



Telford & Wrekin
C O U N C I L

Addenbrooke House Ironmasters Way Telford TF3 4NT

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date **Wednesday, 15 December 2021** Time **5.30 pm**
Venue **West Stand, AFC Telford United, Watling Street, Wellington, Telford, TF1 2TU**

Enquiries Regarding this Agenda

Democratic Services	Jayne Clarke / Rhys Attwell	01952 383205 / 382195
Media Enquiries	Corporate Communications	01952 382406
Lead Officer	Valerie Hulme – Development Management Service Delivery Manager	01952 384130

Committee Membership: Councillors G H Cook, N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, J Jones, J Loveridge (Vice-Chair), R Mehta, K Middleton, P J Scott and C F Smith (Chair)

Substitutes: Councillors V A Fletcher, E J Greenaway, J E Lavery, G L Offland, S J Reynolds, G C W Reynolds, K S Sahota, W L Tomlinson and D R W White

Scan the code with your smartphone to view this agenda and reports online at www.telford.gov.uk/meetings



AGENDA

- 3.1. **Minutes - 17 November 2021**
- 3.2. **Minutes - 24 November 2021**

- Appendix A 3 - 14
- Appendix B 15 - 22

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 17 November 2021 at 5.30 pm in The West Stand, AFC Telford United, Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2TU

Present: Councillors G H Cook, N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, J Jones, R Mehta, K Middleton, K S Sahota (as substitute for J Loveridge), P J Scott and C F Smith (Chair)

In Attendance: Clarke (Democratic and Scrutiny Officer), A Gittins (Area Team Planning Manager - West), V Hulme (Development Management Service Delivery Manager), I Lowe (Principal Planning Officer), I Ross (Legal Adviser) and M Turner (Area Team Planning Manager - East)

Apologies: Councillors J Loveridge

PC205 Declarations of Interest

In respect of planning applications TWC/2021/0557, TWC/2021/0558 and TWC/2021/0832, Councillor I Fletcher advised that he was a member of St Georges and Priorslee Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions on these applications. With regard to planning applications TWC/2021/0722 and TWC/2021/0724 he had taken part in discussions with St Georges and Priorslee Parish Council but did not take part in the recommendations. Due to the comments made on the original application and the suggestions recorded, Cllr I Fletcher would withdraw from the meeting whilst these two planning applications were being discussed.

PC206 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 20 October 2021 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC207 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC208 Site Visits

It was likely that there would be five site visits prior to the next meeting and details would be circulated to Members.

PC209 Planning Applications for Determination

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report.

PC210 TWC/2021/0557 - Site of Woodhouse Farm, Woodhouse

Lane, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire

This Application was for the erection of 16no. dwellings with associated garages and the conversion of the existing farmhouse and barn into 5no. dwellings on the site of Woodhouse Farm, Woodhouse Lane, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire.

Councillor V Fletcher, Ward Member, had requested that this application be determined by the Planning Committee.

Councillor V Fletcher spoke in favour of the application as the Grade II listed building and the outbuildings had fallen into disrepair with difficult terrain, trees and vegetation. She was pleased to see that the farmhouse and barn would be brought back into use and there would be an eco gain with no net biodiversity loss due to landscape and habitat with a wildflower and wildlife area, bat boxes and 79 trees and hedgerows. The sycamore tree had also been saved. It was asked that a traffic management plan and construction plan be in place prior to permission being granted in order to prevent disruption to nearby businesses. She raised concerns with regard to the access road and the 4 way junction at Castle Farm Way and that S106 contributions in relation to primary and secondary education be spent in Priorslee and the attendance area.

Mr R Perrins, Applicant's Agent, spoke in support of the application and explained that the current scheme was compliant with policies, retained the trees and met highway safety. The cycle route and pedestrian access would be improved by dedicated footways to access the road and provide a safe route to connect the adjacent sites. The construction access would not adversely affect business and a traffic management plan would be provided. There would be an inspection of the trees with important trees being retained with wildflowers and landscape management. The biodiversity and ecology had been assessed and adequate measure had been put in place that went beyond what was expected. The listed farmhouse and barn would be renovated to high quality family homes which met planning policy. Contributions towards education, sports facilities, drainage and the enhancement of the existing pond into a focal point would be secured through a S106 Agreement.

The Planning Officer responded to Councillor V Fletcher's concerns regarding the construction management plan and with regard to the access to the adjacent garden centre and farm shop would be maintained via a pre-commencement condition.

The Planning Area Team Manager addressed the concerns of Councillor V Fletcher with regard to the proposed education contributions which were in line with current policies and assured the Committee that the money would be appropriately spent but that further dialogue would be undertaken to ensure that the 3 mile radius was still appropriate.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns with regard to the granting of delegated power to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to negotiate conditions that Members may not agree to if there was a change in circumstances, the 3 mile radius with regard to the contribution towards primary and secondary education and this should be within the designated attendance zones or reduced to within a 2 mile radius and that the conditions with regard to drainage, ecology highways and the construction management plan should be listed as set out in the report at paragraphs 5.11, 5.14 and 5.15 of the report. Other Members felt that as a construction plan was in place and the local businesses would not be impeded that the application was acceptable. It was further raised that vehicles were using the National Cycle Route 81 illegally. Further comments were that the development was welcomed as it was protecting the businesses and the cycle routes were being preserved, it was asked if the enhancement of the sports facilities could be protected within a 1 mile radius for those people who would like on the development. Some Members raised concerns that if conditions were not stuck to could it be brought back to Committee and who would monitor the conditions.

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager explained that in terms of S106 contributions there was a test set out in legislation and policy adopted by the Council on education funding and if S106 monies were not spent within the timeframe they would have to be returned to the developer. It was difficult to set time limits and be restrictive with the contributions in order that the children got the funding that was needed. With regard to sports facilities this was more strategic across the Borough as advised by the Healthy Spaces Officer. In terms of delegated authority if the S106 conditions highlighted could not be settled, the application would be brought back to Committee and this would be monitored by the Service Delivery Manager and the Team. Any breaches of S106 were followed up.

The Planning Officer confirmed to Members that officers were aware of the issue relating to the cycle route and it was being closely monitored. Councillor I Fletcher moved an amendment to the recommendation which was seconded in that with regards to the £65,382 primary school education works that this be within the attendance area for Priorslee Primary School and the additional school which would be coming forward in approximately 2-3 years. With regard to secondary education contribution of £44,972 that this be for education works at Holy Trinity Academy.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority refused and the amendment to the recommendation failed.

The Original recommendation was moved and seconded and upon being put to the vote it was, unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager for full planning permission to be granted subject to:

a) The applicants/landowner entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Local Planning relating to the following (subject to indexation from the date of committee with terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager):

- £10,400 Play and Recreation Works in the locality of the development;
- £10,400 Enhancement of Sports Facilities in the locality of the development;
- £65,382 Primary School Education Works within 3 miles radius;
- £44,972 Secondary School Education Works within 3-mile radius;
- £2623 S.106 Monitoring Fee; and

b) The conditions contained in the report

(with authority to finalise any matter including conditions, legal agreement terms, or any later variations to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

PC211 TWC/2021/0558 - Site of Woodhouse Farm, Woodhouse Lane, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire

Site of Woodhouse Farm, Woodhouse Lane, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire
Internal and external works to facilitate the conversion of former farmhouse into 3no.dwellings (Listed Building Application)

It was recommended that this application be determined by the Planning Committee as it related to planning application TWC/2021/0557

Councillor V Fletcher spoke in favour of the application as the Grade II listed building and the outbuildings had fallen into disrepair with difficult terrain, trees and vegetation. She was pleased to see that the farmhouse and barn would be brought back into use and there would be an eco gain with no net biodiversity loss due to landscape and habitat with a wildflower and wildlife area, bat boxes and 79 trees and hedgerows. The sycamore tree had also been saved. It was asked that a traffic management plan and construction plan be in place prior to permission being granted in order to prevent disruption to nearby businesses. She raised concerns with regard to the access road and the 4 way junction at Castle Farm Way and that S106 contributions in relation to primary and secondary education be spent in Priorslee and the attendance area.

Mr R Perrins, Applicant's Agent, spoke in support of the application and explained that the current scheme was compliant with policies, retained the trees and met highway safety. The cycle route and pedestrian access would be improved by dedicated footways to access the road and provide a safe route to connect the adjacent sites. The construction access would not adversely affect business and a traffic management plan would be provided. There would be an inspection of the trees with important trees being retained

with wildflowers and landscape management. The biodiversity and ecology had been assessed and adequate measure had been put in place that went beyond what was expected. The listed farmhouse and barn would be renovated to high quality family homes which met planning policy. Contributions towards education, sports facilities, drainage and the enhancement of the existing pond into a focal point would be secured through a S106 Agreement.

The Planning Officer responded to Councillor V Fletcher's concerns regarding the construction management plan and with regard to the access to the adjacent garden centre and farm shop would be maintained via a pre-commencement condition.

The Planning Area Team Manager addressed the concerns of Councillor V Fletcher with regard to the proposed education contributions which were in line with current policies and assured the Committee that the money would be appropriately spent but that further dialogue would be undertaken to ensure that the 3 mile radius was still appropriate.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns with regard to the granting of delegated power to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to negotiate conditions that Members may not agree to if there was a change in circumstances, the 3 mile radius with regard to the contribution towards primary and secondary education and this should be within the designated attendance zones or reduced to within a 2 mile radius and that the conditions with regard to drainage, ecology highways and the construction management plan should be listed as set out in the report at paragraphs 5.11, 5.14 and 5.15 of the report. Other Members felt that as a construction plan was in place and the local businesses would not be impeded that the application was acceptable. It was further raised that vehicles were using the National Cycle Route 81 illegally. Further comments were that the development was welcomed as it was protecting the businesses and the cycle routes were being preserved, it was asked if the enhancement of the sports facilities could be protected within a 1 mile radius for those people who would like on the development. Some Members raised concerns that if conditions were not stuck to could it be brought back to Committee and who would monitor the conditions.

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager explained that in terms of S106 contributions there was a test set out in legislation and policy adopted by the Council on education funding and if S106 monies were not spent within the timeframe they would have to be returned to the developer. It was difficult to set time limits and be restrictive with the contributions in order that the children got the funding that was needed. With regard to sports facilities this was more strategic across the Borough as advised by the Healthy Spaces Officer. In terms of delegated authority if the S106 conditions highlighted could not be settled, the application would be brought back to Committee and this would be monitored by the Service Delivery Manager and the Team. Any breaches of S106 were followed up.

The Planning Officer confirmed to Members that officers were aware of the issue relating to the cycle route and it was being closely monitored. Upon being put to the vote it was, unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant Listed Building Consent subject to the conditions contained in the report (with authority to finalise any matter including conditions to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

PC212 TWC/2021/0722 - Former Youth Centre, Gower Street, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire

This application was a full application for the erection of 10no. new dwellings and the conversion of the existing listed building to provide 3no. new dwellings (Use Class C3), community facility (Use Class F2 (b)) and Parish Council Offices (Use Class E(g)) together with associated landscaping at the Former Youth Centre, Gower Street, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire.

Councillor I Fletcher left the meeting for items TWC/2021/0722 and TWC/2021/0724.

The Planning Officer addressed Members that this application was for full and listed consent for the renovation of the northern wing, central entrance area and the southern wing and secured funds to relocate the existing play area on the site of the Women's Institute Building on the opposite end of Albion Street but that the application did involve the removal of the community garden. The building was unsafe to use in its current state.

Mr A Gaut, member of the public, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the restoration of the building for the benefit of the community, impact on neighbouring properties, loss of sunlight, overdevelopment, removal of the play area, lack of public consultation, limited school places, the impact on the local doctors surgery, reduced community activities as a community hub and limited use for refreshments and the lack of an outdoor play area.

The Planning Officer informed Members that there had been several interested parties who wished to speak but in accordance with the Council's adopted public speaking policy had been unable to do so. These included representatives of the Gower Heritage Enterprise Foundation, St Georges Community Group and Mr Edwards.

These representations wished to state that the development was best suited as a community facility for the wellbeing of the local community without housing and for the social and economic benefit of its surroundings and that it required a fully fitted play park and outdoor space. Concerns were raised that sustainability and the Climate Change Action Plan had been ignored, open spaces were to be demolished, there was a lack of a sustainable business plan and that the community had been excluded from the engagement

process with stakeholders, it was an asset of community value, the trees had not been protected, an unviable scheme, loss of community use was not outweighed by the improvements, impact on the designated heritage asset which needed special regard and to be preserved as a listed building and its setting and its unacceptable impact. The Officer advised that Members had also viewed the proposal from Mr and Mrs Gaut's property, 83 Albion Street, on the afternoon of the meeting. The Officer advised that there had been no objections from technical consultees and the officers recommendation remained the same that full consent and listed building consent should be granted.

The Legal advisor addressed the Members that as Cllr J Jones arrived late to the meeting and had not been in the meeting for the whole of the discussion she would be unable to take part in the vote.

During the debate some Members felt concerned that the building was in such a poor state following vandalism and neglect and that if no action was taken soon the building may not be saved and accepted that the housing on site mitigated the enormous costs it would take, the contribution towards the play area was welcomed although the siting of the play area some $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile away meant there would be a loss of the play facility in that part of St Georges. Concerns were raised regarding the two projecting blocks of houses close to the boundary, the height, the number of units in close proximity to the neighbours, the front doors to units 1, 2 and 3 were at the rear with parking to the front and it was requested that the design be reviewed to low rise or bungalows with the play area incorporated within the site. Other Members felt that although they understood the sentiment of the beautiful grade II listed building that economics were a big factor and the viability had to be taken into consideration and it was necessary to consider it was good value for money and had all options been exhausted. Further comments from Members were that the building couldn't wait for funding to come forward and that it needed to be secured now as it was currently an eyesore. It was about sustainability and creating spaces for future generations and at some point a decision for change would have to be made. It was with great reluctance that some Members felt they would have to accept the plans as there was no alternative in place.

The Planning Officer explained to Members that the scheme, even with the residential units, was still marginally unviable. The Gower Heritage Foundation had tried to secure monies but it could only be assumed that the level of funding had not been reached as an offer had not been put forward at this stage.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority:

RESOVLED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to:

- a) The applicant/landowners submitting a Memorandum of

understanding (subject to indexation from the date of committee with terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to the following:

- i) Education contribution of:**
 - Primary £40,121 (towards education facilities within two miles of the development), and**
 - Secondary £17,100 (expansion of Telford Langley School);**
- ii) Children's Play/Recreation contribution of £50,000.00 towards provision within 1km of the development;**
- iii) Monitoring of Memorandum of Understanding contribution of £2,344.42.**

b) The conditions contained in the report

(with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions, legal agreement terms, or any later variations delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

PC213 TWC/2021/0724 - Former Youth Centre, Gower Street, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire

Councillor I Fletcher left the meeting for items TWC/2021/0722 and TWC/2021/0724.

The Planning Officer addressed Members that this application was for full and listed consent for the renovation of the northern wing, central entrance area and the southern wing and secured funds to relocate the existing play area on the site of the Women's Institute Building on the opposite end of Albion Street but that the application did involve the removal of the community garden. The building was unsafe to use in its current state.

Mr A Gaut, member of the public, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the restoration of the building for the benefit of the community, impact on neighbouring properties, loss of sunlight, overdevelopment, removal of the play area, lack of public consultation, limited school places, the impact on the local doctors surgery, reduced community activities as a community hub and limited use for refreshments and the lack of an outdoor play area.

The Planning Officer informed Members that there had been several interested parties who wished to speak but in accordance with the Council's adopted public speaking policy had been unable to do so. These included representatives of the Gower Heritage Enterprise Foundation, St Georges Community Group and Mr Edwards.

These representations wished to state that the development was best suited as a community facility for the wellbeing of the local community without housing and for the social and economic benefit of its surroundings and that it required a fully fitted play park and outdoor space. Concerns were raised that sustainability and the Climate Change Action Plan had been ignored, open spaces were to be demolished, there was a lack of a sustainable business plan and that the community had been excluded from the engagement process with stakeholders, it was an asset of community value, the trees had not been protected, an unviable scheme, loss of community use was not outweighed by the improvements, impact on the designated heritage asset which needed special regard and to be preserved as a listed building and its setting and its unacceptable impact. The Officer advised that Members had also viewed the proposal from Mr and Mrs Gaut's property, 83 Albion Street, on the afternoon of the meeting. The Officer advised that there had been no objections from technical consultees and the officers recommendation remained the same that full consent and listed building consent should be granted.

The Legal advisor addressed the Members that as Cllr J Jones arrived late to the meeting and had not been in the meeting for the whole of the discussion she would be unable to take part in the vote.

During the debate some Members felt concerned that the building was in such a poor state following vandalism and neglect and that if no action was taken soon the building may not be saved and accepted that the housing on site mitigated the enormous costs it would take, the contribution towards the play area was welcomed although the siting of the play area some $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile away meant there would be a loss of the play facility in that part of St Georges. Concerns were raised regarding the two projecting blocks of houses close to the boundary, the height, the number of units in close proximity to the neighbours, the front doors to units 1, 2 and 3 were at the rear with parking to the front and it was requested that the design be reviewed to low rise or bungalows with the play area incorporated within the site. Other Members felt that although they understood the sentiment of the beautiful grade II listed building that economics were a big factor and the viability had to be taken into consideration and it was necessary to consider it was good value for money and had all options been exhausted. Further comments from Members were that the building couldn't wait for funding to come forward and that it needed to be secured now as it was currently an eyesore. It was about sustainability and creating spaces for future generations and at some point a decision for change would have to be made. It was with great reluctance that some Members felt they would have to accept the plans as there was no alternative in place.

The Planning Officer explained to Members that the scheme, even with the residential units, was still marginally unviable. The Gower Heritage Foundation had tried to secure monies but it could only be assumed that the level of funding had not been reached as an offer had not been put forward at this stage.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority:

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant listed building consent subject to:

- a) The brickwork being repointed and recut
- b) The conditions contained within the report

(with authority to finalise any matter including conditions to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

Councillor I Fletcher returned to the meeting.

PC214 TWC/2021/0822 - 30 Highgrove Meadows, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire TF2 9RJ

This application was for the erection of first floor front extension, installation of a second floor rear dormer and retrospective single storey ground floor rear extension at 30 Highgrove Meadows, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9RJ

Councillor V Fletcher, Ward Member, had requested that this application be determined by the Planning Committee.

Councillor V Fletcher, spoke against the application which was in two parts with one being retrospective without consent. This development had caused many months of misery to the neighbours and during December to August had impeded neighbour amenity of their gardens and home and whilst working from home had suffered noise pollution and disturbance which was excessive and without any consideration. The installation of the 2nd floor dormer windows with transparent glass looks entirely over the garden of the neighbours giving them no privacy and destroying residential amenity, the dormer had wood cladding and was not in keeping with the street scene and was a fire risk, it blocked natural light from the neighbouring bathroom window and overshadowed the footpath which was detrimental to number 28 and it caused them additional costs for electricity and lighting and had an impact on global warming. It was considered an overdevelopment with cars needing on street parking which caused congestion due to it being a corner plot. The extension took up three quarters of the plot and dominated the neighbouring property.

Mr E Woodhouse, member of the public, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the 2nd storey overshadowing their property and the loss of light to the side window and sunlight from between the houses. The dormer overshadowed the rear garden, reduced the natural sunlight and compromised their privacy and was an overdevelopment of the plot with the visual appearance no longer in character with the street. The kitchen extension caused nine months of unnecessary disruption to neighbours with the children often confined to home due to noise, vibration and foul language it was impossible to work from home and on several occasions had to vacate

due to the disturbance at all times of the day and weekends. It was difficult for deliveries and working vehicles which caused dangerous congestion for pedestrians who had to walk off the footpath. There was conflict when contractors vehicles blocked access, wouldn't move their vehicles and became aggressive. A bigger project would be more distress if it were to go ahead.

The Planning Officer informed Members that they needed to consider the impact upon the residential amenity and design. The bathrooms was not a consideration and was given limited weight. With regard to design the planning authority has taken into consideration the permitted development rights and the proportions were in line with permitted development rights and did not require planning permission. However, planning permission would be required for the timber cladding as it was not a material used within the existing property and it was asked that Members consider whether the material was appropriate. The single storey extension was built in similar brick and was a retrospective application and did not impact the neighbours and was considered acceptable. The extension was not considered overdevelopment as it was contained within the site boundary. With regard to the nuisance cause to neighbours, the applicants had agreed to accept conditions and the submission of a construction management plan for the remainder of the works which would be proportionate to the development proposed. Officers considered that the application was compliant under BE1 and BE2.

During the debate some Member asked what would happen if the application was refused and what would happen to the single storey ground floor extension. Other Members felt that they took a dim view of retrospective applications and felt that the applicants should have a construction management plan and asked what hours were proposed for construction. The cladding material completed changed the frontage of the development and is not in keeping with the area. Further concerns raised were as it was a corner plot the illegal extension could be seen from the road and the dormer extension and cladding would be visible from the highway and from the gardens of 28 and 32 Highgrove Meadows and would overlook 48, 49, 50 and 51 entirely as the land sloped down. It would overshadow the neighbours amenity and be an eyesore and it was suggested that construction hours be limited to 9.30am to 2.30pm due to traffic becoming gridlocked. Some Members felt there were a lack of bathrooms for bedrooms 2 and 3 within the property.

The Planning Officer explained that if refused it would be considered whether it was expedient for enforcement action. The extension was 5cm deeper than permitted development. The bay window to the rear created a new side extension and under regulations was considered a permitted development. The actual depth was minimal and as a local authority it would have to be considered if it was appropriate to take enforcement action. The hours of construction would be similar to any residential development limited from 7.30am – 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday and Saturday, Sunday and Bank holidays typical hours. Although the timber cladding was not a common

feature in this part of the borough, it was a common material from properties elsewhere and there were no concerns on safety as it was a tried and tested product. With regard to the construction management plan this was a modest extension to a domestic property with the most significant part being the single storey rear extension which had already been implemented. There would be limited deliveries and sufficient parking spaces for 3 vehicles and as the site was at the end of an existing road with was expected there would be no highway issues. A constructions management plan with a full range of hours would enable construction to take place quickly and efficiently without causing too many issues. With regard to bathrooms, this was a matter for building regulations to consider and related more to HMOs than domestic properties.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority:-

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions contained within the report (with authority to finalise any matter including conditions to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

The meeting ended at 7.17 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday, 24 November 2021

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 24 November 2021 at 5.30 pm in West Stand, AFC Telford United, Watling Street, Wellington, Telford, TF1 2TU

Present: Councillors G H Cook, N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, J Jones, K Middleton, K S Sahota (as substitute for R Mehta), P J Scott and C F Smith (Chair)

In Attendance: K Denmark (Principal Planning Officer), I Ross (Legal Adviser) and M Turner (Area Team Planning Manager - East)

Apologies: Councillors J Loveridge and R Mehta

PC215 Declarations of Interest

Councillor G Cook declared an interest in planning applications TWC/2021/0594 and TWC/2021/0595 because he was a member of Wellington Town Council and had been present during the Committee's consideration of the applications and indicated that he would withdraw from the meeting during determination thereof.

In respect of planning application TWC/2016/0816, Councillor P Scott advised that he was a member of Newport Town Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

PC216 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC217 Site Visits

It was **RESOLVED** – that the following site visits take place:

TWC/2021/0871 – Holy Trinity Academy
TWC/2020/1056 = Land at The Hem, Nedge lane
TWC/2021/0637 - Former Builders Yard, Barrack Lane, Lilleshall
TWC/2021/0796 land at Station Road Newport
TWC/2021/0879 - 25 Pinewoods, Church Aston.

It was advised that the site visits be split over two days.

PC218 Planning Applications for Determination

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding [each planning application] [planning applications REFERENCE and REFERENCE].

PC219 TWC/2016/0816 - Royal Victoria Hotel, St Marys Street - 16/17 Water Lane, Newport, Shropshire

This application was for a Deed of Variation to the S106 Agreement in connection with the 2016 planning application for the conversion of the hotel into 7no. Apartments, two and three storey rear extension to hotel, erection of 21no. terraced dwellings with associated parking and landscaping at the Royal Victoria Hotel, St Marys Street/16 & 17 Water Lane, Newport, Shropshire and the demolition of 16 and 17 Water Lane.

It sought to remove an obligation to pay commuted sums in respect of education sum of £72,070 and a sum of £16,800 towards recreation. In support of their application, viability assessment information had been provided previously to confirm that bringing this site forward would not be viable and that the requirement to pay the sums should be removed.

Viability information had been submitted and had been assessed by the Council's independent viability consultant, CBRE. Were the commuted sums to be paid, the return to the developer would not accord with that set out in the NPPF. The development had been hampered by constraints including the need to deal with the Grade Two listed building façade. It was therefore concluded that the provision of the commuted sums was not viable.

The Planning Officer referred to a late consultation response from Newport Town Council which made points including: that the Section 106 agreement was initiated at the time of the first application in 2016/17 and these costs were always going to part of the ongoing costs of the development and it was disingenuous to now reduce these very modest contributions which were for community benefit. Secondly, why should the developer be absolved from its responsibility bearing in mind the impact of the development together with the impact on local infrastructure, schools and recreation and thirdly, that this could set an unwelcome precedent for future development. The Town Council's representation also referred to the setbacks suffered by this development and that it was a continuing eyesore and dangerous structure which could result in a possible fatality and the destruction of the façade. The Town Council stressed the need for urgent action, enforcement if necessary and consideration of compulsory purchase as an option. The Town Council made reference to a dangerous structure notice on one section of the façade and the lengthy process required should a compulsory purchase order be required after service of an urgent works notice. The Planning Officer confirmed Officers' view that the benefits of the development coming forward would significantly and demonstrably outweigh harm arising out of the loss of the funding. The recommendation was put to members to approve the proposed variation of the s106 agreement.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns that the site was an eyesore and that everyone in Newport wanted it resolved, caution was needed to ensure that approval of this application did not open up opportunities for other developers to renege on an already-agreed S106 package, the building was vulnerable to falling down and that this needed to

be guarded against, the developer was holding the Council to ransom to an extent and that a 21 dwelling development should have helped with viability and reducing the commuted sums would increase the viability. Other Members felt that completing the development would help open up the public right of way which ran through the site which was important to many residents of Newport.

The Planning Officers confirmed that removal of the commuted sums would increase the return to developer to bring it more into line with margin allowed for profit under the NPPF and put them in a better position to move forward with the development. Alternative legislation could be used to lead to a compulsory purchase order if required. In terms of setting a bad precedent, Officers confirmed that this would not happen because a full viability assessment would be required in respect of each individual application and each assessment would be independently scrutinised.

Upon being put to the vote it was, unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that all required commuted sums to the Deed of Variation to the S106 Agreement be approved.

PC220 TWC/2020/0670 - Land adjacent 44 Wombridge Road, Wombridge, Telford, Shropshire

This application was for the erection of 1no. dwelling and relocation/reconfiguration of the existing stables and hay store on land adjacent, 44 Wombridge Road, Wombridge, Telford, Shropshire

The Planning officer confirmed that the site's existing use of a paddock for horses would be retained albeit repositioned and in terms of the principle of development, the site was located within the built up area of the borough where the principle of development was acceptable. With regards to the siting, design, scale and massing, the dwelling was considered to be an appropriate addition to the street scene and would be in-keeping with the adjacent properties. The current application responded more positively to the character of the area and was a significantly improved design when compared to one which was refused in 2020. The Applicant had worked to overcome the concerns initially raised by the Coal Authority and the Council's Drainage and Tree Officers due to the constraints on site. Amendments were submitted for consideration and there were no technical objections. The proposal remained subject to Condition(s) being imposed.

The legal advisor read out a written statement from Councillor S Reynolds in which he and local residents raised concerns predominantly related to coal mining, drainage (including flood risk), proximity to trees on site and in relation to archaeology and the proximity to St Leonards Priory (Wombridge) and the former burial ground. The land had a "brown land" classification and was deemed not to allow permission for dwellings.

The Planning Officer confirmed that although a restrictive covenant had been

referred to, Members were reminded that this was not a relevant planning consideration. Officers' view that there were no grounds to object to the principle of the development and the recommendation to Committee was to grant full planning permission.

During the debate some Members raised concerns regarding the restrictive covenant, archaeology, working hours during construction and the impact on the value of neighbouring properties. Other Members felt that a dwelling may improve the street scene it was difficult to find a reason to refuse the application.

Upon being put to the vote it was, unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions) subject to the conditions contained in the report.

PC221 TWC/2021/0594 - Former New College, Telford, King Street, Wellington, Telford

This application was for a full planning application and change of use of the former college (use class F1(a)) into supported accommodation consisting of 28no. self-contained units with associated staff facilities (use class sui generis) with associated internal and external alterations, including insertion of 2no. roof lights, 1no. window to rear elevation, replacement of existing boarding, installation of new disabled access ramp and handrails together with alteration to existing access on the Former New College Telford, King Street, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This application had been referred to the Planning Committee as the Council are the landowner.

Councillor G Cook withdrew from the meeting room during the committee's consideration and determination of this application.

The Planning Officer explained that this application related to the change of use and conversion of the former New College building to short term supported accommodation for young people. She clarified that New College was designated as a grade II listed building in 2020 and that all of the buildings over the wider site had been demolished with a scheme for that area being considered by the Council. She added that the proposed conversion would be used by homeless people and would be supported by the YMCA who would be operating the facility. The proposal would enable the young people to have some stability in their life, take on the responsibility of being required to look after a property and pay rent and assist them with getting credit ratings to be able to move into the housing market. A number of communal facilities would be available, such as a training room, laundry, cycle storage, charging points and garden areas.

The proposals would involve a number of external alterations to the building, such as the insertion of rooflights and 4 new windows, steps and handrails and CCTV cameras and cladding to the rear elevation following the removal of a large external link extension. This would replace the temporary cladding installed after the demolition works. Internally, the building would be subdivided to create the units. In terms of impacts on the listed building, the proposals would be sympathetic to enable the retention of the historic features within the building. Ten parking spaces would be provided to the rear of the building which was considered by officers to be sufficient to meet the requirements of the residents.

No objections had been raised to the proposals by statutory consultees, the Town Council supported the scheme and it was recommended that planning permission and listed building consent be granted as set out in the agenda.

During the debate some Members mentioned that One Councillor mentioned that he had been a governor at the school for 12 years and that he welcomed the retention of the building and the conversion to this accommodation and whole heartedly commended his fellow members to support it. Other Members raised concerns that the frontage to the building was being kept and refuse lorry manoeuvres.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the whole building was listed so the frontage would remain and that there were restrictions on vehicular movements but that the refuse lorries would still operate within appropriate distances from the properties.

Upon being put to the vote it was, unanimously:

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant Full Planning Permission (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions, or any later variations) subject to the conditions contained within the report.

PC222 TWC/2021/0595 - Former New College Telford, King Street, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This application was for the conversion of the former college into supported accommodation consisting of 28no. self-contained units with associated staff facilities with associated internal and external alterations, including installation of 2no. rooflights, 1no. window to rear elevation, replacement of existing boarding, installation of new disabled access ramp and handrails (Listed Building Application) on the Former New College Telford, King Street, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This application had been referred to the Planning Committee as the Council are the landowner.

Councillor G Cook withdrew from the meeting room during the committee's consideration and determination of this application.

The Planning Officer explained that this application related to the change of use and conversion of the former New College building to short term supported accommodation for young people. She clarified that New College was designated as a grade II listed building in 2020 and that all of the buildings over the wider site had been demolished with a scheme for that area being considered by the Council. She added that the proposed conversion would be used by homeless people and would be supported by the YMCA who would be operating the facility. The proposal would enable the young people to have some stability in their life, take on the responsibility of being required to look after a property and pay rent and assist them with getting credit ratings to be able to move into the housing market. A number of communal facilities would be available, such as a training room, laundry, cycle storage, charging points and garden areas.

The proposals would involve a number of external alterations to the building, such as the insertion of rooflights and 4 new windows, steps and handrails and CCTV cameras and cladding to the rear elevation following the removal of a large external link extension. This would replace the temporary cladding installed after the demolition works. Internally, the building would be subdivided to create the units. In terms of impacts on the listed building, the proposals would be sympathetic to enable the retention of the historic features within the building. Ten parking spaces would be provided to the rear of the building which was considered by officers to be sufficient to meet the requirements of the residents.

No objections had been raised to the proposals by statutory consultees, the Town Council supported the scheme and it was recommended that planning permission and listed building consent be granted as set out in the agenda. During the debate some Members mentioned that One Councillor mentioned that he had been a governor at the school for 12 years and that he welcomed the retention of the building and the conversion to this accommodation and wholeheartedly commended his fellow members to support it. Other Members raised concerns that the frontage to the building was being kept and refuse lorry manouveres.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the whole building was listed so the frontage would remain and that there were restrictions on vehicular movements but that the refuse lorries would still operate within appropriate distances from the properties.

Upon being put to the vote it was unanimously:

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant Listed Building Consent (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions, or any later variations) subject to the conditions contained in the report.

The meeting ended at 6.17 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday, 15 December 2021

This page is intentionally left blank