

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 31 August 2022 at 6.00 pm in 4th Floor Meeting Room, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford TF3 4NT**

**Present:** Councillors G H Cook, N A Dugmore, J Loveridge, P J Scott and C F Smith (Chair), and B Wennington (as substitute for J Jones)

**In Attendance:** J Banks (Planning Officer), S Evans (Legal Advisor), A Gittins (Area Team Planning Manager - West), V Hulme (Development Management Service Delivery Manager), R Jones (Senior Planning Officer), I Lowe (Principal Planning Officer), K Robinson (Senior Democracy Officer (Scrutiny))

**Apologies:** Councillors I T W Fletcher, A S Jhawar and J Jones

#### **PC294     Declarations of Interest**

In respect of planning application TWC/2022/0242, Councillor Greenaway advised that she was a member of Lawley and Overdale Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

Councillor Dugmore advised that, in respect of planning application TWC/2022/0170, he was a member of Donnington and Muxton Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application. Councillor Dugmore also advised that he was a member of the Granville Country Park's management committee.

#### **PC295     Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chair

#### **PC296     Deferred/Withdrawn Applications**

None.

#### **PC297     Site Visits**

None.

#### **PC298     Planning Applications for Determination**

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

#### **PC299     TWC/2022/0170 - Granville Landfill, Grange Lane, Redhill, Telford, Shropshire**

This was an application for the variation of conditions on planning consent for the Granville Landfill site. The proposed amendment would extend operations beyond the 31 December 2025 closure date stipulated in Condition 6 of the existing planning consent to 31 December 2030. A further variation of was proposed to Condition 13(b) of the planning consent. This would reduce the maximum amount of waste and soil material permitted per day from 1,500 tonnes to 1,350 tonnes.

The Democratic Services Officer read aloud a representation from Councillor Veronica Fletcher, neighbouring ward councillor. The objection raised a number of key points covering highway issues, noise and disturbance for residents, smells and fumes from the site, and a desire to see the landfill closed in line with Telford & Wrekin's climate and recycling policies.

Councillor Lisa Dugmore, parish councillor, spoke against the application on environmental grounds and the impact of extension on residents.

Councillor Adrian Lawrence, ward councillor, made representations against the application because of the impact of the site on residents and the environmental impact of landfilling.

Helen Howard, member of the public, made a representation objecting to the application. Specific objections were made to outside waste being brought in to the landfill when Telford and Wrekin performed well in terms of recycling.

Georgina Daintith, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application citing the importance of the landfill operating to full capacity and the environmental benefits of the associated Landfill Tax benefits.

The Planning Officer informed Members that there was a need to extend the life of the site to allow the current operator to complete and fill the landfill. This was the most efficient use of the site and would allow the remediation plan to be carried out as already approved. The site and its restoration were strictly controlled by the Environment Agency and actions relating to the site required their approval. Members had previously questioned the two-year closure of the site in 2016; this was not down to the current operator.

The site had not been filled due to reduced input in the five years prior and would require a five-year extension to fill the site. If capacity was reached earlier then restoration could begin sooner.

Members had questioned taking waste from other areas national guidance clearly stated that authorities should work jointly on waste management.

Part of the site had already been restored and all efforts would be made to restore the site to its natural surroundings. Recommendations in the independent report from WSP stated that should a revised scheme be required there could be a number of issues, including gas leakage, water seepage, and slippage. Closing early could lead to an unfeasible scheme.

Another concern raised related to methane. WSP had analysed waste returns data and concluded the site did not receive a high proportion of organic waste and produced low levels of methane and other greenhouse gases. The site itself had considerable methane monitoring on site and operated methane extraction.

During the debate a number of issues were raised by Members. Members expressed reservations about extension because of the impact on residents, stating that extending the sites life would lead to further disruptions from traffic, noise, and smells. The possible impact of fires at the site was also raised.

Another issue raised by Members was environmental. A number of Members objected to the extension stating that it was contrary the Borough's climate change goals and that high recycling rates in the Borough combined with the importing of waste from other authorities made extension inequitable.

Members also queried the need for the extension of the site's lifespan. There were two main strands to this argument. One was that the site, based upon capacity figures, appeared likely to be at full capacity within the remaining three years of its current conditions and therefore extending was unnecessary and, perhaps, de-incentivising. The second argument was that there would be nothing stopping a further extension beyond 2030 and that this would be unacceptable.

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

**RESOLVED – that delegated authority not be granted to the Service Delivery Manager to grant the variation of conditions 6 and 13(b) of application W2006/0232.**

On being put to a vote it was, by a majority

**RESOLVED – that the application be refused on the grounds of the impacts approval would have on the residential amenity of residents and future residents.**

**PC300     TWC/2022/0291 - Land rear of 135 & 137 Hadley Park Road, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire**

This was an outline planning application for the erection of one dwelling. The site comprised a parcel of land extending from Hadley Park Road between numbers 133 and 135 and incorporated a wider parcel of land between the rear gardens of number 135 and 137. Since the report had been published, an additional representation in support had been received.

Councillor Stuart Parr, parish councillor, spoke against the application. The development was a garden development and this was against council policy and access to the property would be unsafe due to poor visibility existing to Hadley Park Road.

Dawne Telford, the applicant, spoke for the application. AC Development had acquired and renovated the derelict 135 and 137 Hadley Park Road cottages, bringing them back to use. The application on the land at the rear was in line with policy requirements and would bring derelict land back to use and provide affordable accommodation for local people.

The Planning Officer stated that highway safety and the principle of development were the main consideration of the application. All matters in the application were reserved. The illustrative block and elevation plan demonstrated that single storey development could be accommodated on the site and meet NDSS standards. Back-land development was often resisted but as the application would not affect the character of the area and did not affect the amenity of neighbouring dwellings, this was not seen as an issue.

Following the presentation, Members posed a number of questions:

*8.7.1 in the report mentions a TPO, was the tree removed as part of the Park Court Development?*

Confirmation of this had not been confirmed, however, this matter was not material to the application. There was sufficient space for replanting in the corner in question if needed.

*Were there any concerns regarding things that had not been included in the submission?*

No, but to progress the applicant would need to submit a reserved matters application on detailed matters.

*On what grounds was back-land development usually resisted?*

It was sometimes resisted on grounds of impact to the character of an area or inadequate separation distance. This was why an illustrative floor plan was requested. It had been provided and a single storey dwelling would not affect either character or separation.

*There was a mention of Japanese knotweed in the report, had this been investigated?*

An informative could be added in terms of any decision made.

Members also queried the visibility when exiting the property and the position of the bus stop. The Planning Officer advised that highways had considered the existing position and had not considered it detrimental given the fall-back position.

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 planning permission subject to the following:**

- a) **The following Condition(s) and Informative(s) (with authority to finalise Condition(s) to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):**

**Condition(s):**

**Time Limit**

**Reserved Matters Time Limit**

**Reserved Matters**

**Construction Environmental Management Plan**

**Foul and Surface Water**

**Materials (details to be submitted)**

**Parking, Turning, Loading (to be submitted)**

**Access drive surface / bound material (to be submitted)**

**Nesting and Roosting Boxes**

**Scale of Development (single storey)**

**Illustrative Site Layout Plan (general principles)**

**Approved Plans**

**Highways License Informative**

**Nesting Wild birds Informative**

**Restriction to 1No. dwelling**

**Japanese Knotweed Informative**

**PC301 TWC/2022/0340 - The Cleveland Arms, Cotwall Road, High Ercall, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 6AE**

The application was for the conversion of a public house into one dwelling. It had been referred to the Committee because of the number and nature of representations that had been received. It was recommended that the Committee refuse the application.

Councillor Kevin Connor, Parish Councillor, spoke against the application. The application was the latest in a series to change the use of the Cleveland Arms. There existed a strong public demand to reopen the public house and there was disappointment that offers to buy and view the property had failed. The applicant had acted obstructively but potential buyers remained interested.

Councillor Stephen Bentley, Ward Councillor, made a representation against the application stating full support for the officer's recommendation. Councillor Bentley paid tribute to planning officer Karen Denmark, who had recently passed away.

The Planning Officer discussed the application. The property was Use Class Sui Generis and had ceased trading as a public house in 2016. The adjacent car park and bowling green were not part of the use-change application. The property itself was in a state of disrepair with the proposed development consisting of a change of use from Sui Generis to C3 dwelling house. Section 7 of the Local Plan listed public houses as community facilities and changing use could not be supported unless an alternative facility was available. The applicant argued that the Village Hall, which operated a bar one day a week,

was an equivalent facility. Officers, however, disagreed; the hall lacked the facilities of a public house. There had also been a failure to demonstrate a lack of need for the facility. Marketing documents for the property had been assessed and it was considered that the applicant had acted in poor faith and that offers made had been viable.

Members spoke of the need for the amenity in the rural setting of the locality, speaking of it as a community asset.

Upon being put to a vote, it was unanimously:

**RESOLVED - that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:**

- 1) The application has failed to demonstrate a lack of need for the community facility, failed to evidence a robust marketing campaign and failed to identify an equivalent or alternative community facility that provides a similar offer which meets the needs of residents. The proposed development would result in the unacceptable loss of a community facility and is contrary to Local Policies SP4, COM1 and EC7 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 and provisions found under National Planning Policy Framework.**

**PC302 TWC/2022/0424 - Site of former Reynolds House/former Boyd House, Ironmasters Way/Boyd Close, Telford Town Centre, Telford, Shropshire**

The application sought full planning permission for enabling and engineering works comprising of ground remediation, reprofiling, demolition of the existing substation, and the diversion of existing utilities. The works were required in connection with the forthcoming 'Station Quarter' redevelopment.

A query was raised regarding the traffic issues in the town centre and whether operating hours for the site could be adjusted to quieter times so that business would not suffer from disruption. The Planning Officer stated that the availability of construction workers limited operation hours. To work on Sundays and bank holidays would add to the cost of development. There was a high tech solution to mitigate the impacts of construction with an online booking-in system to alleviate traffic on the highway.

*Members questioned that while there were dust mitigation measures mentioned in the report, there was no mention of mud. With winter coming up, what measures would be in place for mud?*

Officers confirmed that there would be wheel wash facilities at the exit.

Upon being put to a 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, legal agreement terms, or any later variations) subject to:

- 1) The applicants/landowner entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Local Planning Authority (with terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to the following:
  - a) £104,500 towards Biodiversity Net Gain
  - 2) The following conditions and informatives:
    - a) A04 Time limit
    - b) B057 Remediation Works
    - c) B059Custom Waste Management Plan
    - d) B130 Trees – Protective Fencing
    - e) C38 Development in accordance with deposited plans
    - f) C091 Development in accordance with Ecology Survey
    - g) C091 Development in accordance with CEMP
    - h) I06 Memorandum of Understanding
    - i) I17b Coal Authority Development Low-Risk Area
    - j) I32 Fire Authority
    - k) I40 Conditions
    - l) I41 Reasons for grant of approval
    - m) RANPPF1

**PC303 TWC/2021/1179 - Land at Hadley Quarry, Hadley Road, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire**

This was a full application proposing the construction 186 dwellings, public open space, and a play area. Access would be from Hadley Road to the east, with pedestrian access proposed to the northwest corner of the site. The development was a mix of 2, 3, and 4 bedroom houses along with 2 bedroom bungalows. The applicant had agreed 25% affordable units.

The scheme was well designed and on the brownfield site of a former quarry. There was some tree loss associated with development; however, this would be mitigated by planting and usable public open space. There would also be an s106 agreement for tree replacement offsite. Other s106 improvements included highways, play areas, and schools.

An update to the plan had been received following the report's publication. The applicant would provide each unit with an EV charge point.

Previous consent had been granted in 2011 but the scheme had not come forward.

Members posed a number of questions:

*How close would the offsite play areas, benefiting from s106, be?*

There was a play facility on site and the money offsite would be to facilities in the immediate area.

*Why hadn't the schools benefiting from s106 money been named?*

They had not been named in this case as regulations did not require it. However, the money would be used within a 2 and 3-mile radius of the development.

*Could the developer be asked to include solar panels?*

While developers were encouraged to be energy efficient there was no policy requiring such measures to base a request on. Building regulations set out the energy efficiency required but this could be achieved in a number of ways.

*Was there no space for trees on site?*

To replace like-for-like was not possible, this was why there was a financial contribution to plant offsite. Smaller trees would be planted on site.

Upon being put to a vote, it was unanimously:

**RESOLVED** – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the following:

**A. The following contributions to be agreed through a s.106 Agreement:**

- £65,100 (£350 per dwelling) towards improvements of nearby NEAP and play facilities;
- £120,900 (£650 per dwelling) towards nearby sport and recreation facilities;
- £879,364 Primary School Education Works within 2-mile radius;
- £366,888 Secondary School Education Works within 3-mile radius;
- £160,506.41 Strategic Highways Contribution;
- £36,000 towards off site cycle/pedestrian route alongside Sommerfield Road;
- £5,000 Travel Plan Monitoring;
- £15,000 towards PRow Works;
- £225,420 towards off-site bio-diversity;
- £56,800 Tree Replacement Standard

**B. Condition(s):**

**Time Limit - Full**

**Details of Materials**

**Landscape Design**

**Landscape Management (areas other than private gardens)**

**Highway Conditions (incl. (i) highway construction details works; (ii) parking and roads to be completed to each property prior to occupation; (iii) demolition/construction Management Plan; (iv) drainage solution for existing ditch adjacent Hadley Road; (v) provision of bus stops and (vi) submission of Travel Plan)**

**Highways details of pedestrian link to Waterloo Close**  
**Drainage Conditions (incl. (i) Foul and Surface Water Scheme; (ii) Exceedance Routing and (iii) SUD's Management)**  
**Ecology Conditions (incl. (i) European protected species licence; (ii) bird and bat boxes; (iii) bio-diversity net gain plan; (iv) pre-commencement walkovers; (v) lighting plan; (vi) Work in accordance with protected species survey**  
**Noise Survey Condition (work in accordance)**  
**Tree Protection Implementation (in accordance with Arboricultural Method Statement)**  
**Development in Accordance with Plans**  
**Removal of PD rights for extensions to Plots 83-87**

The meeting ended at 8.37 pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** Wednesday, 21 September 2022