

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 14 December 2022 at 6.00 pm in Fourth Floor Meeting Room, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford TF3 4NT**

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

**In Attendance:** S Hardwick (Lead Lawyer: Litigation & Regulatory), J Clarke (Senior Democracy Officer (Democracy)), A Gittins (Area Team Planning Manager - West) and V Hulme (Development Management Service Delivery Manager)

**Apologies:** Councillors G L Offland, I T W Fletcher and A S Jhawar

#### **PC326     Declarations of Interest**

In respect of planning application TWC/2022/0629, Councillor G Cook advised that he was a member of Wellington Town Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

#### **PC327     Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 16 November 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

#### **PC328     Deferred/Withdrawn Applications**

None.

#### **PC329     Site Visits**

None.

#### **PC330     Planning Applications for Determination**

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

#### **PC331     TWC/2022/0179 - Rushmoor Stud, Rushmoor Lane, Bratton, Telford, Shropshire TF5 0DA**

This application sought retrospective consent for the creation of an earth bund to eastern boundary, erection of fencing, creation of a new access road, siting of 2no. shipping containers and temporary siting for three years of 1no. static caravan and 1no. touring caravan in relation to the established equestrian business, erection of decking adjacent to static caravan and installation of a

sewage treatment plant at Rushmoor Stud, Rushmoor Lane, Bratton, Telford, Shropshire, TF5 0DA

Councillor J Seymour, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

Councillor A Eade read out a statement on behalf of Councillor J Seymour who was unable to attend the meeting which referred to the principal of the application and the wish to build a five bedroomed property on the site. She raised concerns regarding the business impracticalities and its viability, the limited grazing land which she felt was insufficient, the land was rented and was liable to flooding. The structures had appeared without planning permission and challenged whether patio doors, a balcony and kitchen were a necessity and whether 24 hour care was a requirement outside of the foaling season. It was further felt that the holiday let could be made available for staff during this time. The application went against policy HO10 and it asked that the application be refused.

Mr Graham Moss, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application and explained that the objections were the same as had previously been raised on an earlier application. He felt the facts were not correct in that there had never been a refusal for a dwelling. Despite the Applicant not following a conventional and logical approach to the planning application he asked Members to approve the application in order for the business to continue to be a success

The Area Team Planning Manager (West) informed Members that the previous three year temporary consent for the caravans had expired in October 2021. An application for a further three years had been received and it was imperative for the foaling season which would take place between January and May. Due to the nature of the business a worker would be on site 24 hours a day in order to monitor any changes with the health and behaviour of the horses. Officers were satisfied that due to the location of static and touring caravans and their temporary nature there would be no detrimental impact to the character or appearance of street scene. The miscellaneous works were of an acceptable scale and design were minor in scale and did not affect neighbouring properties. Shipping containers were not normally a permanent feature but as they would be well screened by mature boundary treatments and only seen at limited vantage points they were considered acceptable with the condition that they be painted green in order for them to further blend in. The Drainage Engineers had raised no objections in relation to the drainage on the site. In relation to the ongoing land owner dispute, this was a civil matter and not a material consideration and this had been outlined to both parties. As there were no technical objections to warrant refusal, Members were asked to approve the application.

During the debate some Members felt that although retrospective applications were not favoured, the application had no impact on neighbours and the business understood their needs and that the business should be supported. Other Members felt that whilst the painting of the shipping containers was

welcomed they asked if vines for screening the containers could also be requested. It was felt that the horses did require observation and the structures were quite a distance from the narrow road it was acceptable but asked if the applicant would have to re-apply every three years. A question arose in relation to the refusal of an application to build a dwelling in 2017 and if this could be clarified.

The Area Team Planning Manager (West) informed Members that the shipping containers were close to the hedge and had a lot of natural screening and as they were not in a prominent position that painting them green would allow them to blend in against the hedgerow. The NPPF allowed new enterprises the ability to have a worker living on site for three years to establish the business. It was a future hope of the Applicant that the business would remain viable to enable it to sustain a permanent equestrian workers dwelling. The application was not a means of granting consent for a dwelling and an application would be heard at the appropriate time on its own merits. In relation to the application for a permanent dwelling, planning policy required that a business supplied accounts for three years and in 2017 the applicant was advised that it was premature to apply for a permanent dwelling at that point and the application was amended to a change of use to equestrian and use as a stables.

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

**RESOLVED: that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the conditions contained within the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).**

**PC332 TWC/2022/0629 - Site of 1-10 Glebe Flats, Glebe Street/1-32 Nelson Court/1-55 (odds) St John Street/1-18 York Flats, 2-28 (evens) & 34-88 (evens), High Street, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire**

This application was for the erection of 67no. affordable dwellings together with associated access, roads, parking, landscaping and public open space on the site of 1-10 Glebe Flats, Glebe Street/1-32 Nelson Court/1-55 (odds) St John Street/1-18 York Flats, 2-28 (evens) & 34-88 (evens), High Street, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire.

The Application was before Planning Committee as the Council owned a part of the site and it was a major scheme of development.

The Area Team Planning Manager (West) informed Members that this application sought full planning permission on land located at Glebe Street and High Street, Wellington. There had been prior approval for the demolition of the 14 blocks of flats.

Mr S Thompson, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application which had been six years in making was part of the investment plan into Wellington. It was the second part of the project, the first being the site at New College which had recently been approved. The schemes would supply 143 new homes across the two sites and it was felt would make a real difference to the area. Key to the viability of the application was LEP funding which had been secured and Homes England would back the application due to the support of CEOs of both Wrekin Housing Group and Telford & Wrekin Council. The scheme had involved extensive discussions in relation to protecting the vernacular and feel of area and it protected its character and appearance. Although there would be the removal of 130 housing units, there were no longer fit for purpose and they would be replaced with 67 good quality affordable homes which would benefit the local community. The application identified social values and would bring forward apprenticeship and work placement opportunities.

The Area Team Planning Manager (West) informed Members that the previous dwellings did not meet NDSS standards or accessibility standards, had very little amenity space and no designated parking. The proposal brought forward a mix of dwellings, apartments and bungalows and the scheme would provide 100% affordable housing. All proposed dwellings met NDSS standards and 19 dwellings met the M42 accessibility standards for some 9 ground floor apartments and 10 bungalows. In relation to parking standards the application provided 14 spaces above the local plan standards. Some solar panels would be provided within the development. The site was located opposite the Wellington Conservation Area and it had met many of the conservation requirements, although it had not been able to omit fascia boards on the properties. It was felt on balance that the regeneration of the site would improve the character and appearance of the area and no technical objections had been received. Members were asked to approve the application.

During the debate some Members welcomed the site but asked if there was any S106 money available for crossing points across Glebe Street and if there were going to be any ev charging points within the site. Other Members felt it was a shame there would be a net loss in housing and asked why there were no education contributions towards the local schools. They welcomed the ev charging points and asked how many solar panels would be supplied. Some Members felt that this application was a good news story due to the affordable housing and the redevelopment of the Wellington area and it was fully supported.

The Area Team Planning Manager (West) informed Members that they could only seek funding for crossings if highways had raised any issues and in this instance no funding had been sought in this instance. Some ev charging points would be installed in proportion with the current regulations. In relation to the education contributions, as there was a net reducing in the number of units from 130 to 67, education contributions could not be sought due to the lesser demand. In relation to solar panels, at the time of writing the report this was still to be determined following a feasibility study on which units would

most benefit so this had been written into the conditions ahead of the decision.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority/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 the conditions and the informatives contained in the report.**

The meeting ended at 6.27 pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** Wednesday 8 February 2023