat slide roofs. The garage features a dual pitched and cat slide

roof with a white painted up and over garage door. The garage is situated somewhat higher in level than the house whereby the ridge heights meet at a similar level above ground. By reason of existing ground levels the plot is accessed via a descending driveway. Forward of the garage are a set of steps that provide access down to the house.

For the most part, the site can hardly be viewed from the road due to the differences in ground level and the well established landscaping. The site lies in the rural area and is not within a settlement identified for new development in the Core Strategy.

Neighbouring properties are of varied age, size and design.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton Parish Council: No comments

Geotechs: No comments

Sustainability: No comments

PLANNING HISTORY:

No relevant planning history

POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Policy Framework – published 27th March 2012

Core Strategy:

CS7 Rural Area

CS15 Urban Design

Wrekin Local Plan:

UD2 Design Criteria

H18 Conversion of non-residential buildings to residential use in the rural area

H9 Location of New Housing

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy requires development to assist in strengthening local identity and projecting a positive local image. Wrekin Local Plan Policy UD2 asserts that development must respect and respond positively to its context, and enhance the quality of the local environment through high quality design. It also states the development will be assessed in relation to its scale, massing, form, proportions and materials etc.

With regard to national guidance new development shall be located in or on the edge of existing settlements and service areas where housing, employment, services and other facilities are provided close together, in order to create sustainable communities. PPS1 asserts that development should be of a high quality design and should reinforce local distinctiveness, and where

it is inappropriate in its context or fails to improve the character and quality of an area, it should not be accepted.

With regard to local planning policy, it is stated development within the rural area should be limited to meet the needs of the area. Policy CS7 focuses new development in the 3 key settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Outside these settlements development will be limited and within the open countryside strictly controlled. Lilleshall is not one of the key settlements; therefore separate residential dwellings would be limited to agricultural, forestry or other occupational dwellings or affordable housing, having regard to national policy guidance.

The extension would be positioned so that it would directly face eastwards, away from the road. It would be constructed in the same materials as the main dwelling and existing garage, in keeping with the character and appearance of the property. The development would be smaller in scale than the existing garage, but would be of an appropriate design and form. It will not be overly visible or prominent, by reason of its position at the rear of the existing garage building, lower in level to the road and existing boundary treatment. The proposal would not adversely affect the adjoining properties or the character of the area. The existing amenity space would remain unharmed and the development will not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenity.

The proposed annexe (converted garage) would comprise of a garage, staircase, WC at ground floor and a bedroom/study at first floor. It is possible that a converted garage could be altered without planning permission to provide a kitchen and eventually independent living accommodation which can subsequently be let or sold off separately from the main dwelling. However a separate dwelling on this site and in this rural location would not be acceptable and would fall contrary to local and national planning policies.

With regards to the criteria set out in H18, H9 and CS7 this garage building is a modern, domestic type building not deemed to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit that would justify conversion to ensure the long term retention of the building. The building itself is of little merit and therefore could not be argued to be justifiable conversion into a separate dwelling under H18.

Based on these reasons the creation of an additional dwelling would be unacceptable. Therefore if planning is approved for the conversion to habitable accommodation would be appropriate to impose a planning condition to the effect that the annex shall be used solely as accommodation ancillary to the main dwelling house. Additionally the Council requests that the annex is tied to the dwelling with the signing of a legal agreement, known as a Section 106 Agreement.

The extensions and alterations that are proposed are of a similar form as the existing building. The single-storey extension would be in view from a neighbouring dwelling, although the application and neighbouring properties are separated by a significant separation distance. The extension would be

set 9.4m in from the southern shared boundary fence and it is therefore considered that there will not be a significant loss of light, outlook or privacy for the occupants of the newly built dwelling.

Whilst the extra habitable space increases the property's footprint by approximately 25% sufficient private amenity space will remain to the rear and sides of the property and as such the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the existing property. Furthermore the street scene will remain unaffected, retaining the character of the area. Sufficient parking provision will remain and therefore there should not be any detrimental impact on highway safety.

In conclusion, the proposed extensions are considered acceptable in terms of the siting, scale, design, form and materials and will not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities or the surrounding area. The conversion of part of the garage to residential use and its occupation ancillary to the house by a member of family is considered acceptable as, it would not result in a significant detrimental impact on the character and amenities of the surrounding residential area and its use can be controlled through a legal agreement to prevent the annexe accommodation from being sold or let as a separate unit of accommodation. The development accords with national and local planning policy.

RECOMMENDATION: Subject to the Applicants entering into a Section 106 Agreement that the development shall be retained as ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling and not sold as a separate unit or let as a separate unit, to be delegated to the Head of Housing and Planning to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the following conditions:

1. A04 Time Limit
2. C01 Finishing material to match
3. C38 Development in accordance with deposited plans
4. D Custom Converted garage/annexe: ancillary accommodation only - restriction on separate residential use

The proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of the siting, scale, design, form and materials and will not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities or the adjacent agricultural land. Furthermore, subject to a legal agreement to prevent the garage from being sold or let as a separate unit of accommodation, the conversion of the garage to residential use and its occupation ancillary to the house by a member of family is considered acceptable and would not result in a significant detrimental impact on the character and amenities of the surrounding residential area.

TWC/2012/0147 Sundip, Somerwood, Rodington, Telford, Shropshire, SY4 4RF

Conversion of garage to a granny flat and retention of existing door and windows.

APPLICANT

Mr Neil Manley

RECEIVED

16/02/2012

PARISH

Rodington

WARD

Wrockwardine

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: NO.

MAIN ISSUES:

Scale and design, Character and appearance, Impact on adjoining residential amenity.

THE PROPOSAL:

This application seeks planning permission for the conversion of an existing double garage to form a habitable annexe. It also seeks retrospective consent for a door and two windows within the building's north facing elevation.

The proposal is to convert the part of the existing garage to create a self contained annexe (including a bedroom, bathroom, kitchen, hall and lounge) to accommodate a family member. The application seeks consent for a number of doors and windows, however these additions are already in situ and have been when the garage was originally built, therefore this application is part-retrospective. However, it should be noted that no internal changes to the garage have been made.

The proposed annexe (converted garage) is intended as living accommodation for the applicants parent and would be a self-contained unit comprising a living room/bedroom space with kitchenette, and a bathroom. The overall form and character of the building will be unchanged.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site relates to a sizeable dormer bungalow located within a considerable plot. The dwelling is fronted with a large, brick paved driveway and is several metres back from Somerwood Road in Rodington. This main road is characterised with a mixture of houses that vary in style and scale and a large open grassy field and 1.5m high hedgerows that lie to the south.

The property comprises of a large rear garden that offers access onto an existing single track lane. This track, otherwise known as Manley Lane, is situated to the north of the garden and provides access to and from Somerwood Farm. Having checked relevant historical maps it is evident that this track has been in situ for several years and has provided rear access into the application site.

Within the western part of the rear garden sits a red brick double garage building with a pitched gable roof. The garage was approved in 2001 however it was not built, completely in accordance with the approved plans. The garage was approved with a garage door however was built to feature two windows and a door and has been used as an ancillary building to the main house as a workshop and for storage purposes. Fronting the garage building is an area of hard standing. The garage is set approximately 17m north of the main house and 17m south of a track that joins onto Manley Lane. The rear garden is somewhat cluttered with building materials i.e. cuts of wood and bricks, these are mainly scattered in and around the northern part of the garden.

The rear garden is well screened along its western boundary with a well established 2.5m high hedge and along the eastern boundary by a 1.8m high fence. The garden comprises of a greenhouse, a shed, a pond and other structures typically found within a rear domestic plot, however having said this, the garden is predominantly open in character. There is a sizeable tree located to the side of the garage, adjacent the western boundary hedge that appears to have been cut back or damaged in order to allow room for the existing garage. Having noted this, the tree is not protected by a Tree Preservation Order and therefore has no statutory protection from works or removal.

The site lies in the rural area and is not within a settlement identified for new development in the Core Strategy.

PLANNING HISTORY:

W2001/0782, Erection of two-single storey rear extensions, insertion of two dormer windows and replacement of garage with new double garage, granted 16th October 2011.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Policy Framework – published 27th March 2012.

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies

Policy UD2 – Design Criteria

H18 Conversion of non-residential buildings to residential use in the rural area

H9 Location of new housing

LDF Core Strategy

CS7 – Rural Area

CS15 Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Rodington Parish Council: no comments

Shropshire Fire Service: Emergency access and Fire Sprinkler informative

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The scale and design of the development with openings limited to the elevations facing into the rear garden will not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities. There is no impact upon privacy or loss of amenity to the neighbouring dwellings. By virtue of the proposed works are in the rear garden works will be out of view from the public realm, hence, there will be no adverse impact within the street scene. Sufficient on site parking provision is available for the existing and proposed properties and the private amenity space will largely be unaffected.

The application site lies in the Council's Rural Area where there are strict controls over the location of new residential development. At present only proposals within the villages of Tibberton, High Ercall and Waters Upton would be considered for new housing development.

This proposed conversion of part of the existing garage is not creating a new building as it is intended as an ancillary annexe for a family member, nor subdividing an existing plot. It intends to utilise the existing driveway at the front or rear of the plot, being ancillary to the main dwelling. Accordingly the conversion of the garage to ancillary residential accommodation will not have an adverse impact on the surrounding character, nor prejudice highway safety, and is therefore considered acceptable in this instance.

With regards to the criteria set out in H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan this garage building is a modern, domestic type building not deemed to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit that would justify conversion to ensure the long term retention of the building. The building itself is of little merit and therefore could not be argued to be justifiable conversion into a separate dwelling under H18. However the proposal is for ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling and therefore the LPA propose the imposition of restrictive conditions and a legal agreement to ensure that the Local Planning Authority can control the use of the development so that the proposal will not lead to the creation of a separate dwelling, only annexe accommodation to be used in association with the existing dwelling. The Applicant has agreed to this and will sign a Section 106 Agreement.

In conclusion, the proposed conversion of the detached double garage to residential use and its occupation ancillary to the main dwelling by a member of the family is considered acceptable and would not result in a significant detrimental impact on the character and amenities of the surrounding residential area, subject to a legal agreement to prevent the garage from being sold or let as a separate unit of accommodation. Furthermore the proposed extension is considered acceptable in terms of the scale, design, form and materials and will not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities. The development therefore accords with national and local planning policy.

RECOMMENDATION: Subject to the Applicants entering into a Section 106 Agreement that the development shall be retained as ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling and not sold as a separate unit or let as a separate unit, to be delegated to the Head of Housing and Planning to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. A04 Time Limit
2. C38 Development in accordance with plans
3. DCUSTOM Converted garage/annexe: ancillary accommodation only – restriction on separate residential use
4. I32 Fire Informative
5. Section 106 Informative
6. I40 Conditions
7. I41 Reason for grant

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The conversion of the garage to habitable use and its occupation ancillary to the house by a member of the family is considered acceptable and would not result in a significant detrimental impact on the character and amenities of the surrounding residential area, subject to a legal agreement to prevent the garage from being sold or let as a separate unit of accommodation. Furthermore the proposed conversion is considered acceptable in terms of the scale, design, form and materials and will not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities nor prejudice highway safety.

Accordingly, the proposed development is considered compliant with both local and national guidance and policy and therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

TWC/2012/0157 39 New Street, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1LU
Advert Consent for illuminated signage.

APPLICANT
Ladbrokes Ltd

RECEIVED
24/02/2012

PARISH
Wellington

WARD
College

WELLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL HAS REQUESTED THIS APPLICATION
TO BE CONSIDERED BY PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: No

MAIN ISSUES:
Visual amenity and highway safety

THE PROPOSAL:
This application seeks advertisement consent to display one externally illuminated fascia and one externally illuminated hanging sign on the front of the premises on New Street, Wellington.

In conjunction with this advertisement application is a full application (TWC/2012/ 0158) which seeks consent for the change of use from retail shop (Use Class A1) to betting office (Use Class A2), alterations to the shop front, installation of a satellite dish and air conditioning unit to the rear.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:
This is a retail shop sited in the main shopping area of Wellington district centre. The property is a mature 3 storey Victorian shop with a gabled roof line and leaded windows at the first and second floor. The ground floor has a recessed aluminium framed shop front with dark green painted timber pilasters. The existing fascia sign is white background with black letters.

New Street is in the Wellington Conservation area which is reflected by the age and design of the buildings. The shop frontages are noted for their fascia signs and several shops have projecting and hanging signs. The paved thoroughfare is for pedestrian use only.

PLANNING HISTORY:
W2008/0696 Erection of a rear extension to retail premises and conversion of upper floors to form 2no dwellings.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:
Wrekin Local Plan:
S31 Shop Fronts, Advertisements and Hoardings
HE3 Development in Conservation Areas

National planning guidance:
PPG 19 Outdoor Advertisement Control

PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Wellington Town Council: Have no comments on the advertisement proposal.

Built Heritage: No objection as the timber elements of the shop front are to remain and the signs are externally illuminated and fill existing signage spaces.

Shropshire Council: No comment

16 direct neighbour letters publicised this application – no comments were received.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The proposed fascia sign will run 4900mm along the existing timber fascia. It will be a red aluminium panel 965mm deep with “Ladbrokes” formed from individually located white acrylic lettering. The hanging sign projecting out by 700mm and 600mm deep will be located adjacent to the fascia on a traditional scrolled bracket. It will be a red coated aluminium panel with “Ladbrokes” on both sides formed from white vinyl. Both signs will be externally lit using a trough down-lighter.

The design, size and colour of the signs are acceptable within the context of the site and are not considered excessive. They are positioned on the front elevation only and will not dominate or effect the appearance of the building. It is considered that there will be minimal impact on the visual amenity of the immediate surrounding area or users of the highway. The proposal therefore accords with the general design and amenity objectives of policies S31 and HE25 of the Wrekin Local Plan and National planning guidance PPG 19.

RECOMMENDATION : GRANT ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

E01 Advertisement Standard
C38 Development in accordance with plan Nos.

Informatives

I40 Conditions
I41 Reasons for Grant of Permission

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The signs are acceptable within the context of the site and would not result in an unacceptable amount of visual clutter; furthermore there will be minimal impact on the visual amenity of the immediate surrounding area or users of the highway.

TWC/2012/0158 39 New Street, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1LU
Change of use from retail shop (Use Class A1) to betting office (Use Class A2), alterations to the shop front, installation of a satellite dish and air conditioning unit to the rear

APPLICANT
Ladbrokes Ltd

RECEIVED
24/02/2012

PARISH
Wellington

WARD
College

WELLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL HAS REQUESTED THIS APPLICATION
TO BE CONSIDERED BY PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES:

Principle of development, impact on Primary Retail Zone, character and appearance.

THE PROPOSAL:

This application seeks permission for the change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to betting office (Use Class A2) alteration to the shop front and installation of a satellite dish and air conditioning unit to the rear of the building.

In conjunction with this is an advertisement application (TWC/2012/ 0157) which seeks consent for advertisement of signage at the front of the buildings.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

This is a retail shop sited in the main shopping area of Wellington district centre. The property is a mature 3 storey Victorian shop with residential above. It features a gabled roof line and leaded windows at the first and second floor. The ground floor has a recessed aluminium framed shop front with dark green painted timber pilasters.

The rear is part of a courtyard accessed off New Street which serves both the retail and residential uses of approximately 10 units. The courtyard is accessed via gates and bounded by fencing as is the rear courtyard of each unit. The rear of the building has a service door at ground floor level and external steps leading to the residential units above.

New Street is in the Wellington Conservation area which is reflected by the age and design of the buildings and within the Primary Retail Zone of Wellington District Centre. It has mixed uses of retail and commerce with residential living above. The paved thoroughfare is for pedestrian use only. Within walking distance are both bus and train stations providing links in and around Telford.

PLANNING HISTORY:

W2008/0696 Erection of a rear extension to retail premises and conversion of upper floors to form 2no dwellings.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Policy Framework – published 27th March 2012.

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies:

S10: Wellington Primary Retail Zone

H6 – Windfall sites in Telford and Newport

UD2 – Design Criteria

LDF Core Strategy:

CS5 – District and Local Centres in Telford

CS15 – Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Wellington Town Council: Object to the proposal on the basis that if allowed there would be an over proliferation of betting shops in the town; a perception that there would be a decline of the Wellington “offer” which would prejudice future retail investment; the application appears to be contrary to the conclusions of the Portas Report; the proposed development would adversely affect local residents; would make the town less attractive for people to visit and shop in; and worries that the shop is located in one of the Borough’s most economical deprived area and might encourage gambling which can have a disastrous effect on the lives of the poor and vulnerable.

Built Heritage: No objection as the alterations to the shop front are minimal.

Shropshire Council: No comment

16 direct neighbour letters publicised this application – no comments were received.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The premise is currently used as a Wallpaper shop.

The site is within the Prime Retail Zone of Wellington where ‘saved’ policy S10 of the Wrekin Local Plan states the changes of use at ground floor level to Use Class A2 will only be permitted where the proposal does not threaten the primary zone’s function as a shopping area by the creation of unacceptable levels of non retail use. Furthermore these unacceptable levels are considered to occur when: non retail uses within a continuous frontage would exceed one in every four ground floor units and where the proposal consists of a non-retail frontage in excess of 6m.

There is an existing A3 use (the William Withering Public House) within 3 units of the proposal which would exceed the 1 in 4 non-retail units deemed acceptable by policy S10. To assess if there would be any harm to the Primary Retail Zone of Wellington the case officer surveyed the use of these

units on each side of New Street, which is approximately 200 metres in length, and the uses of the 52 units are broken down into the following;

Use Class	Number of Units
A1	39
A3	5
A2	3
D1	1
Unoccupied	4
TOTAL	52

As shown in the table above there is a high proportion of A1 uses along the street; therefore the local planning authority considers that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable level of non retail use and will not be a threat to the A1 uses currently available to shoppers visiting Wellington or to the main function as a primary shopping area. The frontage does not exceed 6m and in this regard conforms to policy S10.

The National Planning Policy Framework, published 27th March 2012 is committed to securing economic growth and pursuing sustainable development in order to make it easier for jobs to be created in towns and asks that local planning authorities plan proactively to meet the needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century.

Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy states that the mix uses in Local Centres will be carefully managed and new development must assist the creation of a vibrant, safe and attractive place, with a design that reflects and responds to the locality.

Wellington Town Council argue that the proposed development would adversely affect local residents; would make the town less attractive for people to visit and shop in; and worries that the shop is located in one of the Borough's most economical deprived area and might encourage gambling which can have a disastrous effect on the lives of the poor and vulnerable. They also comment on the Portas report which was published in December 2011 by retail expert Mary Portas and looked into how to revive the High Street and get town centres to run more like businesses. The government also published research on High Streets' performance which shows that a third of them are "degenerating or failing". The recommendations of the report were;

- The focus is on putting the heart back into the centre of our high streets, re-imagined as exciting social hubs for shopping, learning socialising and having fun. Get town centre's running like businesses.
- Get the basics right to allow businesses to flourish.
- Level the playing field.
- Define landlords' roles and responsibilities.
- Give communities a greater say.

The Government will now review and publish their response in spring. It is therefore difficult at this stage to either agree or disagree with Wellington Town Council's comment that the application appears to be contrary to the conclusions of the Portas Report.

The applicant has argued that a modern betting office of the type proposed will attract high visitation rates with far more customers than a shop of similar size. In addition, at least 70% of customers will have already or will go on to make other purchases in the locality thereby creating spin-off trade. With changes in betting and gaming legislation, betting offices are no longer closed in the sense that you can see into or out of them. They employ maximum use of glazing and have 'active frontages'. Betting offices are often bright and busy and represent a picture of activity in the street scene. In this way they contribute to the vitality of the area in the most positive manner.

The proposed hours of opening are Monday to Sunday and Bank Holidays 0800 to 2200. Corals have similar opening hours but 1000 to 1800 on Sundays. The proposed opening hours for Sunday are not considered to be of any benefit to customers as Sunday opening hours are traditionally shorter for the majority of businesses therefore the hours of opening can be conditioned to be 1000 to 1800.

In terms of the shop front it is intended to restore the existing aluminium framed shop front and paint it off white. The surrounding timber pilasters and fascia will also be painted off white following necessary repair work. This work is considered acceptable as it results in no change to the existing shop front or the current access provision and respects the character and appearance of the building; therefore accords with 'saved' policy S31 of the WLP.

To the rear will be a wall mounted air-conditioning unit and new satellite dish. Both of these elements will be out of view from the adjacent walk way due to existing boundary treatment and any impact on immediate adjoining properties is considered minimal.

In conclusion the local authority acknowledges that there will be a loss of a retail unit within the Wellington primary zone that is contrary to policy S10 as there would be more than 1 in 4 non retail units together and notes the concerns raised by Wellington Town Council but it is considered that due to the numbers of existing retail units within New street there will be little threat to the primary zones function as a shopping area; therefore on balance the application conforms with national sustainable principles.

RECOMMENDATION: to GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. A04 Time Limit
2. C38 Development in accordance with plans
3. D11 Hours of opening

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

Whilst the proposal would result in more than 1 in 4 units being non-retail contrary to policy S10, the frontage and length of the unit does not exceed 6m (as required by policy S10) and due to the number of existing retail units on both side of New Street in the Primary Retail Zone it is considered that the proposed change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to betting office (Use Class A2) is acceptable as it would not result in an unacceptable level of non retail use nor be a threat to the existing A1 use within the Primary Retail Zone of Wellington. The alteration to the shop front, installation of a satellite dish and air conditioning unit to the rear of the building will not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the building nor be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

