PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 20 May 2020 at 2.00 pm in Remote Meeting

<u>Present:</u> Councillors N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, A S Jhawar, J Jones, J E Lavery (as substitute for K Middleton), P J Scott, C F Smith (Chair) and C R Turley

<u>In Attendance:</u> A Gittins (Area Team Planning Manager - West), V Hulme (Development Management Service Delivery Manager), I Ross (Legal Adviser) and M Turner (Area Team Planning Manager - East)

Apologies: Councillors J Loveridge and K Middleton

PC80 Declarations of Interest

Cllr P Scott declared that he had received an email from the Applicant on planning application TWC/2020/0116 and that he had helped the applicant get in touch with the Parish Council but that he had not had any further input with regards to this application.

PC81 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

<u>RESOLVED</u> – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 28 April 2020 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC82 <u>Deferred/Withdrawn Applications</u>

None.

PC83 Site Visits

None.

PC84 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 prior to the meeting regarding planning application TWC/2020/0210 and TWC/2020/0218.

PC85 TWC/2020/0116 - Land Adjacent to Yew Tree Manor, Pave Lane, Chetwynd Aston, Newport, Shropshire

This was an application full planning permission for a change of use and creation of a Ménage including the erection of a fence on land adjacent to Yew Tree Manor, Pave Lane, Chetwynd Aston, Newport, Shropshire. The ménage would measure 20 metres in width by 40 metres in length, and be

constructed from a non-woven membrane with a riding surface on top. A 1.3 metre high timber fence would be constructed around the border to keep the horses contained and would be accessed from the south, from the entrance to Yew Tree Barn.

Councillor A Eade, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

Councillor D Griffin spoke on behalf of the Parish Councillor who raised representations regarding the impact on Yew Tree Manor, the conditions with regards to lighting and whether the ménage could be turned 90 degrees or relocated to the adjoining field. It was also asked that the hedge be put in place prior to the ground works commencing.

Councillor A Eade, Ward Councillor, spoke against the application and he raised concerns regarding the application was contrary to Policy BE1 Section 1 and Section 2, the impact on the landscape and neighbouring property, the slope of the land, highway safety and visual access to the site. He requested that the condition no business use be changed to personal use only.

Mrs E Williams, a member of the public, spoke against the application which she felt went against Policy BE1 and raised concerns regarding the segmenting of the land, future business use, controls and monitoring of the site, highway visibility, impact on the amenity, additional noise, the establishment of the hedgerow and asked that the ménage be relocated to the adjoining field.

Mr W Askin, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application. This area was already used for practice and the horses were schooled, lunged and jumped without loss of amenity, noise or light pollution. Having to travel off site would create unnecessary equine traffic. There would be no lighting, a two metre hedge would screen the area from the ground floor. The ground would be excavated to reduce the height of the horse and rider and there would be no access by the general public. The alternative site would impact 6 dwellings and the local public house/beer gardens and the horses could not be grazed on this site.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the landscaping would soften the visual appearance of the ménage that there would be no additional traffic created and that a condition would be changed from "no business use" to "personal use only".

During the ensuing debate, some Members felt that due to the change to the condition to "personal use only" and confirmation that there would be no lighting on the site, the establishment of a hedge and the alternative site was not suitable that they were happy to support the application. Other Members raised concerns regarding it being contrary to Policy BE1, the slope of the ground, noise and impact on amenity and it was suggested that a site visit take place.

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

<u>RESOLVED</u> – that in respect of Planning Application TWC/2020/0116 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the Conditions set out in the report, as amended to restrict the use of the ménage to personal use only, and the proposed new hedgerow being of a native species (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

PC86 <u>TWC/2020/0210 - Sunnycroft View, 209 Holyhead Road,</u> Wellington, Telford TF1 2DP

This application was for the change of use from a dwelling house (use class C3) to residential institution (use class C2) at Sunnycroft View, 209 Holyhead Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire TF1 2DP.

Councillor M Hosken, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

Councillor M Hosken, Ward Councillor, spoke against the application and he raised concerns regarding the watercourse and drainage, the house had been built for use as a residential home, lack of consultation of neighbouring properties, highway safety, impact on neighbours and the impact on the National Trust House and he asked if this application could be deferred until the legal position had been clarified with the drainage and for further information regarding the residential use.

Mr M Wilcox, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application. The watercourse and drainage would be dealt legally via a search and survey and he felt there were no serious issues that would compromise the house. It would be conducive to a normal family environment and part of the community and having a National Trust facility nearby would benefit the children. Highways had not objected to the application and standard consultation procedure had been undertaken by the Planning Department.

The Planning Officer confirmed there would be no physical alterations to the house. Care would be provided by up to three carers and a manager would be assigned and would oversee the site. The maximum of 4-5 staff on site at any one time. There would be space to park and turn seven vehicles which exceeded the Telford Local Plan parking standards it was felt that there would not be unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties.

During the ensuing debate, some Members raised concerns regarding the type of placements, the number of visitors such as Ofsted, the security and welfare of the children, lack of comments from Police and Fire Authority, highway and access safety and the flooding. Other Members felt that this would be similar to a normal family household of five, there would be no impact on the nearby National Trust property, it would be an asset to Telford and Wrekin and there were no planning reasons to refuse the application.

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

<u>RESOLVED</u> - that in respect of Planning Application TWC/2020/0210 that delegated authority be granted to the Delivery Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to 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).

PC87 <u>TWC/2020/0218 - Former Dairy Crest Ltd, Crudgington, Telford, Shropshire</u>

This application was for the erection of 7no. dwellings with associated parking and roads at the former Dairy Crest Ltd, Crudgington, Telford, Shropshire.

This application had been referred to Planning Committee as it contained a S106 Agreement to secure financial contributions and affordable housing.

An update report was circulated prior to the meeting.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this was an additional seven dwellings to the 111 dwellings that had already been approved on the site. The application site had previously been approved for commercial workshops, but a separate parcel of land had now come forward and an application had been submitted to officers to relocate the workshops. The density and design of the development was acceptable and drainage, ecology and trees were subject to pre-commencement conditions. It was proposed that there would be two affordable units which was compliant with policy together with financial contributions towards primary and secondary education of £80,000 which would be secured by a Deed of Variation to the original S106 Agreement.

Mr A Sheldon, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application and noted that there was no objections and that the application was supported by the Parish Council and asked that the scheme be approved.

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

<u>RESOLVED</u> - that in respect of planning application TWC/2020/0218 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the following:

- a) The applicant/landowners entering in to a Deed of Variation to the original Section 106 agreement (TWC/2015/0157) with the Local Planning Authority (subject to indexation with terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to:
- i) The provision of two additional affordable dwellings

- ii) Increase education contributions to £314,735 (Primary) and £197,969 (Secondary)
- b) the conditions contained in the report and the update report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

| Chairman: | |
|-----------|-------------------------|
| Date: | Wednesday, 15 July 2020 |

The meeting ended at 3.12 pm