

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 18 March 2026 at 6.00 pm in Council Chamber, Third Floor, Southwater One, Telford, TF3 4JG

Present: Councillors S J Reynolds (Chair), F Doran, N A Dugmore, A R H England, S Handley, T L B Janke, G Luter, N Page and R Sahota (as substitute for A S Jhawar)

In Attendance: J Clarke (Senior Democracy Officer (Democracy)), A Gittins (Area Team Planning Manager - West), K Goffe (Senior Highways Development Control Engineer), S Hardwick (Lead Lawyer: Litigation & Regulatory) and V Hulme (Head of Development Management)

Apologies: Councillors A S Jhawar and P J Scott

PC69 Declarations of Interest

None.

PC70 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 4 February 2026 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC71 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC72 Site Visits

None.

PC73 Planning Applications for Determination

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

PC74 TWC/2025/0480 - Site of Former The Wrekin Endeavour Centre, North Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for the erection of 40no. affordable dwellings with associated parking and amenity space on the site of the former The Wrekin Endeavour Centre, North Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire.

Councillor P Davis, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

A site visits had taken place on the afternoon prior to the meeting.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the application was subject to a Section 106 agreement comprising contributions to health, education, sport, play and recreation. A contribution was requested by Highways towards the implementation of parking restrictions and a monitoring contribution and measures to ensure the delivery of building regulations part M42 and M43 units. In relation to the amendment to the house types which resulted in more one bed units, the contribution to mitigate the impact on education would be amended to £177,767. This comprised a split between primary of £132,000 and secondary £45,000 (figures rounded up).

Councillor P Davies, Ward Councillor, spoke against the application and on behalf of the residents who did not oppose the housing but considered that this application represented clear overdevelopment on a constrained and sensitive site due to its density. He raised concerns regarding highway safety, school traffic, blocked driveways and dispersed parking which had resulted in the need to increase enforcement and implement double yellow lines. It was felt that the application was not modest or in keeping with the local vicinity and this was exacerbated due to the layout, the three-storey element and residential properties being overlooked at close range. Concerns were raised in relation to privacy, safeguarding, noise and disturbance and the overall suitability of such a dense housing development immediately next to an educational facility. There were three further essential safeguards that he considered must be secured if the application were to be approved which were displaced parking, the S106 agreement must bring forward meaningful road design and real improvements to protect children and residents. Part of the site was set within the green network and permanent useable access to greenspace from North Road to Crescent Road playing fields was required. It was requested that there was a 20% uplift in biodiversity net gain. If approved, the application must be done so with strong enforceable conditions to address the residents' concerns.

Mr T Wragg, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application and informed Members that a site visit had taken place and that the development would provide 40 homes on a brownfield derelict site. There would be a mix of homes including some wheelchair accessible and adaptable units which would be well insulated, warm and low carbon in nature lowering fuel bills and working to combat fuel poverty. Access would be provided through to the Crescent Road playing fields which was considered an important aspect of the application. With regard to traffic and parking issues this had been addressed through the planning application. As the development was for social rented homes, statistics showed that only around 40% of households own a car and that the application provided 48 parking spaces for 40 homes. Highways had not raised any concerns regarding traffic collisions and minimal additional journeys would be created which was not classed as severe impact. It was hoped that families would access the two primary schools and walk or cycle to school. Parking restrictions would be introduced at the entrance to the site and S106 contributions had been agreed making a positive financial

contribution and a contribution towards identified need for social housing for rent in Telford.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this application followed on from a previously withdrawn scheme which had been approved for a 56 unit two and three storey dementia care centre. The proposal that was before Members was for 40 affordable units which were less imposing than the previously approved scheme which at 66 metres in width was a very large structure. Two apartment blocks were now proposed and measured 16 metres and 13 metres respectively. The ridge heights of the apartments were of a similar height to the previously approved Dementia Care building at 12 to 13 metres and would comprise of 30 apartments sitting within the three storey blocks of Birch House and Rowan House, four flats, one on each floor set within two storey properties and six two storey houses. Two of the 40 units would be regulation M42, which were accessible and adaptable, and two units being M43, which would be wheelchair user dwellings. This was compliant with the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan and the supplementary planning document - Homes for All. It was proposed that the existing access at the western edge of the site be widened to allow double width provision. Parking would comprise 48 spaces, 42 of which would be allocated to the apartment blocks and the terraced housing plots in combination with six unallocated visitor spaces. The parking would be spread across four areas of the site, one at the frontage, two in the centre and one on the eastern edge of the built development. Two covered and secure bicycle stores would sit either side of the apartment blocks. Residential amenity for the occupants would be served by communal space at the site frontage with the greatest proportion of open space at the eastern end with pockets dotted around the remainder of the site. Pedestrian access through to the Crescent Road playing field would be secured by a planning condition. The scheme would include electric vehicle charging points and solar provision on the roof structures. Existing boundary treatments would be retained with the addition of a ball stop net along the northern boundary with the school, three metres in height, together with improvements to the landscaping around the edge of the site. Officers were in support of the application subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement.

The Highways Officer explained that the applicant had engaged in relation to the concerns with the proposed parking strategy and the internal road layout based on the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and compliance with local planning policy set out in the adopted Local Plan. The NPPF required officers to consider whether the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. If they were not considered severe, development should not be refused on transport grounds. The NPPF wording set out that schemes should facilitate sustainable transport, provide safe and suitable access and that any significant impacts could be mitigated to an acceptable degree. It also supported the delivery of affordable homes and efficient use of land in accessible locations particularly where it helps meet identified local need. North Road was a local distributor road which directly served two primary schools. Although there was knowledge of existing local parking pressures and congestion during short term school pick

up and drop off activity during the weekday, outside of these peak periods, traffic flows and parking demands on the surrounding network reduce materially. A transport statement had been submitted with the application and the highway authority considered the assessment to be robust and in line with industry best practise. Following a review of the latest five -year personal injury collision data available, it was confirmed that no collisions on North Road have been recorded. The Road Safety Engineers had confirmed there were no traffic management and road safety concerns on North Road at this present time that warrant intervention. A traffic count survey had been undertaken recently in Deer Park Road to capture existing residential trip generation during school peak times associated to that of a similar scale and locality of the development site. The survey concluded that residential trip generation during school drop off and pick up times were very low. Even assuming worst case scenario trip rates and the additional flow from 40 homes represented only a small percentage increase over existing traffic volumes on North Road and it was considered that the development did not give rise to a material or severe impact on the operation of the highway network. The close proximity of local catchment schools and existing bus services to the site would encourage sustainable journeys. The existing access was proposed to be amended to a bell mouth junction to serve the residential development and complied with highway design standards and was a safe and suitable access for all users. The existing bus stop would not be negatively impacted by the revised access arrangements and would remain in situ. The bus shelter had recently been upgraded and conformed to current standards. The proposed level of on-site parking had been increased to 48 parking spaces, with the majority of residential units now being allocated at least one parking space and there would be EV charging provision. Six unallocated parking spaces will also be provided and this was considered to be acceptable. The parking layout had been adequately designed to ensure that parking spaces were conveniently located to highway design standards ensuring the proposed parking vision within site was comfortably accessible. The highway authority were content that the proposed vehicle and cycle parking provision was acceptable and complied with policy C5 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan and NPPF. Parking restrictions would be installed at the site access and secured by section 106. The proposed internal road layout has been amended to meet adoptable residential highway design standards and was compliant with Policy C4 in relation to the design of roads and streets. As the proposal met the NPPF it should not be refused on highway or parking grounds.

During the debate, some Members felt that the application was overdevelopment in terms of density and due to the three-storey nature of the properties it was not in keeping with the immediate area and that it fundamentally altered the existing street scene. Other Members considered that the site visit had proved very useful and although the density was a little high it was what you would expect with flats, the brownfield site was ripe for development, but it was disappointing that the dementia care centre was no longer coming forward. It was considered that the main issue for residents was the highway and the lack of off-site parking due to the location and that it did not meet the current parking standards. There was no mention of school

travel plans and it was difficult for schools to implement things like walking buses due to the length of the route. It was asked why the applicant was being asked to make S106 contributions if the application was not considered severe or requiring mitigation and had the SIL been adopted. In relation to the S106 Agreement it was asked for clarification on Wellington Medical Practice being listed as receiving the s106 monies listed as it was a private business and private businesses could not receive funding directly. The biggest concern on the site was the orientation of the building which overlooked the school playing field and these are usually positioned not to overlook the school site and if there were any windows frosted glass would be put in place. There was also the addition of Juliet balconies and tinted windows which would not allow staff overseeing the children to note if anybody was observing them. It was proposed that the application be deferred to look at reconfiguration of the site to mitigate the safeguarding issues. Other Members were pleased to see the proposals which were broadly speaking compliant with local and national policy they raised concerns regarding the highway issues and congestion which were well established in the borough around school site. Although the technical assessments indicated that the impact was not severe, it was felt that they did not necessarily reflect the lived experience of the residents. It was also felt that the balance between quality and quantity in design meant that just because homes were affordable and not for profit or less profitable that the quality of the living standards should be met. The site would benefit from the orientation of Birch House and Rowan House in order they did not overlook the school and it was felt that the repositioning of the site may also create more parking spaces and supported the deferment. Questions arose in relation to the two disabled parking spaces and if this was sufficient and why application TWC/2024/0855 was withdrawn. It was also asked if consideration could be given to the inclusion of bungalows within the development.

The Planning Officer replied in terms of the overlooking he fully respected the view of the Members and it could be discussed with the developer. A part of the Local Plan review, a document had been produced called the density and net site area study which contained a lot of facts and figures and it was concluded that the net density was an average of 37 per hectare and this site had a density of 45 dwellings per hectare. Things to consider with this site was there were a lot of small units, so it was not comparable to a typical plan, and this was the reason for the increased density. In relation to biodiversity net gain, this site would achieve 10% and potentially higher due to the retention of the willow scrub at the back of the site and due to it being coppicing it would improve the quality in place. With regard to the S106 contributions to Wellington Medical Practice, officers consulted with the Integrated Care Board (ICB) on whether there was a requirement to improve the infrastructure in relation to the primary care network. The previous application TWC/2024/0855 had been withdrawn due to a number of issues in relation to the design which had been overcome with the current scheme presented to Members.

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager informed Members that in terms of the S106 contributions that officers were directed by the ICB in

terms of where they have identified capacity. Any payment of funds goes directly to the ICB for them to allocate and not directly to the private business.

The Highways Officer informed Members that the Local Plan set out at Appendix F that consideration could be given to a reduction in the maximum parking standards. As the application was for 100% affordable housing, there was evidence that supported a lesser demand for parking linked to those units and this led to officers accepting a reduced level of parking provision. It was therefore considered that the level of parking would be sufficient to support the development and could be fully managed on site and in terms of allocation some of the units have a higher provision of allocated spaces with the remainder of the spaces being allocated for visitors. There was some parking availability on North Road within the parking bays, but it was not considered these would be required. Disabled Parking fell within the parking standards and equated to approximately 5% of the parking across the site.

Following a lengthy debate, it was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for discussions to take place with the applicant in relation to the density, the reorientation of the building so that habitable windows were not overlooking the school, an increase of parking spaces, demographic of units and to look at the inclusion of bungalows.

On being put to the vote it was, unanimously:

RESOLVED – that the application be deferred for the application to be revised to address members concerns relating to the following:

- density
- the orientation be configured to ensure that no habitable windows were overlooking the school
- an increase in the number of parking spaces
- the proposed demographic and accessible units with the consideration of bungalows

The meeting ended at 6.59 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday 13 May 2026