

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 18 December 2019 at 6.00 pm in Telford Suite, The Whitehouse Hotel, Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NJ

Present: Councillors E A Clare (Reserve) (as substitute for J Loveridge), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, A S Jhavar, J Jones, K Middleton, P J Scott, C F Smith (Chair) and C R Turley

In Attendance:

Apologies: Councillors J Loveridge

PC41 Declarations of Interest

None.

PC42 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 23 October 2019 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC43 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC44 Site Visits

None.

PC45 Tree Preservation Order

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Director: Governance, Procurement & Commissioning seeking confirmation of a provisional Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

On 29 July 2019 a provisional Tree Preservation Order was made in respect of one cherry tree. On 27 August 2019 an objection to the TPO was received from Mrs Natalie Marsh, the owner of the property in respect of the cherry tree.

Mr M Seabrook - Tree & Woodland Officer, gave Members a brief background to the site which was now a fully developed site and screened the properties. The trees along the lane were retained through the planning process and the owner of the land has now requested that the beech trees and cherry tree along the lane be removed. The beech trees had been planted with the intention of growing them into a hedge but these had been neglected although these could be cut back to encourage growth to thicken the base and increase

privacy, but this would not be possible with the cherry tree as it was a tree within the hedge in its own right and did not lend itself to form part of a hedgerow. A footway and highway lay next to the hedgerow and the cherry tree had become of significant amenity value over the last 40 years and of benefit to the local wildlife and that a Tree Preservation Order had been deemed necessary and Members were asked to confirm the Order without modification.

During the debate some Members felt that the tree was of sufficient distance from the house, remedial works could be undertaken such as lopping and pruning to enhance the tree and that there were insufficient gains to justify cutting down the tree.

The decision was then put to vote. All members voted in favour of confirming the Tree Preservation Order.

RESOLVED That Tree Preservation Order (Cherry Tree at Paddock House, 1 William Ball Drive, Horsehay, Telford TF4 2SQ) be confirmed without modification.

PC46 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 TWC/2019/0672 and TWC/2019/0753.

PC47 TWC/2018/0701 - Site of former Charlton School, Severn Drive, Dothill, Telford, Shropshire

This was an outline application for up to 200no. dwellings, retention of the existing sports hall building for community uses (Use Class D2) with associated car park, public open space, landscaping, attenuation areas and associated infrastructure together with approval for access arrangements from Harley Close and Severn Drive with all matters to be reserved on site of the former Charlton School, Severn Drive, Dothill, Telford.

This application was before Committee as it involves the Council as landowner and included financial contributions secured by a Memorandum of Understanding.

Councillor K Tomlinson, Ward Councillor, spoke on the application and raised concerns regarding the pedestrian footway, lack of street lighting on the footpath linking Harley Close to McCormick Drive, highway safety particularly around Whitchurch Road/North Road junction, flooding and drainage and asked for clarification with regard to play facilities.

Mr T Ayres, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application and explained that this application formed part of the BSF programme through which the a new school was built which is a legacy the Council can be proud

of. He acknowledged that the proposal was not policy compliant regarding the provision of affordable housing but we can see that the new school has been provided and there will be a community benefit of up to 200 new houses and highway improvements to Apley Avenue and Whitchurch Road. The car parking area would be increased to allow parking for the football pitches and there would be public open and accessible green space. A Memorandum of Understanding would be required for highway contributions, the NEAP and the public open space.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the application before them was for the principle of development together with points of access with all other matters reserved. This was part of the final stage of the Council's BSF programme and was a development in the Telford urban area which had good connectivity and met local and National Policy. A third of the site would be developed with the remaining two thirds being playing fields and this had been accepted in principle by Sport England with new off-site sports facilities being provided. The layout was indicative at this stage and there were no objections on highway grounds and there would be financial contribution to improve Apley Avenue and Whitchurch Road. Parking provision had been improved. The SUDs pond would be contained within the green guarantee area and details of this would form part of the reserved matters application.

The Highways Officer informed Members that the improvements would take place on the Whitchurch Road/North Road Junction with contributions from this coming from a neighbouring development and that the highway contributions from this application would be used to improve Apley Avenue/Whitchurch Road.

During the debate some Members asked for clarification regarding who the applicant was and raised concerns regarding the lack of affordable housing, public access to the SUDs pond, the cost of the LEAP and if this should be conditioned, layout, the overflow car parking needed to be closer to the Park Gym. Other Members felt that the design was acceptable but were concerned regarding the density, lighting on the Harley Close/McCormack Drive footpath and the flood risks on Coney Green Way.

The Planning Officer confirmed to Members that the Applicant was the Council. He confirmed that there would be no public access to the SUDs pond and that this area would be a biodiversity gain on the green guarantee site and would be barriered to prevent public access. A boundary treatment condition would be required. With regard to the LEAP this was proposed as part of the scheme and would be positioned next to the Gym and this had been assessed by the Healthy spaces Officer.

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager explained that the financial contribution was only set if the LEAP was being built off-site.

The Planning Officer explained levels on the site were challenging and the overflow car park had been positioned on the higher level utilising the current hard standing. With regard to street lighting the Planning Officer was not

aware of any discussions and this was not part of the application. Drainage officers had considered the flood risk and no objections were raised.

On being put to the vote it was, by unanimously:

RESOLVED – that in respect of planning application TWC/2018/0701 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission subject to the following:

- a) The applicant/landowners entering into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Local Planning Authority (subject to indexation from the date of committee with terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to:
 - i) Highways contribution of £455,700
 - ii) Ecology contribution of £33,400
 - iii) Provision of LEAP and POS on site
 - iv) Confirmation of Management of POS
- b) the conditions set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager) and
- c) an extra informative requesting the applicant to consider low carbon technologies at the reserved matters application stage.

PC48 **TWC/2019/0473 - Land adjacent 17 Charlton, Telford, Shropshire**

This application was for the erection of 2no. detached dwellings with associated access on land at 17 Charlton, Telford, Shropshire.

This application had been called in by Wrockwardine Parish Council.

Councillor P Cooper, spoke against the application on behalf of the Parish Council who raised concerns regarding overdevelopment, car parking, layout pinch point in the lane, access and egress for larger vehicles include refuse lorries and agricultural vehicles, highway safety in respect of pedestrians and cyclists, flooding and the development was not in keeping with surrounding buildings.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this application was within the rural area but a reserved matters application had been granted in 2013. Objections received had been addressed within the report and officers felt that there was sufficient space for vehicular movements and car parking and density was acceptable. With regard to drainage this could be controlled with conditions. Any health and safety concerns regarding the location of butane gas bottles for central heating was not a material consideration. Due to the

size of the development it was not intended to impose a congestion management plan.

During the debate some Members considered that officers had addressed all of the concerns. Other Members felt that the principal of development had already been conceded but raised concerns regarding the manoeuvrability of vehicles within the site, parking did not meet standards but overall it was an acceptable development.

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

RESOLVED - that in respect of planning application TWC/2019/0473 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions, informatives and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

PC49 TWC/2019/0672 - Land adjacent 39 Shawbirch Road, Admaston, Telford, Shropshire

This application was for the erection of a new medical centre (Class D1) with associated parking and landscaping on land adjacent to 39 Shawbirch Road, Admaston, Telford, Shropshire.

This application had been called in by the neighbouring Ward Councillor.

A written update was circulated at the meeting which contained information regarding formatting errors within the report, a correction to the Ward Councillor comments, the receipt of 12 letters of support and the submission of an additional plan showing the indicative location of highway works.

Councillor B Tomlinson, adjoining Ward Councillor, agreed with the application in principle but raised concerns with difficulties with the planning portal prior to the Committee meeting, the loss of green network, water supply pipe, road access, the preference of pedestrian refuges to a single signalised crossing, limited bus service, lack of footpath, highway safety, amount of vehicular movements, lack of disabled car parking spaces and felt that there should be a taxi parking and a drop-off point.

Dr P Davies, Applicant, informed Members that the current surgery had been extended twice and there was no further scope to extend and that this had been identified by the CCG in 2016 as a high level need. The practice could grow up to another 4,000 patients which could not be accommodated on the current site. The development would have capacity for up to 20,000 patients and would be a vibrant community based hub with a project based business case and funding from the CCG of £1m. The grant from the CCG was time limited until March 2020. Other sites had been explored but proved unsuitable. The site was close to a bypass, easily accessible and fully viable and had support from local residents.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the development was within the urban boundary and although on the green network the development could be allowed due to the exceptional circumstances of the case and the significant social and community gains. The green network currently had little contribution to visual and ecological value and the benefits on balance were in favour of the medical centre. Highway safety was the key consideration and pedestrian refuges would be located along Shawbirch Road either side of Brandon Avenue with the existing pavement being extended to meet the refuge secured by a Section 278 Agreement and this would be beneficial to pedestrians, especially vulnerable ones, who would be able to cross the road in a two stage process.

The Highways Officer informed Members that the development would frame the gateway to Brandon Avenue and this would reinforce the speed limit in place. There would be adequate parking and although a mini roundabout had been considered this was not required as the junction had been capacity tested and would operate at one quarter capacity and there would be no dropped kerbs. Pedestrian safety had been addressed by the pedestrian refuges and a signalised pedestrian crossing would be difficult to achieve. Severn Trent had no objections and the design and scale was considered appropriate with suitable separation distances from the nearby properties, but secure glazing would be added to protect privacy, where necessary.

During the discussion some Members felt that this was a good news story and due to its time limited nature it should be approved, but it was suggested that the neighbouring ward councillor should continue to fight for a signalised pedestrian crossing. Other Members considered the development attractive and that the solar panels were a benefit although a concern was raised that there was a delivery bay but no ambulance bay. Further concerns were raised regarding opening hours and if the contributions towards highway improvements were conditioned but on the whole Members fully supported the application.

The Planning Officer confirmed that opening hours would be secured via Planning Condition and confirmed the financial contributions would be secured by a condition and Section 278 Agreement.

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

RESOLVED - that in respect planning application TWC/2019/0672 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and the update report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

PC50 TWC/2019/0753 - Land between Arleston Lane & Dawley Road, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for the erection of an Extra Care Facility containing 70no. self-contained flats (use Class C2) and associated communal/public facilities and erection of 105no. residential dwelling (Use Class C3) with associated access, landscaping and ancillary works. This application had been referred to Planning Committee as a major development which required a S106 Agreement.

An update report was tabled which set out information regarding developer contributions, the balancing pond and drainage information, together with an amended plan.

Councillor A McClements, Ward Councillor, spoke against the application which she had been opposing since 2012 and raised concerns regarding the increase of extra care units and residential units, highway safety, the effect on the neighbouring Arleston Village and houses bordering the development, drainage, overdevelopment and the increased traffic causing congestion on busy roads and junctions. She asked if the 10ft wall was due to be included within the scheme.

Mr G Davey, a member of the public, spoke on behalf of the residents group and raised concerns regarding the amount of public objections received, increase size of the care facility by 40%, viability study, lack of layout and design, the impact of the surrounding Arleston Village, footpath links, loss of badger sets and trees and drainage.

Mr J Howell, Applicant, informed Members previous applications had not been built as they were unviable. This had led to an increase of units on the site. Housing 21 had been secured for the extra care facility. Drainage and flooding concerns had been noted and additional water would be received into the balancing ponds and the future flow of water would be a reduction on the current flow. Three plots had been removed in order to protect amenity and dust screens, a wheel wash and other measures would be put in place to protect the neighbouring village. The site would also include green infrastructure.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the application was within the urban area of Telford and, although located on the green network, public open space would be created near to the extra care facility. Planning applications had previously been approved on this site in 2012, 2016 and 2018 but had not been built out due to viability issues and they had not secured an extra care provider at that time. Housing 21 had been secured to run the extra care facility and they would be a signatory to the S106 agreement. There had been an increase of units on the site in order to make this viable, but the mass of the facility had been reduced. Density was acceptable and it was less visible within the street scene and would have appropriate landscaping.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns regarding the overdevelopment of the site, lack of parking spaces, loss of trees and the growth of Japanese knot weed and it was asked for clarification regarding the play facility. Other Members raised further concerns regarding the extra care

facility not being fit for purpose due to lack of staff parking, no off-site parking, no cycle store, no delivery area and no facility for emergency vehicles, drainage, the cumulative effect of increased traffic, the impact on the Grade II listed building and it was asked if the 10ft wall was to be included within the scheme. It was suggested that this application be deferred for further consideration of the concerns raised.

The Planning Officer confirmed to Members that the parking met current standards with a minimum 2 car spaces and more for larger properties with 240 in total. With regard to Japanese knot weed, this would be dealt with by an environmental management plan with the Environment Agency and removal was the developer's responsibility. The Arboricultural Officer was content with the removal of the trees subject to certain conditions. Parking for 32 vehicles for the extra care facility lay to the south east side of the development with parking for taxis and ambulances within the courtyard. Visitor parking was within the internal estate roads and secured cycle parking would be provided. The drainage information had been received late in the day, but this had been presented on the update report and drainage officers were satisfied. With regard to the 10ft wall at Midfields the Planning Officer stated that there would be reasonable separation distances from the neighbouring properties and, due to the level differences, the area would be naturally landscaped with a smaller wall and some close board fencing. The Healthy Spaces Officer had agreed the provision of contributions totalling £150,000 towards the enhancement/upgrading of nearby play areas. Separation distances from Arleston Manor were 41m and it was felt that there would be no detrimental impact.

The Highways Officer informed Members that the parking standards had not been met with regard to staff parking, but the care provider did not feel that this was required.

It was moved and seconded that this application be deferred for further discussions to take place on the concerns raised.

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

RESOLVED – that in respect of Planning Application TWC/2019/0753 that this application be deferred for one cycle in order for further consideration to be given to staff parking, drainage, density, overdevelopment, highway safety, visibility and Policy C3 of the NPPF with regard to the cumulative effect on the traffic.

The meeting ended at 8.06 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday, 15 January 2020