

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 9 July 2025 at 6.00 pm in Council Chamber, Third Floor, Southwater One, Telford, TF3 4JG

Present: Councillors S J Reynolds (Chair), A S Jhawar (Vice-Chair), F Doran, N A Dugmore, A R H England, S Handley, G Luter, N Page, P J Scott, K T Blundell (as substitute for T L B Janke) and J Thompson (as substitute for C Chikandamina)

In Attendance: J Clarke (Senior Democracy Officer (Democracy)), A Gittins (Area Team Planning Manager - West), V Hulme (Development Management Service Delivery Manager), H Khatun (Solicitor - Planning & Highways), M Rowley (Principal Engineer) and M Turner (Area Team Planning Manager - East)

Apologies: Councillors T L B Janke and C Chikandamina

PC35 Declarations of Interest

None.

PC36 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 26 March 2025 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

PC37 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC38 Site Visits

None.

PC39 Terms of Reference 2025/26

The Legal Advisor presented the report on the Terms of Reference 2025/26.

The Constitution requires that Full Council should agree at its Annual Meeting the Terms of Reference for each of its Committees to enable the Council to efficiently conduct its business.

At the Annual Meeting of the Council on 15 May 2025, Full Council delegated authority to each Committee to review its own Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference forms part of the Constitution and was approved by Full Council in that context on 3 March 2022.

There were no changes to the Terms of Reference from the previous municipal year.

Upon being put to the vote it was, unanimously:

RESOLVED – that the Terms of Reference for 2025/26 be approved.

PC40 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 TWC/2025/0314.

PC41 TWC/2025/0022 - Land off, Arleston Lane (South side), Arleston, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for outline planning permission for the delivery up to 250 dwellings (Use Class C3) with all matters reserved on land off Arleston Lane (South side), Arleston, Telford, Shropshire

The application had been referred to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor M Boylan and the Lawley & Overdale Parish Council.

A site visit took place on the afternoon prior to the meeting.

The Planning Officer informed Members that further traffic data had now been received and the National Highways had removed their holding response subject to a construction and environmental management plan. Since publication of the report four further representations had been received with comments already being addressed within the committee report. Illustrative plans had been provided which demonstrated that the site could accommodate up to 250 dwellings but details such as layout, scale, access, landscaping and appearance would come forward with a reserved matters application.

Mr H Armatage, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application and fully supported the Officer's recommendation to approve 250 high quality homes which would meet an identified housing need as set out in the adopted Local Plan. The site would include seven hectares of landscape and proposed a cycle tract and formal and informal play. Buffer zones had been implemented following extensive public consultation. There would be a 5-10% biodiversity gain and natural features preserved including the Wrekin Way and new footpaths created across the site. Section 106 contributions would enhance the connection to Wellington and the development would integrate a safe route. The existing highway had been challenging and they had worked with highway officers and the primary school to reduce any impact with a 40-space car park of offsite improvement works around the school, together with a drop off and pick up area being proposed. Education, local health care, open space provision and 25% affordable housing were set out in the S106 agreement and exceeded £2.8m, but it was noted that if an alternative access

was required the scheme would be rendered unviable. There were no objections from statutory consultees and, if approved, a reserved matters application would subsequently bring forward the details of what could be achieved.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this application was mostly greenfield land with some tree coverage across the central band of the site with varying topography. Significant engineering would be required to achieve the residential units that would come forward at reserved matter. The site was in the urban area of Telford and sat in proximity to existing facilities, Lawley Primary School, community centre and nursery. The application sought outline permission and an illustrative masterplan set out separation distances, proposed dwellings, screening and landscaping. A noise assessment had not been provided but would come forward at the reserved matters stage. Included in the application were enhancements and upgrades to recreation facilities, primary and secondary education, upgrade of Wrekin Way and remodelling and a one-way road around Pepper Mill and Lawley Primary School, travel plan monitoring and 25% affordable housing. There were no objections to the scheme and financial contribution would mitigate the impact. National highways had removed their objection following receipt of an environmental management plan.

The Highways Officer informed Members that the site was allocated within the local plan with a strong level of merit in favour of development. These were indicative proposals for a reserved matters application. The Local Highway Authority have help to shape how the application could evolve with conditions and financial contributions and mitigate the impact by bringing benefits to residents. There was no direct access and the land for this connection was not available so the application would need to be assessed on its merits. Traffic impact would be mitigated via a 40-space car park would be delivered prior to commencement of any work on the site. A one-way system would be put in place and there would be no impact for existing resident parking. In relation to Arleston lane, it was proposed that a closure of a section of the road be put in place in order to prevent its use as a "rat run" and this would offset any additional traffic. As this was a sensitive location, a management plan would be put in place with no construction traffic or deliveries during school drop off and pick up and no construction traffic allowed on Arleston Lane.

During the debate some Members could not find any reason to refuse the application as the detail would come forward at the reserved matters stage. It was asked that the buffer between the existing and new buildings be retained and that the development did not go too close to the three small houses on Arleston Lane. A query was raised in regard to the deer currently living on the land and if they would be move to another area. Rather than clearing the trees could they remain in place and ensure that 25% affordable housing did come forward. It was important that the S106 contributions came forward to address the impact of the development. Other Members asked if there was a limit for streets being brought to an adoptable standard, had the transport assessment taken into account larger 3 and 4 bedroom houses having 4 or 5

cars and how were the education contributions split between primary and secondary. It was also raised that if someone called in the application were they not duty bound to attend the meeting to speak.

The Highways Officer responded that the trip rates and modelling were benchmarked against the data from the Lawley Phase 6 development. In relation to the adoption of the roads, this would be conditioned and the completion plan would set out the development phases.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the buffer areas would be considered at the reserved matters stage. With regard to the woodland area, there were a lot of unknowns at the present time. He had spoken with the Ecologists and the deer were known to roam the area of land within a 30-mile radius and they would happily transition naturally when the work started. In respect of education contributions, these would be split £1,576,216 for primary and £547,220 for secondary. In relation to S106 contributions, there would need to be a formal process alongside viability appraisals.

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager addressed the call in procedure and on this occasion, there had been mitigating circumstances and a discussion had taken place with the Democratic Services Team. As the application had been evolving, no further concerns had been raised on the application.

On being put to the vote it was, unanimously:

RESOLVED – that Delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission subject to the removal of the Holding Objection, from National Highways, and any requested mitigation (with the authority to finalise any matter including Condition(s), Legal Agreement Terms, or any later variations) subject to the following:

- a) the Applicant/landowners entering into a Section 106 Agreement 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) £650.00 per dwelling towards enhancements and upgrades to local sport and recreational spaces (with the final amount payable confirmed at the reserved matters stage, where the final number of dwellings will be confirmed);
 - ii) £294.00 per bed space towards Development of Primary Care Infrastructure (with the final amount payable confirmed at the reserved matters stage, where the final number of dwellings and their break-down will be confirmed);
 - iii) £2,197,081 Primary and Secondary School Provision;

- iv) **£35,000 towards the upgrade of the Wrekin Way from Dawley Road to the development area;**
- v) **£250,000 towards the remodelling and an increase in effectiveness of the existing one way road between Pepper Mill and Lawley Primary School;**
- vi) **£5,000 towards Travel Plan Monitoring for 5-years;**
- vii) **1% Monitoring Fee for Section 106 Contribution(s); and**
- b) **the conditions and informatives set out in the report (with authority to finalise condition(s) and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).**

PC42 TWC/2025/0314 - Land adjacent Oak View, Sugden Lane, Sugden, Telford, Shropshire

This was a retrospective planning application for full planning permission for a Gypsy/Traveller site with 2no. mobile homes and hardstanding on land adjacent Oak View, Sugden Lane, Sugden, Telford, Shropshire.

The application was before the Planning Committee at the request of Councillor G Thomas, Ward Councillor.

An update report was tabled at the meeting which set out details of a further representation in relation to development plans and drainage which had been received following publication of the report.

The Planning Officer set out details of the application, together with the receipt of an additional objection in relation to enforcement matters. Confirmation had been received that, if Members were minded to approve the application, the applicant's grandchild (upon reaching school age) would attend the local school and that they had an existing registration at the local doctors surgery and the provision of broadband had already been arranged.

Councillor G Thomas, Ward Councillor, spoke against the application and raised concerns in relation to land drainage he questioned whether the proposal was adequate, as an application on the same site two years previously had been refused as there had been issues with flooding in adjacent lanes. The proposed highway access was on 60mph road, on a bend and a slight hill and he considered that there was poor visibility. The Parish Council had raised a number of concerns in relation to the lack of facilities in the immediate area including shops and schools and that this application was retrospective.

Mr P Ashdown, member of the public, spoke against the application and highlighted concerns in relation to the site and its location and echoed

comments made by Councillor Thomas. He considered that this was a speculative application which had bypassed the proper process and did not satisfy policy. The site was not supported by local shops, public connection or employment and there were limited services over four miles away. A previous application on the site had been refused in 2022 and there had been no changes to policy since that time. He also raised concern on the amenity on neighbouring property and planning creep which would set a precedent.

Ms R Munns, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application and noted there were no objections from the Council's consultees and no conflict with the development plan. There was an unmet need for gypsy and traveller sites in Telford and this application would help fulfil that. Following amendments to the PPTS in 2024, these sites were assessed very differently from bricks and mortar and where sites were located outside settlement boundaries applications may be acceptable. The site was in close proximity to Rodington and as set out in Policy H09 it was supported by local services. The residents were registered with the local GP Surgery in Shawburch a short drive away and there were two pubs, a playground and a well-served bus stop within a mile of the site. The proposal offered a stable and settled base with access to health and education and thereby reducing the social and financial cost associated with unauthorised encampments. Whilst it offered a modest contribution to achieving the aims of the PPTS, the overall need in terms of the family was very significant.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the application had been assessed against Policy H08 and H09 of the TWC Local Plan, NPPF and Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (PPTS). There was currently an unmet need for 26 pitches, of which twenty could be achieved via expansion two existing sites. No technical objections had been raised in relation to highways, drainage or flooding. In relation to the impact on amenity, the nearest residential boundary was 62m from the site boundary and was of a modest scale. The site was one mile from Rodington and one mile from Longden Upon Tern. There was access to water and electricity supply as well as broadband, local GP services and facilities. There was an established hedge along Sugden Lane and the site currently had equine use. The principle of development was acceptable and there were no technical reasons to refuse the application.

During the debate some Members raised concerns regarding the retrospective application and asked for clarification in relation to the maximum amount of mobile homes and caravans that would be on site. Further concerns were raised regarding the septic tank and if the capacity was sufficient and whether a temporary application for a few years to ascertain viability would be more appropriate. Other Members felt that as long as conditions were adhered to, particularly around the septic tank and the existing drainage for water, there were no reasons to refuse the application.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the caravans had been in place since mid January 2024 but the application has been prepared and submitted earlier in 2025. There was a condition to restrict the site to 2 mobile homes plus one

tourer for each mobile home and there would not be separate families (unless visiting for short periods). In relation to the septic tank, consent had been given by Drainage Engineers and drinking water was obtained from the bore hole and it was not expected that the threshold for an EA Licence would be exceeded.

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 (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions or any later variations) subject to the conditions and informatives (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 7.08 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday 10 September 2025