

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 10 September 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), N A Dugmore, A R H England, G Luter, N Page, P J Scott and J Thompson (as substitute for S Handley)

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

Apologies: Councillors F Doran, S Handley and T L B Janke

PC43 Declarations of Interest

None.

PC44 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 9 July 2025 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC45 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC46 Site Visits

None.

PC47 Planning Applications for Determination

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

PC48 TWC/2025/0368 - Tzigane House, Managers Office (Tzigane House), Rhapsody House, Maurice House and Ravel House, Freeston Avenue, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9EF

This was an application for a change of use of 4no. dwellinghouses (Use Classes C3 and C3(b)) to Residential Institutions (Use Class C2) at Tzigane House, Managers Office (Tzigane House), Rhapsody House, Maurice House and Ravel House, Freeston Avenue, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9EF

St Georges and Priorslee Parish Council had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

Councillor R Overton spoke against the application on behalf of the Parish Council who strongly objected in relation to highways, parking and congestion in relation to Policy C5 and BE1, overdevelopment, traffic noise, impact on quality of life and amenity of residents in relation to Policy HO7 and BE2, oversubscription of local services and in particular relating to Policy HO7 and CM1 and the oversubscription of children in care in the local primary school, not in keeping with the local area, age and vulnerability of the local residents in relation to Policy BE1 and BE2 and the 50mph speed limit. A previous application had been refused and there were issues with ground levels which were being looked at by the Enforcement Team and he asked that the application be refused.

Mr G Jones, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application as there was a need for specialist accommodation ensuring children were not placed out of the area and local children stayed local. The application met the principle of development under Policy NPPF63 and Local Policy HO7 and the Transport Statement gave details of staff patterns, visitors and the operational needs of the development. Sufficient on-site parking and the reduction of the number of children to one child per dwelling addressed the concerns raised by the highways authority. The amenity of neighbouring properties had not been affected as there were no external alterations and the application was considered a betterment as there could potentially be more children on site if the property was sold on the open market. There were no technical objections to the application and he asked that the application be approved.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the application was in the urban area of Telford in a highly sustainable location. Amended document had been submitted which outlined that there would be one child and one member of staff per dwelling which equated to four children and four staff at any one time. It was likely that a manager would also be present at times. Staff changeover times were staggered into two patterns with change overs taking place at two properties at a time. The application was compliant with Policy HO7 which specified a need and the scale, design and form was acceptable. No external changes were proposed. Highway impact was minimal with ten spaces being available on site. No technical objections had been received. Impact on residential amenity was limited and there was no evidence to suggest the scheme would cause noise or light pollution or impact that a typical residential dwelling would have if there were two adults and two children living in the property with no external control in relation to vehicles on site or the impact of journeys. In relation to the enforcement action, work on the replacement fencing had taken place and was now installed on the site. The application for the level changes had been received and the applicant was working with the Council to resolve this. Change over times and shift patterns had been addressed. In relation to antisocial behaviour, it should not be an assumption that this would occur and this could take place in any regular dwelling house.

During the debate, some Members asked what assurances could be put in place to ensure that antisocial behaviour and parking issues were resolved quickly and could the planning application be rescinded? Other Members considered that the application was acceptable as the fencing had now been completed and there were no privacy issues, it was in a cul-de-sac and there was sufficient parking spaces and shift patterns had been designed to avoid peak times and that the children would be living as part of society. The reduction in the number of the children was an improvement and there would be no increase on the footprint of vehicles. Amended plans had been received and some of the issues raised by residents during the consultation had been mitigated against. It was asked if a condition could be put in place that staff had to use the onsite parking spaces in order to alleviate concerns or if this was not possible, suggest to the applicants that staff be advised not to park in the street. As a Corporate Parent some Members felt that there was an identified need to look after children, but it was important to do as much as possible to alleviate the concerns of residents.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Management Plan would be conditioned and that this outlined the shift patterns and the number of children that were allowed which could not be increased without requesting a change to the planning application. Antisocial behaviour was difficult but there could not be an assumption that this would take place. In relation to parking, work had taken place with the applicants to design a better layout but in terms of what was required there would not be a need to park on the street. It would not be possible to apply conditions regarding the parking as they would not be enforceable.

The Planning Area Team Manager (West) informed Members that the planning authority could hold discussions with the Children's Commissioners and social workers if problems arose and the Police could intervene in relevant circumstances.

On 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 full planning permission (with the authority to finalise any matter including Condition(s) or any later variations) subject to the following:

- a) the conditions and informatives contained in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

PC49 TWC/2025/0415 - 181 Teagues Crescent, Trench, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 6RA

This application was for a change of use of a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a small children's residential home for up to two young persons (Use Class C2) at 181 Teagues Crescent, Trench, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 6RA.

The application was before Planning Committee due to the receipt of a significant number of objections.

There were no speakers present at the meeting.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this was a full planning application for a change of use from a five bedroomed dwelling house to a small children's residential home for up to two young persons aged 8-18 years. The application was located within the urban area and was generally considered acceptable. There would be no external alterations to the scale and design and it would not cause harm to the street scene and the internal design was considered appropriate. The site was in a sustainable location 0.4m from shops and 0.2m from the primary school and was compliant with Policy HO7 of the Local Plan in relation to specialist housing and Use Class C2 in relation to Housing Needs. The supporting documentation set out that there would be three staff members with the manager working 9am-5pm and two staff who would work 24 hour shifts. Changeover would take place at 9.45am to avoid on street parking. Other visitors such as social workers or Ofsted would be infrequent and staff meetings would take place off site. There was sufficient onsite car parking for four cars on the existing driveway and there would be no requirement for on-street parking and the Highways Authority considered there was sufficient space to manoeuvre vehicles. The scheme complied with Policy C3 of the Telford Local Plan. A consultation exercise had taken place and all material considerations had been addressed. In relation to the previous refusal on the site, a Lawful Development Certificate had been assessed and the Local Planning Authority had concluded that an application for full planning permission would be required. There were no objections from statutory consultees.

During the debate some Members considered that due to the size of the property and the application being for up to two children and that no one had attended at the meeting to speak either for or against the application there was nothing negative to say, they were in favour of children's homes in the community and the application was supported. Other Members did raise concerns in relation to antisocial behaviour and asked that the development allay the concerns of residents.

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 Condition(s)) subject to the following:

- a) The conditions set out within the report (with authority to finalise Condition(s) and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).**

The meeting ended at 6.47 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday 12 November 2025