

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 23 September 2020 at 2.00 pm in Remote Meeting**

**Present:** Councillors N A Dugmore, R T Kiernan (Reserve) (as substitute for I T W Fletcher), J Loveridge (Reserve) (as substitute for J Jones), K S Sahota (Reserve) (as substitute for R Mehta), P J Scott, C F Smith (Chair) and C R Turley (Vice-Chair)

**In Attendance:** A Gittins (Area Team Planning Manager - West), V Hulme (Development Management Service Delivery Manager) and I Ross (Legal Adviser)

**Apologies:** Councillors I T W Fletcher, J Jones, R Mehta and K Middleton

#### **PC102     Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Kiernan declared an interest in planning application TWC/2020/0624 due to his involvement with the Free Masons but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

#### **PC103     Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 02/09/2020 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

#### **PC104     Deferred/Withdrawn Applications**

None.

#### **PC105     Site Visits**

None.

#### **PC106     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/2020/0446 - Site of Haughmond Court & Apley Court, Dothill, Telford, Shropshire

TWC/2020/0410 - Site of Doseley Industrial Estate, Frame Lane, Doseley, Telford, Shropshire

TWC/2020/0624 - Site of Masonic Hall, Constitution Hill, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

TWC/2019/1042 - Former Concrete Works, Lightmoor Road, Lightmoor, Telford, Shropshire.

**PC107**     **TWC/2019/1042 - Former Concrete Works, Lightmoor Road, Lightmoor, Telford, Shropshire**

(Cllr Kiernan returned to the meeting for this agenda item)

This was an application that sought reserved matters approval for the erection of 52no dwellings including details for scale, appearance and landscaping pursuant to outline application TWC/2016/0107.

Amended plans relating to the external design of the buildings, floorspace and garden requirements, the retaining walls and the ecological corridor to the north were submitted during the course of the application. These were all submitted at the request of the Planning Officer and consultees.

Mr Wennington – member of the public spoke against this application. He shared his concerns for the Great Crested Newt's habitats as they were within close proximity to the proposed site as they are protected creatures. The development and removal of trees may cause a detrimental effect on them.

Mr Wennington also shared his concerns regarding potential flooding within the area and sought assurance on these concerns.

Mr Gittins – Planning Officer, assured the committee that £10,000 had been secured in order to protect the Great Crested Newts and the Shropshire Wildlife Trust were in conversation with the developers regarding the situation and details of the habitats will need to be submitted.

The Ecology Team were satisfied with the proposal and there had been no objections from the Tree Officer. A construction exclusion zone had been planned to address any concerns regarding the wildlife within the vicinity.

Members raised concerns regarding drainage and the significant surface water increase that had been seen more in recent years that may not have been taken into account within the allowance for climate change statistics.

Mr Gittins – Planning Officer explained that an ecological buffer and a relocated footpath had been formalised through this application proposal and that, although a larger drainage system to drain in excess of 1 in 100 year events would be beneficial, it is not possible to request a system to accommodate in excess of such an event.

On being put to the vote it was, unanimously:

**RESOLVED** – that in respect of planning application TWC/2019/1042 delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant Reserved Matters subject to the conditions and informatives (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager) set out in the report.

**PC108**     **TWC/2020/0410 - Site of Doseley Industrial Estate, Frame Lane, Doseley, Telford, Shropshire**

This application sought full planning permission for the erection of 48 dwellings on land at Doseley Industrial Estate, Doseley and was referred to Planning Committee as a section 106 is required to secure financial contributions and affordable housing.

Cllr Hopkins – Parish Council Representative spoke against this application. He raised concerns that the site was not disused and there were businesses still trading on the industrial estate whom would like to continue operating there. He shared concerns that the developers were looking to purchase the land and sell it for profit rather than to invest in business and jobs within the area. He shared that if the application were to be approved this would increase strain on highways and cause on road parking.

Cllr Seymour - Adjoining Ward Councillor (representing Cllr Jayne Greenaway – Ward Councillor) spoke against this application. She shared that the site provided work spaces for small to medium businesses and was unable to accommodate large HGV vehicles. Some of the businesses who currently reside on the industrial estate have not been able to relocate as there was nowhere similar to meet their business needs within the borough. Cllr Seymour shared her concerns that developers were looking for a housing for profit scheme over a working site. The area would need to be levelled as in its current state, it was too steep for use. The off-site play area was too far away for potential residents to make use of. Frame Lane was very narrow with intermittent footpaths making it inaccessible. There had been no bus service for the area since July 2018.

Mr Hooper – Agent for Applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He informed the Committee that the site was currently used as an industrial site, however the buildings had become tired and needed updating. The current site caused noise nuisance to residential properties and therefore the applicant had been working with these businesses to secure alternative premises for them. The site provided good access and new pedestrian route was proposed. A s106 agreement would be entered into to ensure funding for local schools and highways.

Mr Gittins – Planning Officer explained to the Committee that the loss of land for employment purposes was key issues and that it was a balanced case. The principle of the proposed redevelopment of the site for residential purposes could be supported as the site was not an allocated employment site. Businesses would receive help to relocate. A new access was proposed to include a pedestrian footpath provided across the site frontage. There would be minimal impact on traffic along with a reduction of HGV's and LGV's. The Conservation Officer was content with scheme and there had been no objections from internal consultees.

Members raised questions regarding possible land contamination and highways improvements. They were concerned with the potential demolition of industrial units that were still in use and the financial impact that would have on the businesses. Members sought clarity on the education and highways contributions within the s106 agreement.

Mr Gittins – Planning Officer explained that the Streetworks Team were looking at improvements to Frame Lane and was due to go out to consultation.

Ms Hulme – (Development Management Service Delivery Manager) informed members that the plans for highways were part of a wider scheme that included traffic calming. There were also plans for a bus service to be reinstated.

Upon being put to vote, it was unanimously:

**Resolved: that in respect of planning application TWC/2020/0410 delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to:**

**A) the applicant/landowners entering into a Section 106 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 £25,000**
- ii) Playspace and public open space contribution of £31,850**
- iii) Education contribution of £316,562**
- iv) Provision of 25% affordable housing**

**B) The conditions and informatives (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager) set out in the update report.**

**PC109     TWC/2020/0446 - Site of Haughmond Court & Apley Court, Dothill, Telford, Shropshire**

This application was called to Committee at the request of Cllr Karen Tomlinson.

The application sought full planning permission for an 81 unit Extra Care Facility owned and operated by Wrekin Housing Trust on a social rented basis, comprising 38no one bedroom and 43 two bedroom apartments. A ground floor café, lounge area and hairdressers for use by residents and members of the public would be provided and termed the Community Hub; with buggy store, ancillary office accommodation, laundry and plant. The accommodation is proposed to be delivered across each floor, comprising a mass of five and six storey heights (at the northern Apley Court end) which are shown to alter across the site depending on the changing site levels.

Mr Camp – Member of the public spoke against this application. He shared with the Committee that his objections relate to the cutting down of trees, in particular, a cherry tree. He believed that cutting down healthy trees was not in keeping with the current climate emergency and his thoughts were shared

by other objecting members of the public. He shared the statistics regarding the death rate in Telford that relates to poor air quality.

Cllr K Tomlinson – Ward Councillor, spoke against this application. She raised concerns regarding the removal of trees, over development and the lack of consultation due to COVID-19. The updated proposal sought to build closer to the road and therefore will reduce the size of the existing car park.

Ms Heather Sutton – Agent for the Applicant, spoke in favour of the application. She shared that the proposed application would address the current shortage of supported living accommodation within the area. The application sought the removal of the current 9 storey building with a view to replacing it with a 5/6 storey building. The development would be delivered in 2 phases to allow current residents the option to stay in their homes until their new property is ready to move in to. With regards to tree removal, 7 trees would be removed and of which were 3 dead/unhealthy. 22 new trees were proposed to be planted and would include maple and cherry trees to represent the original ones. The proposed building would be contemporary energy efficient and high quality.

Mr Gittins – Planning Officer informed the Committee that the updated plans were closer to Severn Drive than previously proposed. Special attention had been paid to the windows and balconies. With regards to the tree removal, there would be an increase of 15 semi mature trees. The development would provide extra care facilities. Any harm would be outweighed by the benefits.

Members of the Committee welcomed this application as it would address the need for more supported accommodation. Concerns were raised with regards to the size of the refuse storage area and accessibility for refuse collection and emergency vehicles. Questions were raised regarding the consultation.

Ms Hulme – ((Development Management Service Delivery Manager) job) explained to Members of the Committee that the consultation went out in June, with the deadlines for comments being 3<sup>rd</sup> July. This was then extended to 10<sup>th</sup> July. This followed the standard 21 day consultation period.

Upon being put to vote, it was unanimously:

**RESOLVED: That in respect of planning application TWC/2020/0446 delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager) set out in the update report.**

**PC110 TWC/2020/0624 - Site of Masonic Hall, Constitution Hill, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire**

Ms Hulme made the Committee aware that the proposed site has been subject to enforcement complaints. These complaints we investigated and

then further investigated. The findings were that there had been an increase of ground level for the proposed application and therefore offered apologies on behalf of the Planning Department that this issue had not been identified sooner.

This application sought a minor material amendment to a scheme that was granted planning permission under reference TWC/2019/0711. The material amendment relates to the finished floor levels (FFL) of the dwellings being up to 500mm higher than approved.

Cllr Carter – Ward Councillor, spoke against this application. He shared with Committee that the local residents were unhappy due to the impact of the stark development that was overlooking their properties. The proposed development was now on a larger scale than first agreed. Residents' complaints consisted of loss of light and privacy due to the extra height and noise increase.

Mrs Lloyd – Member of the public, spoke against this application. She raised her concerns regarding overdevelopment of the area and believed that the developer saved money by not lowering the ground. She raised concerns that residents were not consulted and raising fence height would not lower the height of the houses.

Mr Knight – Applicant, spoke in favour of this application. He shared with the Committee that he worked for a small loyal workforce with the proposed application being their 4th site since 2014 and was purchased with planning permission. They were not a large scale building company and unfortunately had no knowledge of the height error originally. The reason for the error was due to the service plan with the floor level not being transferred to the report. Plans included the addition of trees within the boundary. He informed Committee that the raise in the height of the fences would be in accordance with height of the properties.

After clarification from the Legal Adviser regarding the general position relating to members' interests and committee decision making, Cllr Kiernan withdrew from the Committee meeting for this application saying that he would not be staying or voting on this application due to any potential conflict of interest due to his Free Mason membership.

Members stated that they had found the site visit useful and did not feel the increased height of 48cm would make much of a difference to the current residents view. Proposed tree planting was sufficient and the development would improve the area. A member raised questions regarding the number of parking spaces for residents.

Ms Denmark – Planning Officer, informed the Committee overdevelopment, scale, noise disturbance, highways and overshadowing were considered and deemed acceptable. Additional landscaping and higher fences would contribute to making the development acceptable. The original application's

parking did comply previously and provided garages remain as garages then parking will comply. Measures will be in place to prohibit garage conversions.

Upon being put to vote, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED: that in respect of planning application TWC/2020/0624 delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager) set out in the report.**

The meeting ended at 3.52 pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** Wednesday, 21 October 2020