

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 5 February 2025 at 6.00 pm in Council Chamber, Third Floor, Southwater One, Telford, TF3 4JG

Present: Councillors S J Reynolds (Chair), G Luter (Vice-Chair), G H Cook, F Doran, N A Dugmore, A R H England, A S Jhavar and P J Scott

In Attendance: V Hulme (Development Management Service Delivery Manager), M Turner (Area Team Planning Manager - East), K Craddock (Principal Planning Officer), M Bailey (Planning Officer), S Hardwick (Lead Lawyer: Litigation & Regulatory) and J Clarke (Senior Democracy Officer (Democracy))

Apologies: Councillors T L B Janke and J Jones

PC22 Declarations of Interest

Councillors N A Dugmore and F Doran declared an interest in planning application TWC/2024/0926 and indicated that they would withdraw from the meeting during determination thereof.

PC23 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 25 November 2024 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

PC24 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC25 Site Visits

None.

PC26 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 planning application TWC/2024/0926.

PC27 TWC/2024/0756 - Land opposite Byre Cottage, Sambrook, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for the erection of 1no. self build dwelling with associated parking and landscaping works on land opposite Byre Cottage, Sambrook, Telford, Shropshire

Councillor S Burrell, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

The Planning Officer reported that there was a typographical error in paragraph 8.17 of the Officer's report and should have stated that ". . . whilst land does currently consist of a green field HO10 does not prohibit the building . . ." The amendment was proposed and seconded and unanimously agreed by Members.

Councillor E Phillips spoke on behalf of the Parish Council against the application and raised concerns regarding ecology and the biodiversity required to achieve 10% net gain, the use of an unploughed field with excellent soil, impact on birds due to the site being on a flight corridor, the impact on bats and their dusk feeding. Further concerns were raised regarding scale, the bund, impact on the Grade II listed building, the drainage due to hard surfaces, disturbance to the grazing field and the lack of privacy for local residents.

Councillor S Burrell raised concerns in relation to what defined an outstanding design, the contribution to the setting and its lack of sympathy to local surrounding and whether exceptional architecture had been met. He considered that this would be a blot on the rural landscape and questioned the design of the drainage system. It was asked that a site visit take place before any decision was made in order to consider the benefit of the application against its overwhelming harm.

Mr M Rowley, member of the public, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding Policy HO10, lack exceptional design or inspiration from the local area, biodiversity gains and minimal tree/hedgerow planting. The dwelling would be prominent sitting on top of a hill and would light up the night sky, lack of privacy for local residents and the land was part of a listed farm and barns which had been untouched for 50 years.

Mr J Harris, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application which adhered to Policy HO10 and Policy 85 of the NPPF which supported housing if it represented innovative design. There was no requirement for the dwelling to be isolated and the application would be conditioned in order to prevent the site becoming a care home or multiple dwellings. The application had gone through three reviews and it was considered surface water run off could be improved via the discharge strategy. There was suitable distance separation to neighbouring properties and adopted landscaping strategies. The construction process would be carefully managed by conditions and consents and a 10% biodiversity net gain would enhance the site.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the site was located in the rural area and considered acceptable under Policy HO10 which outlined that this application was outside of the five main settlements for residential development which were strictly controlled. The Local Planning Authority do not have any publicised guidance on exceptional quality. The application had

been presented to and considered, on three occasions, by a wholly independent design panel who, following the third and final review, considered the application had demonstrated that it represented exceptional quality or design. The Local Planning Authority were satisfied in principle that the annexe and guest accommodation could be appropriately conditioned noting that an annex and guest accommodation are shown on the submitted plans. The officers were satisfied that the occupancy of these could be appropriately restricted via a condition to ensure that they are not let or sold as separate units of accommodation. It had been assessed that there would be no impact on the amenity on neighbouring properties due to the separation distance and the existing and proposed landscaping would not have a significantly detrimental effect. Consultees have supported the application subject to conditions and there were no objections to the parking as this was considered adequate. There would be 10% uplift in biodiversity net gain and officers were confident the site can be drained following soakaway testing. Members were asked to delegate authority to grant consent subject to a revised drainage scheme and the lead local flood authority having no objections and any additional conditions being put in place.

During the debate some Members considered that the application was acceptable but questioned if the building needed to be 8m high. Other Members considered that aesthetics were subjective and that the criteria was quite strict and detailed and that it had met all the elements required by the independent body and there was no reason to refuse the application. A query was raised regarding birds and bats and the impact on the ecology and had there been a study undertaken. Other Members felt that the application did not meet exceptional design criteria and that there would be a detrimental impact on the existing ecology. Concerns were also raised regarding the drainage and flooding and the lack of heat pumps or solar panels.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the height of the building was to allow for a two storey dwelling and for assessment as an exceptional innovative dwelling. The building would need to be a prominent form on the site to act as a landmark and come forward with ecological enhancements holistically in order to show off the building within the landscape. Design Midlands attended the site in order to undertake a full appraisal and the applicant and their family intended to live in the property. In respect of ecological appraisal, details could be found in 8.11-8.16 of the report and the conclusion was that the application could be supported subject to conditions and enhancements. Officers explained the ecological benefits of the scheme to members and explained that the benefits were considerable when compared to other applications of this scale. Furthermore, Officers explained that the scheme was to be assessed holistically noting that the ecological benefits were a significant reason as to why the Local Planning Authority considered the scheme to represent exceptional design quality. In relation to sustainability and climate change this was raised in paragraph 8.29 of the report. Drainage information had been received prior to the meeting and this was the most up to date it could be and it had been accepted in principle.

On 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 or any later variations) subject to revised/updated drainage information being submitted and deemed acceptable by the LLFA, the conditions and informatives (including any further drainage conditions required to be necessary), with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager set out in the report.

PC28 TWC/2024/0926 - 9 High Mount, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 7NL

This was an application for a change of use from dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to Residential Institution (Use Class C2) at 9 High Mount, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 7NL.

The application was before Committee at the request of Donnington & Muxton Parish Council.

An update report had been tabled at the meeting and included two letters of objection that have been received following preparation of the report but did not raise any further concerns in addition to those listed in the main report.

Councillor L Dugmore spoke on behalf of the Parish Council against the application and raised concerns regarding highway safety on the single track road, parking, shortage of bungalows and it contravened both the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan. Further concerns were raised regarding staff attending at similar properties within the area which caused difficulties parking half on and off the pavements and difficulties for emergency services, there were also parking issues at the residential care home.

Miss Thai, member of the public, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding Policy HO7 and the specialist homes that were required for the elderly and disabled and would remove a much needed home from the market, the cumulative impact of conversation, parking and wheelchair access for residents, to cycle parking provision, drainage and waste management in relation to Policy ER7. It was asked if members refuse the application in its current form and review further before a decision was made.

Mr Madumere, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application which had been thoroughly assessed. The application would be a loving and nurturing home for a maximum of two children aged 7-17 years of age to feel safe and supported who would receive emotional and therapeutic care helping them to build meaningful relationships. Parking was sufficient with 4 spaces and a garage for 2 members of staff and a manager working between 9am and 5pm. The property was a 1.5 level chalet style building with bedrooms in the loft and had already been purchased. There would be no external changes and the

applicant would work collaboratively with the Local Authority and the wider community to provide a safe and loving home for vulnerable children.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this application sought change of use to a residential care facility for two children aged 7 to 17. Local Plan Policy SP1 supported the principle of development. This was a standard dwelling on the open market which could be purchased or lived in by anyone and had off street parking. The appearance and design would not be impacted as there were no external changes to design or scale. Internal arrangements were considered acceptable. It was in a sustainable location close to shops and school and compliant with Policy HO7 which supported specialist housing. There would be two full time staff and a daytime manager who would change shifts every 48 hours with changeover being staggered to reduce movement. It was considered that movements would be more or less similar to a typical family home and there would be no adverse impact on adjacent properties.

During the debate, some Members considered that there had been similar applications recently and that objections were often based on fear. It would be a standard family home with the children being well managed and parking issues could arise whoever lived in the property. Members had a duty to children as a corporate parent and there were no material consideration to refuse the application.

On being put to the vote it was, unanimously:

RESOLVED – that delegated authority granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions, legal agreement terms, or any later variations) subject to the following:

- a) the condition(s) (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager) as set out in the report and update report.**

The meeting ended at 7.01 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday 26 March 2025