

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 22 July 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, G Luter, P J Scott and C Chikandamina (as substitute for A S Jhawar)

In Attendance: J Clarke (Senior Democracy Officer (Democracy)), A Gittins (Area Team Planning Manager - West), S Hardwick (Managing Solicitor: Litigation & Regulatory), V Hulme (Head of Development Management), R Jones (Principal Planning Officer) and M Turner (Area Team Planning Manager - East)

Apologies: Councillors A S Jhawar and T L B Janke

PC1 Declarations of Interest

None.

PC2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 18 March 2026 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

PC3 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC4 Site Visits

None.

PC5 Terms of Reference 2026/2027

The Legal Advisor presented the Terms of Reference 2026/27 report which set out that the council's Constitution required, that at its Annual General Meeting of Full Council, it agreed that each of its Committees reviews its Terms of Reference to enable the council to efficiently conduct its business.

At the Annual Meeting of the Council on 21 May 2026, Full Council delegated authority for each Committee to review its Terms of Reference.

There were no suggested changes to the Terms of Reference which remained consistent with the previously municipal year.

Upon being put to the vote it way, unanimously:

RESOLVED – that the Terms of Reference for 2026/27 as set out in Appendix A to the report be agreed.

PC6 Scheme of Delegation July 2026

The Head of Development Management presented the Planning – National Scheme of Delegation report which sought approval for the council's Planning Scheme of Delegation as set out at Appendix A of the report.

Members were also asked to note the National Scheme of Delegation of Planning functions in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act as amended by the Planning and Infrastructure Act 2025, the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 and the statutory guidance published on 1 June 2026.

The council's existing local Scheme of Delegation had been amended solely to a constitutional mechanism to give effect to the National scheme which included the removal of previous local call-in arrangements and referral triggers where these were in conflict with the national framework.

It was necessary to ensure that the council's decision-making arrangements were fully compliant with mandatory national requirements thereby enabling planning functions to be lawfully discharged by Planning Committee or by officers in accordance with the National Scheme of Delegation. The Scheme must be implemented by 31 October 2026.

Under the National Scheme of Delegation, planning applications and related decisions would be divided into prescribed categories:

- Applications falling within Schedule 1 of the Regulations must be determined by the Chief Planning Officer or authorised officers and may not be referred to Planning Committee.
- Applications falling within Schedule 2 of the Regulations are delegated to officers by default and may only be referred to Planning Committee in limited circumstances, in accordance with the statutory referral process.

The new arrangements would not be informal and would require transparency of decision making and it would be necessary to maintain records through a gateway process recording the outcome and decision reached. It would still be a requirement to consult on applications coming forward and consider what weight to give to the information before them. Work would also continue to ensure that compliance to planning consent was adhered to.

A training session would be delivered to Members as well as Parish and Town Councils in order for them to effectively engage with the new scheme.

The Scheme of Delegation and Constitution would be part of the framework and would be lawful, transparent and robust.

During the debate, some Members felt that although they did not agree with the new Scheme, that it would be law by 31 October 2026 and if the council did not take on the Scheme they would not be legally compliant. Other Members felt that the Scheme ripped out the heart of planning with 90% of decisions taking place behind closed doors with no checks and balances and there were flaws within the Scheme. It was asked if a regular report could be brought before Committee to update Members on applications that had been approved. It was welcomed by some Members that some applications should sit with officers and not be considered through the call in procedures due to their technical nature. Officers were asked to confirm that the public were not losing their opportunity to engage in the planning process. A suggestion was made that an additional committee, such as a pre-engagement planning committee, be commenced to discuss the applications prior to any decision being made.

The Head of Development Management confirmed that a report could be produced showing the applications and their route to decision and that this had been done previously and this would also be published online. It was confirmed that Members and Parish and Town Councillors would be able to attend training sessions which would encourage them to have an active dialogue with officers and that nothing would be removed from the engagement process. With regards to the additional committee, it was suggested that this may be more appropriate at Parish and Town Council level.

It was proposed and seconded that a pre-engagement committee be set up. Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority, refused.

Members were asked to consider the original recommendations as set out in the report and upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority:

RESOLVED – that:

- a) the National Scheme of Delegation of Planning functions in accordance with Town and Country Planning Act as amended by the Planning and Infrastructure Act 2025), the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 and the statutory guidance published on 1 June 2026 be noted; and
- b) the Council's Planning Scheme of Delegation, as set out at Appendix 1, insofar as it gives effect to and is fully compliant with the National Scheme of Delegation, noting that the Scheme replaces previous local delegation and call-in arrangements where these conflict with the national framework be approved.

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 applications TWC/2025/0480 and TWC/2025/0772.

PC8 TWC/2025/0480 - Site of Former The Wrekin Endeavour Centre, North Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

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

The application was before Planning Committee having being deferred at the meeting held on the 18 March 2026 following a request from Members for amendments to be made to the scheme in relation to density, overlooking onto the school, parking, the mix of housing and accessibility.

An update report was tabled at the meeting and set out details in relation to the amendments to the rear elevations of the proposed Rowan and Birch House and Site Plan.

The Planning Officer updated Members on changes that had been made to the application following its deferment in March 2026. Parking arrangements now exceeded parking for the residents and reduced the visitor parking 'deficit' to four. Some of the windows and doors had been amended on Birch and rowan House apartment blocks. The Applicant had responded to the request to amend the scheme by advising that a reduction in the number of overall dwellings would make the scheme unviable. The principle concerns raised by Members remained and had not been satisfactorily resolved being the density and overdevelopment, the orientation of the buildings and safeguarding issues in relation to the neighbouring school and the officers' recommendation was that the application be refused.

Councillor P Davis, Ward Member, commented that he genuinely recognised the need for affordable housing and regeneration, but any decision needed to be appropriate and acceptable. He raised concerns regarding overdevelopment, highway safety and parking. Although the applicant had gone some way to amend the plans, but he considered that privacy was still an issue and he asked that the application be refused.

C Taylor, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application which would be 40 well insulated, warm, low carbon homes for people in need set on a brownfield, derelict site. He considered it to be a really good scheme and had taken on board representations and significant changes made to the development in relation to density. The orientation in relation to the school was not a reason to refuse planning permission as there were a lot of examples where houses overlook playing fields. Some rooms had been reorientated and there were only 2 apartments that continued to overlook.

The Planning Officers clarified the details within the update report and the changes to the rear elevations of the two blocks of flats. This remained unsatisfactory and did not address the overlooking of the school. In relation to the density, 49 dwellings per hectare was the net density of the developable area and did not take into account the willow shrub and the suds feature and this was considered overdevelopment.

During the debate, some Members were not against the development of a brownfield site or affordable housing, but that the applicant had not addressed the issues of concern that Members had previously raised in relation to overlooking the school site, change of orientation, density and overdevelopment.

On being put to the vote it was, unanimously:

RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to refuse Full Planning Permission on the following grounds:

- a) the proposed development, by reason of its excessive density and scale of development within the developable area of the site, would result in a form of development that is excessively dense and represents an overdevelopment of the site. The proposal fails to respond appropriately to the character and prevailing density of the surrounding area. As such, the development would fail to make appropriate use of land, failing to respects and enhance its context and would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 (i.) (Design Criteria) of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011–2031 and Policy DD1 (1.a. and b.) of the emerging Local Plan which require development to respond positively to its context and safeguard the quality of the built environment; and
- b) the proposed development, by virtue of its overbearing relationship with and overlooking of the adjoining school playing field from habitable windows, doors and amenity space, would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy and intrusion to a sensitive neighbouring use. The submitted layout fails to provide adequate separation and mitigation to prevent harmful overlooking of areas regularly used by school pupils. As such, the proposal would fail to protect the amenity of adjoining land users, would prejudice and undermine an existing surrounding use and would not constitute high quality design. The development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 (i. and xi.) (Design Criteria) of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011–2031 and emerging Local Plan Policy DD1 (1.n.).

PC9 TWC/2025/0772 - Land south of, The Dale/The Crescent, Church Aston, Newport, Shropshire

The application was for the erection of 166no. dwellings (Class C3), means of vehicular access off the A518, open space, landscaping, play area, footpaths, drainage and all other ancillary and enabling works on land south of, The Dale/The Crescent, Church Aston, Newport, Shropshire. An update report was tabled which set out details in relation to a typographical error in relation to the Parish Council, additional comments from Councillor Eade regarding a formal pedestrian connection across the A518, additional objections received and an additional representation from Severn Trent Water.

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

Councillor A Eade, Ward Member, together with the Church Aston Parish Council, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

Councillor A Eade, Ward Member, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding site not being within the urban boundary of the Local Plan, the number of objections to the application, the impact on Church Aston and the need to protect its identity. If Members were minded to approve the application, it was asked that consideration be given to making the route as safe as possible for pedestrians and detailed the crossing at the Clock Tower in Donnington as a precedent along the A518 and whether S106 monies could be used to provide this which would also enhance health and wellbeing, social mixing, and cohesion.

G Johnson, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the applications which had been included on the emerging Local Plan under Policy HO3. The Planning Inspector had not raised any issues in regard to the application and this had given significant weight, together with the affordable, social, shared and private housing within the development. It met national space standards and all SPD requirements in relation to M42 and M43 standards with a net density of 28.4 per hectare. There were no objections from any statutory consultees, Highways Officers or the Ecology Officer who had no objection to the 10% biodiversity net gain. A central open space and play area would be retained as well as cycleways and paths. The s106 agreement would fund the existing NEEP, the Public Right of Way, health and infrastructure.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the site sat outside of the current settlement within the current adopted Local Plan but that the site had been allocated within the emerging Local Plan and a thorough examination by the Planning Inspector was at a very advanced stage and no changes had been requested. The principle of development was acceptable. In accordance with both the adopted and emerging Local Plan 35% affordable housing in a mix of two to five bedroom properties and seven bungalows had been put forward. Most of the protected trees, located in the central area of public open space, would remain with a small areas of trees to the north west being removed to facilitate the roundabout. The design, type and materials had been set out in a design code statement to reflect the character of the surrounding area and the proposed layout allowed for the separation distance to be exceeded in relation to the neighbouring properties and the boundary treatments would be

retained. It was accepted that there would be a change of outlook, but a loss of view was not a material consideration. In relation to the flood risk, a sustainable drainage strategy had been submitted. The application included a new roundabout and transport modelling which was acceptable to Highways Officers and not create severe impact. In relation to a formal pedestrian crossing, connection to the existing footpath would be conditioned with the creation of a cycleway and a cycling and walking infrastructure plan would fit into the wider strategy. Highways would not be supportive of a signalised connection across the A518 on the balance of pedestrian movements but dropped kerbs and a central reservation was already installed and the roundabout would slow down traffic to help with the connection. The biodiversity net gain would be conditioned as well as the veteran trees remaining on site.

During the debate some Members raised concerns regarding the doubling of the size of Church Aston and that the application was contained within the emerging Local Plan which should be ratified fully before this application came forward. Further concerns raised were health services, flooding, and that 35% affordable housing be the final figure supplied and not reduced later, pedestrian safety whilst crossing, fencing off the attenuation ponds, impact on local schools, lack of local shops and the need to install public bins. Other Members were unable to find material reasons to refuse the application, but asked that the road not be closed for several weeks for the installation of the roundabout if this could be avoided.

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 Planning Permission (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 (item i. subject to indexation from the date of committee), with terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager, relating to:

- i Strategic Highway Contribution: £233,229.84**
- ii Travel Plan: £5,000**
- iii Public Rights of Way Improvements : £75,000**
- iv Education Contribution: £1,286,091**
- v NHS (ICB) Contribution: £181,555**
- vi Public Open Space and Recreation: £738,825**
- vii Sports and Recreation: £207,795**
- viii Public Transport Improvements: £10,000**
- ix S106 Monitoring: £20,000**
- x Affordable Housing at 35%**
- xi Biodiversity Net Gain Monitoring for 30 years**

- b) the conditions contained within the report and update report (with authority to finalise Condition(s) and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).**

PC10 TWC/2026/0119 - 23 Bridge Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1ED

This was an application for the subdivision of existing unit to 2no. retail units (Use Class E) and 1no. hot food takeaway (Use Class Sui Generis) following the erection of a single storey side extension, first floor extension and associated external alterations at 23 Bridge Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 1ED.

This application was before Committee at the request of Wellington Town Council.

Councillor G Cook, representing the Town Council, explained that he wasn't opposed to new business, but that there had previously been issues with takeaways. He raised concerns regarding the drainage, the air conditioning and the air pollution, lack of proper insulation, parking, deliveries and the lack of space within the car park, bin storage and litter and the impact on the neighbouring public house.

Councillor P Davis, Ward Member, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the unacceptable harm to the character of the area as an historic market town, impact on the highway network, traffic movement, deliveries and parking. Further concerns were raised regarding the extraction systems and cooking odours and the company previously being prosecuted via enforcement action. If Members were minded to approve the application, it was requested that odour be controlled through a management plan, high quality materials be used, compliance with a traffic management plan and agreement of delivery times and waste collection as well as hours of operation.

A Bruce, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application and set out that the Applicant was in agreement with all conditions set out in the report, particularly in relation to highways, air quality, odour control and bin collections. He explained that the current system in operation was not cost effective and the applicant considered that the new site offered a good opportunity to ensure a more robust system be installed on the first floor which would irradiate noise and odour as they did not wish to be prosecuted again. It was agreed that an appropriately worded condition be set out by the Environmental Team in order that there were no issues going forward. In relation to deliveries, the car park was considered sufficient and it would be an improvement in respect of highways issues. He asked that the application be approved.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the site was located within the built-up area but whilst it was situated within the Market Town of Wellington it

sat outside of the designated primary shopping area. Consideration had been given to Policies EC6 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan and Policy EC7 of the emerging Local Plan and supported the change of use to retail and it was therefore accepted in principle. The over-proliferation of similar uses such as takeaways within an area was considered and as the unit would be positioned between a proposed E Class Use unit and an estate agent it was considered that this complied with policy. Officers were satisfied that the site was large enough to accommodate the proposed use and would not lead to an overdevelopment of the site. The proposed extensions were considered proportionate to the existing building and fairly modest and would not detrimentally impact the character and appearance of the site. The site was approximately 50 metres from the Wellington Conservation area boundary and next to a building of local interest but Officers were satisfied that the development would be an enhancement to the site as a whole. The Council's Built Heritage Specialist raised no objections to the scheme. Should the application be approved, a separate advertisement consent would be required for signage. Conditions would be required in relation to samples of materials, details of the windows and doors to ensure that the scheme was appropriate. In relation to parking, 14 spaces had been demonstrated on the site plan which was a shortfall of 1 space but the application was in a highly sustainable location and benefitted from a range of public car parks all within walking distance of the site. Peak operating hours of the three units on the site would differ and the site would work together as a whole. A highways technical note had been produced which included a tracking exercise for delivery vehicles and this demonstrated that there was sufficient space for delivery vehicles and the Highways Authority have raised no objection to the proposal. The submission of a Delivery Management Plan would be conditioned. Officers were satisfied that the scale and positioning of the extensions would not cause significant detrimental harm by way of loss of light and privacy or have an overbearing impact. In relation to odour and noise, particularly the proximity of the extraction equipment to the neighbouring site, a Noise Impact Assessment had been submitted and no fundamental concerns had been raised by the Environmental Protection Team, although an updated Noise Impact Assessment would be required and that would be conditioned. Whilst a full Odour Impact Assessment had not been submitted as it was not deemed necessary, Environmental Protection had requested a condition for suitable extraction, filtration and odour abatement measures and further assessment would be undertaken in order to ensure that the proposal did not result in detrimental harm to nearby sites. In relation to the control of fats and oils, this would be looked at separate to the planning application by the Environmental Protection Team. The proposed bin store would be conditioned and a Litter Management Plan requested in order that this can be suitably controlled. In conclusion the scheme was considered acceptable due to its compliance with both local and national policies and it was recommended that that application be approved.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns regarding previous issues with odour and the necessity for adequate conditions in relation to extraction in order to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties, opening hours, parking, the impact on the highway, the bin store and refuse collections.

Other Members considered that the application would be an improvement of the area due to its run down nature and that it had previously run as a shop and had meat deliveries so it would be sustainable in that respect, there were no adjoining houses on the proposed site as it was located next to a public house, conditions would be imposed in relation to the extraction unit and the application was considered acceptable.

The Planning Officer explained that at its current site there were two takeaways next to each other and Highway Officers had given consideration to this. The opening hours for each unit would peak at different times. The finer details of the extraction unit and its orientation would be conditioned and a Delivery Management Plan would be requested in order that deliveries could be controlled. A Litter Management Plan would also be requested and these would be assessed in more detail once received and would contain details relating to litter and refuse.

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 Planning Permission (with the authority to finalise any matter including Condition(s)) subject to the following:

- a) the Condition(s) 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).

The meeting ended at 8.03 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday 14 October 2026