

**THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED AT PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 15<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2021 TO ALLOW OFFICERS TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE APPLICANT IN RESPECT OF CONCERNS RELATING TO IMPACT ON THE LOCAL HIGHWAYS NETWORK, IMPACT ON THE EXISTING RIDING CENTRE, LACK OF ON-SITE FACILITIES AND PROXIMITY TO EXISTING LOCAL FACILITIES.**

Online planning file: <https://secure.telford.gov.uk/planning/pa-applicationresponses-public.aspx?ApplicationNumber=TWC/2020/1056>

## **1.0 DETAILS OF CONCERNS RAISED**

1.1 This application was heard at a previous planning committee meeting on 15th December 2021, whereby it was agreed by Members that the application would be deferred to allow Officers to liaise with the applicant and provide additional information for Members to consider. Members raised concerns in respect of impact on the local highways network, impact on of the existing Riding Centre, lack of on-site facilities and proximity to existing local facilities.

## **2.0 NEIGHBOUR & STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS**

2.1 No re-consultation has taken place and no additional representations have been received since the outcome of the previous committee.

## **3.0 DISCUSSIONS**

3.1 The applicant has provided a position statement on the matters raised by Members, dated the 6<sup>th</sup> January 2022. This can be read in full on the online planning file but is discussed below as part of the planning consideration.

## **4.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **4.1 Highways**

4.1.1 Members were concerned that the development of upto 350 dwellings would result in a significant increase in vehicular trips and would exacerbate an already busy section of the Boroughs highway network. Highways matters were discussed at section 8.6 of the original Committee Report.

4.1.2 To reiterate a few key points from the Highway Officers comments on the application; the wider traffic impact of the development was modelled in the Telford Strategic Transport Model. This allows for all existing committed development, background growth and future Local Plan sites to be accounted for to ensure a robust cumulative appraisal of the network.

4.1.3 The model findings can be summarised as follows:

- The site when completed will generate circa. 230 vehicular trips on the highway network at a peak AM and PM hour.

*NB. The common assumption is that every house has three cars and that these all leave and return between the hours of 8-9am and 5-6pm, resulting in (this case) 1,050 car movements at these peak hour times, is incorrect. The reality is that at a peak hour a robust two way car trip generation, for a site outside of a town centre, is usually 0.6-0.7 per residential unit i.e circa 2/3rds of the number of units.*

- 76-85% of all development traffic is expected to route to and from wider Telford through Stirchley Interchange. The capacity of the interchange has been comprehensively modelled up to 2031 where no tolerance thresholds are shown to be exceeded.
- Of the 76-85% which passes through Stirchley Interchange the predominant weight of traffic routes to and from the north to access Telford Centre, M54 west and eastbound and the northern districts of the town along the A442 corridor. This results in an approximate 2-3% increase in traffic on the A442 here at a peak hour.
- Traffic on other routes, in quantum terms, can be considered minimal and will be absorbed into the usual daily fluctuations in flow. Notwithstanding this, every new trip which is affecting highway infrastructure, pencilled for any future improvement, is being charged a S106 contribution in line with Telford Transport Growth Strategy.

4.1.4 In road safety terms, a detailed appraisal of the adjacent highway network was undertaken for accidents occurring in the last five years. The spatial analysis indicates that there is no evidence to suggest that there is a specific existing safety issue which would be influenced or exacerbated by this development.

4.1.5 The site is located adjacent to the A442 offering excellent vehicular connectivity to the wider area and this ensures no material attributable impact on any local residential areas or streets.

4.1.6 Nedge Lane provides an opportunity to form a sustainable corridor through to Stirchley, Randley and Telford Town Centre without having to cross Stirchley Interchange.

4.1.7 The development is making substantial financial contributions towards strategic highway infrastructure, green routes and CCTV installation on Nedge Lane.

4.1.8 The LHA has raised no technical objections on grounds of highway safety subject to the proposed conditions and contributions set out within the recommendation.

4.1.9 Paragraph 111 of the NPPF (2021) states that “*development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.*” As such, Officers consider that there are no material planning grounds to recommend refusal on this basis.

## 4.2 Riding Centre

4.2.1 The Riding Centre lies to the north of the application site, with the two northernmost fields forming part of this application currently being leased by the Riding Centre for grazing purposes.

4.2.2 The lease is short-term, as we understand from the applicants has always been the case, on the basis that the land has been earmarked for development for in excess of 50 years. The Nedge Riding Centre being established in 2000 (as advertised on <https://www.nedgefarmridingcentre.co.uk>).

4.2.3 For clarity purposes, a few key points are made below in relation to the Riding Centre and the land surrounding it:

- Nedge Farmhouse is under private ownership and does not form part of the application site boundary or the land owned by the applicants;
- Only the two fields sandwiched between Nedge Farmhouse and Nedge Lane are proposed to be developed with this application;
- The leaseholders were made aware that the lease ends in early 2023 and would not be renewed for land falling within the application site boundary. If they were not made aware prior to the submission of this application, they were certainly aware during the early stages of the application when it was submitted in November 2020, as this was discussed with Officers;
- The stables themselves, the retail unit and the grazing fields to the north of the farmhouse are not included within the application site boundary and are not proposed to be developed;
- The applicants have confirmed these points within their Position Statement, and to the leasee directly. The leasee and applicants can privately liaise over the future of the lease of these buildings and land;
- If the application were approved and the downgrading of Nedge Lane granted, access to any remaining facilities and the farmhouse would be re-routed through the proposed development primary spine road which is likely to be over 6m in width. In consideration of the illustrative masterplan, the stables users are unlikely to have a significant impact on future residents of the development. It could be argued that deliveries and access to the stables would be improved, as the current access via Nedge Lane is a very tight single-track carriageway with limited visibility;
- This application will not result in the direct closure of the Riding Centre.

4.2.4 Nevertheless, as explained to Members at the Planning Committee, this is a civil matter outside of the control of planning.

### 4.3 Local Facilities

4.3.1 Members were concerned about the sites association with local facilities given its conceived separation from the main residential area by the A442 (Eastern Primary) and the likely walking distances to such facilities, with the nearest being the Petrol Station at the Stirchley Interchange.

4.3.2 As discussed in the original Committee Report, the purpose of the downgrading of Nedge Lane is to facility a sustainable corridor which provides a safe walking and cycling route to local facilities, and discourages users from accessing these on-foot via the Stirchley Interchange.

4.3.3 Officers have undertaken an assessment of local facilities in terms of both variety, distance and availability. The following walking distances are measured on the basis of users utilising the proposed Nedge Lane sustainable corridor, measured from the westernmost point of the application site boundary (the Network Rail bridge), with distances and times taken from Google Maps. Copies of the maps are uploaded to the public file and included in the Committee Agenda.

- Elliot Close (0.2miles/320m – 4min walk):
  - Public House (Boscobel Tavern)
- Calcott (0.4miles/640m – 8min walk)
  - Hair Studio/Barber Shop (Inhibitions)
  - Supermarket (Premier)
  - Hot Food Takeaway (Fatz Chips & Diner)
- Stirchley Local Centre (0.8miles/1280m – 15min walk)
  - Secondary School and Leisure Centre (Telford Park)
  - Primary School (Grange Park)
  - Childrens Nursery (Chipmunks)
  - Medical Centre
  - Pharmacy (Rowlands)
  - Community Library and Café
  - Dental Practice
  - Supermarket (Co-op)
  - Health Food Shop (Bare Nutrition)
  - Hot Food Takeaways (Stirchley Spice Indian, Kebab-Ye, Hong Kong City Chinese)
  - Church (of Pentecost (UK))
- Stirchley Interchange Services (0.6miles/965m – 12min walk)
  - Shell Petrol Station & Car Wash
  - Convenience Store (Select) - *incorporating a Costa Coffee and Jamie Oliver Deli.*

- 4.3.4 Stirchley Avenue has undergone various speed reduction measures in recent years and has a number of safe crossing points along its length in order to access the facilities listed above safely.
- 4.3.5 Manual for Streets suggests that walkable neighbourhoods are those with facilities which can be accessed within 10minutes on foot albeit this is not an upper limit, with walks of upto 2km being appropriate to replace short car trips. Officers consider that the immediate facilities at Calcott are easily walkable, with those at the Stirchley Local Centre also being more than reasonable walking distance for future residents.
- 4.3.6 Additionally a number of high frequency bus stops are located along Stirchley Avenue to provide direct access to Telford Town Centre, which is a 3-4minute drive.
- 4.3.7 Given the level of provision currently available in the locality, the applicants do not consider the provision of an on-site local centre or convenience store to be a viable proposal and this is set out within their supporting Position Statement. It is not considered that the occupiers of 350 dwellings is enough to self-sustain a new convenience supermarket and would likely result in an empty retail unit.
- 4.3.8 Members are also reminded that the sustainability and principle of development at this site has already been considered and accepted by way of:
1. New Towns Act 1981 Section 7(1) Submission 242: The Hem; Granted June 1991. This is an extant consent, granted by the Secretary of State for the Environment.
  2. Allocation in the Wrekin Local Plan 1995-2006
  3. Allocation in the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031

As an allocated housing site, this proposal has been through various rounds of public consultation during the Local Plan, scrutinised by an Independent Examining Planning Inspector and formally adopted by the Council in 2018. The housing allocation (H7) is for residential development and does not necessitate the provision of on-site retail unit, or medical services.

- 4.3.9 As confirmed to Members during the previous Planning Committee, the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) have not commented on this application or sought any contributions towards local facilities and this is not an unusual situation for Telford & Wrekin. Officers have nevertheless made direct enquiries and can confirm that the Medical Centre is accepting new patients and that the Dental Practice will be looking to do so in the next 2-3weeks.
- 4.4 Other Matters – Homes for All Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and First Homes Policy Position Statement
- 4.4.1 Following the adoption of the Homes for All SPD in January 2022 and the publication of the Council's Policy Position Statement on First Homes on the

6<sup>th</sup> January 2022, a few matters arising from these documents need to be considered and discussed in the Committee Update.

- 4.4.2 Comments from the Councils Housing Team were received on the 18<sup>th</sup> October 2021 and are available on the public file. These comments were made following two detailed pre-application workshops, which set out the expected requirements for this application.
- 4.4.3 The First Homes scheme was introduced in May 2021 through a Written Ministerial Statement and planning practice guidance. First Homes will not apply to sites with full or outline planning permissions already in place or determined before 28 December 2021, or 28 March 2022 where there has been significant pre-application engagement. On the basis of two formal pre-application workshops and an application with a formal recommendation having been made in December 2021, the position for affordable housing remains unaltered and the First Homes scheme will not apply to this site.
- 4.4.4 In respect of the Homes for All SPD, this application is in outline with all matters reserved but any future reserved matters application(s) will be expected to comply with any relevant standards set out within this SPD, which includes a proportion of proposed dwellings being Category M4(2) and M4(3). This requirement was also set out within comments received from the Housing Team and has been incorporated into a draft S106 agreement in addition to the proposed mix and tenure of affordable dwellings.
- 4.4.5 Table 5 of the SPD also suggests that all developments of 100 dwellings or more should consider the inclusion of supported or specialist housing in accordance with the Council's assessment of local needs. However, as an allocated site with extant permission, this is not a requirements for this application.

## **5.0 CONCLUSION**

- 5.1 Officers are satisfied that concerns raised by Members at the 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021 Committee have been considered in the planning balance and are detailed further in the report above for the purposes of clarity.
- 5.2 Officers advice to members is that given the sites existing extant planning consent, and its continued allocation in the most recent and up to date Local Plan the proposes principle of this development is acceptable. Furthermore with the imposition of planning conditions and the planning obligations and financial contributions being secured through S106 agreement, the proposal fully complies with the relevant policies contained within the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan, and the NPPF. As such in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in para 11 of NPPF, this application should be approved without further delay.

## **6.0 DETAILED RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 Based on the conclusions above, it is recommended that Delegated Authority be granted to the Service Delivery Manager to **GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION** (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions, legal agreement terms, or any later variations) subject to:

- A) The applicants/landowner entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Local Planning relating to the following (subject to indexation from the date of committee with terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager):
- i) On-site provision affordable housing (25%);
  - ii) Financial contribution towards primary education provision, at a cost of £4,737.15 per dwelling (*the total sum being no more than £1,658,004.00*);
  - iii) Financial contribution towards secondary education provision, at a cost of £1,988.12 (*the total sum being no more than £695,842.00*);
  - iv) Financial contribution of £121,328.00 towards the Telford Transport Growth Strategy;
  - v) CCTV Provision at a cost of £42,500.00 along Nedge Lane ;
  - vi) Financial contribution of £10,000.00 towards the Green Routes Strategy;
  - vii) Travel plan monitoring at a cost of £5,000.00;
  - viii) Financial contribution towards off-site sports provision (*figure TBC dependent upon number and mix of housing at REM - £650/dwelling for 2bed or larger*)
  - ix) Financial contribution of £32,700.00 towards woodland management at Halesfield 1;
  - x) Financial contribution of £70,200.00 towards woodland management and safety surveys/management at The Nedge;
  - xi) S106 monitoring fee (*1% of the total value of S106 contributions, or capped at £20,000.00*)
  - xii) Implementation timetable for the on-site LEAP provision
  - xiii) Implementation timetable for on-site NEAP provision, or financial contribution towards either a partial or entire off-site enhancement towards local NEAP provision (*figure TBC dependent upon number and mix of housing at REM - £350/dwelling for 2bed or larger as a partial on-site NEAP provision, or £650/dwelling for 2bed or larger as an entire off-site contribution*).
- B) The following conditions (with authority to finalise conditions and

reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):-

A01: Time Limit Outline  
A03: Time Limit – Submission of REM  
B0001 – Standard Outline – all reserved matters  
B0003: General Details Required  
CUSTOM: Internal Highways Network  
CUSTOM: Roundabout Details  
CUSTOM: Non-vehicular Sustainable Corridor  
B045: Travel Plan  
B150: SEMP  
B106: Greenfield Foul & Surface Water  
B076: SUDS Management Plan  
CUSTOM: Modelling for Future Urban Creep  
CUSTOM: Exceedance Flow Routing Plan  
CUSTOM: Mapped Surface Water Flood Risk  
CUSTOM: Culvert Design & Modelling  
CUSTOM: Riparian Ownerships  
B141: Ecological Mitigation Strategy & Method Statement  
CUSTOM: Bat/Bird Boxes  
B142: Habitat Management Plan  
B145: Lighting Plan  
CUSTOM: Badger pre-commencement inspection  
CUSTOM: Updated Site Surveys  
CUSTOM: Biodiversity Net Gain  
CUSTOM: Biodiversity Monitoring Strategy  
B110: Archaeological WSI  
B126: Landscape Management Plan  
B155: Details for LEAP and/or NEAP  
CUSTOM: Air Quality Monitoring  
CUSTOM: Affordable Housing Noise Levels  
CUSTOM: Updated AIA & Shading Assessment  
CUSTOM: Character Plan  
CUSTOM: Phasing Plan  
CUSTOM: Non-approval of Layout  
CUSTOM: Approved plans/general principles  
CUSTOM: Maximum Housing Numbers  
CUSTOM Specifying: Strategic Newt Licensing – EPS  
CUSTOM Specifying: Land Contamination Assessment  
CUSTOM Specifying: Landscape & Visual Appraisal

**AS THE COUNCIL IS THE LANDOWNER/APPLICANT AND INVOLVES S106 FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS, THIS APPLICATION IS TO BE DETERMINED BY MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE.**

Online planning file: <https://secure.telford.gov.uk/planning/pa-applicationresponses-public.aspx?ApplicationNumber=TWC/2020/1056>

## **1. SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1.1 It is recommended that **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to **GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to conditions, informatives and the applicant entering in to a S106 agreement to secure financial contributions.

## **2. APPLICATION SITE**

- 2.1 The site is located North East of Stirchley Interchange, Nedge Hill and lies on the far east of Telford where it adjoins the Shropshire Council boundary.
- 2.2 The site is located within the built up area of Telford and is an allocated housing site (allocation H7 of Policy HO2). There are no nearby statutorily Listed Buildings or Conservation Areas. To the north lies Nedge Farmhouse a 'Building of Local Interest' classified as a 'non-designated heritage asset'.

## **3. APPLICATION DETAILS**

- 3.1 This application seeks outline planning permission, with all matters reserved, for the erection of upto 350 dwellings.
- 3.2 The application is supported by an illustrative masterplan to demonstrate how the site could be developed, but is not a formal layout for approval at this stage.

## **4. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 **EIA/2020/0001** – Screening Opinion for outline application for the development of upto 350 no dwellings with all matters reserved – Environmental Impact Assessment not required – Decision issued: 10<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

4.2 **T90/0021** – Authorisation under New Towns Act for Residential Development – 14<sup>th</sup> December 1990.

## **5. RELEVANT POLICY DOCUMENTS**

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.2 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

5.3 Telford and Wrekin Local Plan (2011-2031)

SP1 Telford

SP4 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

HO1 Housing requirement

HO2 Housing Allocations

HO5 Affordable housing thresholds and percentages

NE1 Biodiversity and geodiversity

NE2 Trees hedgerows and woodlands

NE4 Provision of public open space

NE5 Management and maintenance of public open space

C1 Promoting alternatives to the car

C2 Safeguarding rail and transport corridors

C3 Implications of development on highways

C4 Design of roads and streets

BE1 Design Criteria

BE6 Buildings of local interest

ER11 Sewerage systems and water quality

ER12 Flood Risk Management

## **6. NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS**

6.1 The application has been publicised through a site notice, press notice and direct neighbour notification.

6.2 The Local Planning Authority received 80 neighbour representation objecting to the scheme, the following summarised issues were raised:

- Loss of riding school/community facility.
- Loss of green spaces
- Pressure on local services
- Impact on local wildlife
- Loss of riding school
- Impact on local highway network
- Loss of walking routes/land

- Possible complaints from future residents over commercial uses to the south

## 7. STATUTORY REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 **Stirchley & Brookside Parish Council (HRPC)** – Object:  
Need to retain green space.

7.2 **Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council** – comment

Members were disappointed comments made in the consultation were not taken into consideration – this is an ideal opportunity to create an outstanding development.

- Protect the existing woodland, particularly at Nedge Hill and create a corridor from the Valley to the Nedge.
- Revisit issues around cars, parking and charging facilities. Access to Nedge Farm should not be through the estate. Access to the countryside should include cycle paths, bridleways etc.
- Conditions to prevent HMOs and car repairs from home, other small businesses etc.
- A health and wellbeing centre is likely to be required – GP surgery, outreach NHS provision, play and recreation facilities, adult gym etc.
- Affordable warmth initiatives and house-for-life adaptable dwellings.
- Development should be within the Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council and HRPC will work with developers to continue their work in Randlay Valley, whilst linking this development to TWCs Strategy.

7.3 **Highways, Arboricultural, Healthy Spaces, Ecology, Drainage and Environmental Health, Archaeology, Education, Affordable Housing** – Support subject to conditions / S106 contributions

7.4 **Built Heritage** – object

The proposed development to the north side of Nedge Lane would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Nedge Farmhouse, a Building of Local Interest, contrary to policy BE 6 iii. The harm to the setting of the non-designated asset is considered to be less than substantial.

7.5 **Environment Agency** – comment

Site lies predominantly in FZ1; a low risk zone, and falls within the remit of the Local Lead Flood Authority to provide comment. The EA would however recommend consideration, at detailed design stage, of flood risk betterment on site through the management of surface water and also the use of natural flood risk management techniques.

7.6 **Natural England** - support

The proposed development will not have a significant adverse impact on designated sites and therefore raise no objection. The proposed development would not appear to lead to the loss of over 20 ha 'best and most versatile' agricultural land (paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework).

**7.7 Shropshire Fire Service – Comment:**

As part of the planning process, consideration should be given to the information contained within Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service's "Fire Safety Guidance for Commercial and Domestic Planning Applications" document, and a robust swept path analysis required.

**7.8 West Mercia Police – Comment:**

General design guidance provided as an Informative.

**7.9 CPRE Shropshire – object**

Conflicts with housing targets and site yield within the LP of 300; detail on how carbon emission reduction will be achieved through design; NE Land map classifies the land as Grade 3 (good and moderate) – how will the loss be offset; commitment to the recommendations of the AIA; threat to the Green Belt and sets an undesirable precedent for erosion of this asset; impact on local businesses including the Riding Centre; LVA admits that suburban light levels will intrude eastwards but no mitigation is proposed; analysis of impacts on schools and GPs needs to be addressed. Short consultation process.

**8. APPRAISAL**

**8.1** Having regard to the development plan policy and other material considerations including comments received during the consultation process, the planning application raises the following main issues:

- Principle of development / Policy Background
- Design
- Heritage
- Impact on the amenity of adjacent properties / uses
- Highways impacts
- Drainage
- Arboriculture and Ecology
- Other matters – Archaeology, Environmental Health, Healthy Spaces, Coal Mining, Contamination, Landscape & Visual Appraisal.
- Planning obligations

## 8.2 Principle of development/ Policy Background

- 8.2.1 The site is an allocated housing site (ref: H7) as identified in Policy HO2 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan. The site was approved under section 7(1) of the New Towns Act and has been allocated in all superseded local plans since 1990.
- 8.2.2 The site was shown for residential development within the Telford New Town Masterplan of 1965.
- 8.2.3 Appendix D of the Local Plan, which supplements Policy HO2, identifies the application site as H7 (Land at the Hem, Telford). The site is shown to be an approximate size of 42.37hectares with an indicative yield of 300 dwellings.
- 8.2.4 The indicative dwelling yield in the Local Plan was based on a 60% net site area being applied in the site assessment process to take account of infrastructure, services provision, landscaping and constraints. However, technical matters are for consideration during the planning application process which includes the proposed yield.
- 8.2.5 Reference is made within consultation responses regarding concern over the erosion of the Green Belt. The application site does not fall within designated Green Belt but does fall alongside the allocation within the Shropshire Council Local Development Framework. Shropshire Council were consulted on this application but provided no formal comments.
- 8.2.6 The illustrative Masterplan demonstrates in principle that a development of upto 350 dwellings is possible taking account of site constraints, however the matter of design and layout are reserved for later approval. Planning permission is recommended for upto 350 dwellings and it will be for the applicant(s) to demonstrate whether this is achievable without negatively impacting on the overall design ethos and taking account of site constraints. The 350 dwellings is a maximum yield, rather than an aspiration.
- 8.2.7 In principle the residential development of this site is considered acceptable at outline stage, based on the parameters outlined.

## 8.3 Design

- 8.3.1 The application is supported by an Illustrative Masterplan to demonstrate how the site could be capable of accommodating upto 350 dwellings.
- 8.3.2 The application has been submitted in outline with all matters reserved and as such, this layout is not for approval at this stage. Consideration has therefore not been given to specific matters such as garden amenity standards, car parking standards or Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) however,

any reserved matters applications(s) are expected to meet these standards, as a minimum.

8.3.3 There are however areas and features of note on the Masterplan which would be expected to come forward with any reserved matters application(s). A number of these key aspects are also outlined within the Landscape Visual Appraisal which is conditioned. These include the following:

- i) Provision of a 4-arm roundabout off Halesfield 1, as agreed with the LHA;
- ii) Provision of sustainable corridor from the application site towards Stirchley, via Nedge Lane;
- iii) On-site play provision;
- iv) Appropriate landscaping/transition of the eastern boundary where it lies adjacent the Shropshire Green Belt;
- v) Meadow buffer adjacent to, and connectivity to with the Nedge woodland on the north-east boundary;
- vi) Extensive open space buffer to the frontage of Nedge Farmhouse (a local interest building);
- vii) Retention and improvement of the vista towards Nedge Farmhouse from Nedge Lane;
- viii) Protection of all existing veteran/ancient tree specimens and hedgerows, in addition to the enhancement of adjoining woodlands.

8.3.4 The applicant has noted that the site is likely to be developed in no more than two phases. To provide appropriate flexibility in this respect, the conditions will be worded to allow appropriate conditions to be discharged on a phased basis.

### *Sustainability*

8.3.5 Whilst only in outline form, the submitted Design & Access Statement does make some commitments towards the sustainability credentials of the site that the applicants intend to impose as highlighted below:

- Solar orientation and wind sheltering;
- Composters, internal and external bin provision for recycling;
- Targets to minimise waste production during construction;
- Sustainable water supplies to homes;

- Optimising the use of reclaimed/recycled products as well as naturally and locally sourced products;
- Provide attractive sunlit public and private amenity spaces at ground level.
- Optimise passive solar gain by providing natural shading and cooling to minimise overheating.
- Ensure good levels of daylight within dwellings at every floor level.
- Optimise the potential for collecting solar energy at roof level.
- Position taller buildings to the north of any perimeter blocks to prevent overshadowing.
- Make use of street trees to provide shelter and shade;

8.3.6 The reserved matters should provide a long-term commitment to the climate crisis, by installing measures such as solar panels, electric charging points and 5G internet connections from the onset; avoiding future retrofitting, as well as all other commitments made in the supporting Design & Access Statement described above. The applicants aim is to seek to achieve 'better than' building regulations standards for all housetypes.

8.3.7 Any reserved matters would be supported by a Character Plan to demonstrate how these design aspirations have been fed into the detailed design stage. This is conditioned accordingly.

## 8.4 Heritage

8.4.1 The site does not fall within any Conservation Area or other statutory protected areas. Additionally, there are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site which may be impacted by this development.

8.4.2 Nedge Farmhouse is a mid-19<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse identified on the TWC Register of Buildings of Local Interest, i.e. a 'non-designated heritage asset'. It is set in an isolated location surrounded by green fields and accessed from a long driveway from Nedge Lane. Its setting emphasises its historic agricultural origins and gives it a particular presence within the landscape. The farm buildings to the west of the house have seen many alterations and losses over the years, but some residual historic buildings and the ongoing agricultural use of the site continue to add to the setting of the Building of Local Interest.

8.4.3 The Built Heritage Team raise no objection to the development south of Nedge Lane on historic environment grounds. There would be some suburbanisation of distant views from Nedge Farmhouse, but this would be a very minor impact.

8.4.4 With reference to the development north of Nedge Lane, the applicants Heritage Statement states: *"The presence of the development [north of Nedge Lane], with houses, gardens and associated infrastructure to the south of the principal elevation would alter the open agricultural character of the assets"*

*setting, as well as dominate views to and from the principal elevation of the farmhouse. The historic and architectural interest of the farmhouse as a mid-19<sup>th</sup> century gothic-style farmhouse, would be retained, however the development would diminish the understanding of the buildings' relationship to the surrounding landscape and reduce the contribution of setting to their significance..."* (7.3 para 1).

- 8.4.5 This summary of the impacts on the Building of Local Interest is supported by the Council's Built Heritage Specialist, adding that the key view of the farmstead from Nedge Lane across open fields would be transformed to a formal avenue of detached suburban housing. The buffer of green space between farmstead and housing development would affect only the closest views of the Building of Local Interest, and not address the harm to this key view and experience of its wider setting.
- 8.4.6 The Heritage Statement identifies the harm as 'less than substantial'. Again this view is supported by the Council's Built Heritage Specialist. The Built Heritage Specialist considers that the proposed development to the north side of Nedge Lane would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Nedge Farmhouse, a Building of Local Interest, contrary to policy BE 6 iii.
- 8.4.7 Whilst recognising the concerns raised by the Council's Built Heritage Specialist, the principle of development in proximity to the non-designated heritage asset was previously considered and found to be suitable through the Local Plan adoption process.
- 8.4.8 In accordance with para 203 of the NPPF (2021), proposals for development which would have 'less than substantial harm' that directly or indirectly affects a non-designated heritage asset, should form "*...a balanced judgement ... having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.*"
- 8.4.9 It is recognised that the development of housing in the near vicinity of the farmhouse could have some impact upon the historic and established open agricultural setting to its south, however this could be reduced through appropriate design and layout.
- 8.4.10 The masterplan has been adapted since pre-application discussions to include a green buffer of over 60m to the north end of the site; retaining a sense of openness to the frontage of the farmhouse which should follow through to any reserved matters application. Additionally, the proposed access has been aligned so as to retain a direct vista of the farmhouse from Nedge Lane. It is appreciated, and expected at detailed design stage, that further effort will be made to improve this vista; setting proposed dwellings back further from the highway, creating a wide green corridor which softens views through to the farmhouse and avoids the appearance of a formal avenue; a feature not supported by TWC's Built Heritage Specialist.

8.4.11 It is considered that the scale of harm can be mitigated so as to ensure that the farmhouse still retains some of the open setting which it currently enjoys; with the north, south and eastern boundaries remaining unaltered. As such, on balance, the scale of the impact on the non-designated heritage asset in consideration of para 203 of the NPPF, is considered acceptable.

## 8.5 Impact on neighbouring properties/uses

8.5.1 Given the site's location, the impact on nearby residential amenity is limited.

8.5.2 The nearest residential property is Nedge Farmhouse and based on the illustrative Masterplan, any proposed dwelling will be sited in excess of 60m from the existing residents. As such, no impact on amenity or issues of overlooking/overbearance are considered likely to occur. Detailed design stage will need to ensure appropriate separation distances are carried through to the final layout.

8.5.3 It is recognised however that the proposal will have a marked change on the landscape to which the current residents enjoy and are accustomed too. However, there is no right to a view and this site has been allocated for housing for in excess of 30 years and part of the Telford New Town plan since its creation.

8.5.4 In consideration of the impact on the Riding School, with the loss of fields to the north of Nedge Lane which are currently utilised by the Riding Centre, this is a civil matter outside of the control of planning.

8.5.5 The land associated with the Riding School has been subject to short-term leases for many years, with it borne in mind that the fields would likely be developed at some stage due to their allocation in the current and previous local plans. The current lease expires in early 2023 and it has been confirmed by the applicants that this will not be renewed.

8.5.6 The Nedge Farmhouse itself is in private ownership and will remain.

## 8.6 Highways Impacts

8.6.1 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment, Outline Travel Plan, Road Safety Audit and Road Safety Review (all received Nov/Dec 2020); in addition to the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Response, Proposed Roundabout - Earthworks and Sections; and proposed 4 arm roundabout details received in March 2021.

*First Principles*

- 8.6.2 The site is located adjacent to the A442 offering excellent vehicular connectivity to the wider area and this ensures no material attributable impact on any local residential areas or streets.
- 8.6.3 Nedge Lane provides an opportunity to form a sustainable corridor through to Stirchley, Randlay and Telford Town Centre without having to cross Stirchley Interchange.
- 8.6.4 The development is making substantial financial contributions towards strategic highway infrastructure, green routes and CCTV installation on Nedge Lane.

#### *Site Access*

- 8.6.5 The application is outline with all matters reserved, including access. However, the application does propose a 4 arm roundabout as the junction form to access the site from Halesfield 1. The arrangement is supported by the LHA and is conditioned to this recommendation.
- 8.6.6 Pre application consideration was given to both a traffic signal and roundabout solution at this location but ultimately it was decided that the roundabout option was the most suitable for the following reasons:
- It forms a more attractive gateway to the site, better delineating a residential development from the industrial nature of the landscape to south;
  - The signal junction would have involved a staggered crossroads arrangement with Halesfield 24 opposite, creating an urbanised and also somewhat convoluted arrangement;
  - A roundabout suits the pattern of the network in this location and there are no other traffic signals in the vicinity;
  - In capacity terms the roundabout is more future proof than a signal arrangements
- 8.6.7 The roundabout has been comprehensively modelled and received a preliminary safety assessment. Therefore the LHA is happy that the general design principle proposed is acceptable but a full detailed design will be required prior to any development taking place.

#### *Wider Impact*

- 8.6.8 The wider traffic impact of the development was modelled in the Telford Strategic Transport Model. This allows for all existing committed development, background growth and future Local Plan sites to be accounted for to ensure a robust cumulative appraisal of the network.
- 8.6.9 In road safety terms, a detailed appraisal of the adjacent highway network was undertaken for accidents occurring in the last five years. The spatial analysis indicates that there is no evidence to suggest that there is a specific

existing safety issue which would be influenced or exacerbated by this development.

### *Sustainability*

8.6.10 The key proposal which unlocks the sustainable merits of this site is the Nedge Lane connection that runs through the centre of the site and links directly onto Stirchley Avenue to the west providing easy access to Stirchley, Randley and Telford Town Centre. Options on Nedge Lane range from a full non-vehicular downgrade of the route for exclusive pedestrian, cycle and bridleway status, through to a hybrid solution where priority is given to non-motorised users but a form of low level vehicular corridor is left available if required.

8.6.11 The LHA has specifically asked for a detailed planning condition to be included on any consent given to detail the specific option and the methodology for its implementation prior to any occupation of the development. The LHA does not under any circumstances want the primary sustainable connection to the west of the site being across the Stirchley Interchange.

8.6.12 A sustainable corridor on Nedge Lane delivers the following benefits:

- High frequency Bus Stops on Stirchley Avenue can be reached on foot within 10 minutes. Stirchley Local Centre, Grange Park Primary School, Telford Park Secondary School, Doctors and local convenience shops are all within a 20 minute walk;
- The above walking times can be cut by 2/3rds for cycle use and Telford Town Centre, Stafford Park, Madeley, Brookside and Dawley are become within a 15 minute journey time;
- Through a S.106 contribution the route can be surveyed by CCTV to ensure safe passage for all users;
- A high quality route to promote health, wellbeing and an alternative to the car.

### *Internal Layout*

8.6.13 As the application is all matters reserved the internal layout submitted is just a high level Masterplan to provide a concept as to how the site could be delivered. However, some efforts have been made to prescribe parameters with the submission of documents for access and movement in and around the site. The principles set within these documents do have merit and fulfil many of the expectations of the LHA for an overall modern context with defined street types, hierarchy and function.

- 8.6.14 There is of course a lot of detail to be added at the revised matters stage where specific requirements for parking numbers and refuse and emergency servicing will need to be met.
- 8.6.15 Accordingly the Local Highway Authority could not defend any objection to the proposals on highways grounds, in that the NPPF 'severe' impact test is not met on any level and the proposal is considered to be compliant with local and national policy.

## 8.7 Drainage

- 8.7.1 The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment, Drainage Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment Addendum (all received Nov/Dec 2020), as well as a Drainage Overview received on the 15<sup>th</sup> November 2021 and associated plan outlining indicative flood compensation areas.
- 8.7.2 Following discussions with the developer the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) is now satisfied in principle with the proposals, subject to the conditions in the recommendation below.
- 8.7.3 It is understood by the LLFA that in order to access the site, a crossing will be necessary for the watercourse. It was initially assumed that this would be in the form of a bridge crossing with the indicative masterplan not stipulating any specific proposals.
- 8.7.4 During the course of the application however, it has come to the light that the crossing is likely to take the form of a culvert due to viability constraints. Policy ER12 (viii) requires developments to demonstrate *"...no loss of open watercourse with culverts being opened up where possible to improve drainage and flood flows. Proposals involving the creation of new culverts (unless essential to the provision of access) will not be permitted"*.
- 8.7.5 It is understood from the applicants that neither the culvert or bridge is a viable option, but that the culvert is the more viable option of the two and is therefore, on balance, considered 'essential' to bring forward this allocated housing site and the provision of its access (as per the exception to policy). It is understood that the landowners accept the viability concerns and that it is ultimately going to have an effect on the land receipt.
- 8.7.6 It is important that as much watercourse as possible on site is left open, to reduce the impact of culverting. It is vitally important that any loss of floodplain storage is compensated for on a level for level, volume for volume basis, to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Multiple benefits of the storage areas should be provided where possible, and consider biodiversity and amenity as well as their primary flood function.

- 8.7.7 The flood risk assessment supporting the application should be updated at reserved matters stage to include the final models and details relating to the culvert and the flood compensation areas.
- 8.7.8 The surface water drainage for the site as set out in the submitted information is accepted in principle. Further information on this will be required at later stages of planning and is conditioned accordingly.

## **8.8 Arboriculture & Ecology**

### **Arboriculture**

- 8.8.1 The application is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) which surveys all existing trees on the site, categorising their quality and their likely Root Protection Area (RPA).
- 8.8.2 A number of Tree Protection Plans support this assessment and are prepared on the basis of the illustrative masterplan. As layout is not for approval at this stage, these protection plans are not to be approved as part of this application.
- 8.8.3 The illustrative masterplan highlights a number of locations where the RPAs of veteran trees are shown as being encroached, and this would not be supported. Additionally, the standing advice from Natural England should be utilised (i.e. an RPA of at least 15 times the diameter of the tree), and not a diameter of 12 times, as is currently set out within the submitted AIA.
- 8.8.4 There are 3 very large trees described as being veteran trees and over 1400mm in diameter (T24, T32 and T68). These specifically need to be considered as a constraint to the development and the detailed layout created to make features of them; positioning them within pockets of incidental open space.
- 8.8.5 There are also other tree groups/hedgerows of ancient quality which should be made a feature within areas of open space, rather than encompassed into highway verges and gardens as is shown on the illustrative masterplan.
- 8.8.6 It is therefore recommended that whilst an AIA has been completed having assessed the quality of tree specimens on site, any subsequent reserved matters applications(s) should be accompanied by an updated AIA which takes account of the proposed layout put forward at the time, in addition to the comments and concerns outlined above. This AIA should also include a shading assessment for any proposed dwellings positioned in proximity to existing and proposed woodlands.

## Ecology

- 8.8.7 The application is supported by an Ecology Impact Assessment (Nov 2020), Impact Assessment and Conservation Payment Certificate (July 2021) and Biodiversity Net Gain (BGN) assessment (Oct 2021) and subsequent emails clarifying details on the watercourse culvert.
- 8.8.8 The site comprises grassland, cropland, woodland, sparsely vegetated land, heathland and shrub, urban land, hedgerows and rivers and streams. The EIA sets out that priority habitats on site will be retained and protected and the development has demonstrated that NE1 can be satisfied in terms of protection of priority habitats and that achieving no net biodiversity loss, and in fact biodiversity net gain, is possible across all habitat types on the site.
- 8.8.9 There are two SSSI's in 5km of the site but the development is outside of the Impact Risk Zones for these sites and no impact is considered likely. There is a Green Guarantee site adjacent to the site which is appropriately buffered in the landscaping design to ensure no impact upon this woodland.
- 8.8.10 There are a number of badger setts within 30m of the site boundary and the EIA sets out that these have been appropriately buffered within the site design and pre-commencement badger inspections have been conditioned.
- 8.8.11 Surveys and eDNA data confirmed no presence of GCN on-site. However, as a precautionary measure the scheme is going to enter the Strategic Newt Licencing Scheme (Telford's District Level Licencing). The Conservation Payment and Impact Assessment Certificate has been fully signed and the payment will be made upon the grant of planning.
- 8.8.12 Three red list bird species (barn owl, skylark and yellowhammer) are present on the site along with a range of other breeding bird species. The EIA sets out that the habitat retention and provision on the site is sufficient to provide opportunities for these species and that a range of bird boxes and appropriate landscaping design.
- 8.8.13 A single building was assessed for roosting potential but was deemed not to be suitable. 17 dusk emergence surveys were carried out to assess bat roosting within trees on the site, a single tree at SJ7141907193 was identified as a roost for 2 common pipistrelle and 1 brown long-eared bat. This tree is identified for retention and protection within the development. Conditions would secure it's retention along with precautionary measures of working for trees on the site with some bat roosting potential.
- 8.8.14 The EIA sets out Biodiversity Net Gains across habitats and hedgerows based on current landscape masterplanning for the site and losses and gains relating to streams are set out in a separate document. The position, which will be subject to a planning condition, is that there will be an 18.34% increase in biodiversity units

across a range of habitat types on the site, a 12.58% uplift in hedgerow biodiversity units and a 1.36% uplift in river biodiversity units. Each of the reserved matters applications will need to demonstrate how they are feeding into delivering those site wide uplifts.

8.8.15 The Ecology Team have been involved in the emerging proposals for this site since the pre-application stage. Throughout those discussions it was understood that the crossing of Nedge Brook would be achieved with minimal impacts upon the brook and retaining the watercourse in its current form across most of the site. More recently it has been advised of the need to culvert around 70m of the watercourse in order to effect the highway crossing of the brook.

8.8.16 Discussions have clarified that while a bridge remains a theoretical option it is prohibitively expensive and that a large culvert with a partly naturalised channel flowing through it is likely to be the option taken forward (although the costs associated with this are also significant).

8.8.17 The Ecological Impact Assessment for the site states that the stream is considered to be a priority habitat type. The Rivers and Streams Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (2021) provides a high level assessment of the stream habitat by carrying out a River MORPH survey which deems the stream to be in a 'moderate' condition. This survey, along with the two versions of the Defra Biodiversity Metric which have been provided for the development sets out the potential for onsite mitigation which would address the loss to this Priority Habitat.

8.8.18 The result is that the whole length of the Nedge Brook on site is valued at 15.01 biodiversity units (including an existing short culvert). The proposed culvert would result in a loss of 0.72 biodiversity units.

8.8.19 There are opportunities on site to provide an increase in river biodiversity units by daylighting areas of the watercourse through tree removal, excavating side channels, back waters and linked wetlands, increasing river morphological diversity, forming side bars in the channel and planting trees and otherwise reinstating the riparian corridor. By applying these measures across the site the Applicant conclude that it will be possible to achieve a 1.36% uplift in river biodiversity units on the site (alongside the uplift being achieved for other habitat types), which is sufficient to satisfy policy NE1.

8.8.20 A recommendation of support is provided for the application on ecology grounds, subject to the conditions outlined below.

## **8.9 Other matters - Archaeology, Environmental Health, Healthy Spaces, Contamination, Coal Mining.**

### **Archaeology:**

- 8.9.1 The proposed development site lies in an area with a background of archaeological remains of the prehistoric through to post-medieval periods. There are a number of non-designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the proposed development site. The proposed development site therefore may be considered to have some archaeological potential and historical interest.
- 8.9.2 In accordance with para 194 of the NPPF, a Heritage Impact Assessment and Geophysical Survey have been submitted.
- 8.9.3 The geophysical survey identified a number of small anomalies of potential archaeological interest, including a number of linear features in the northeast and southern parts of the site. The majority of these features of interest are located in proposed area of open space on the illustrative masterplan.
- 8.9.4 The Historic Environment Team have recommended that a phased programme of archaeological works should take place, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to include limited trial trenches, prior to commencement.

#### **Environmental Health – Noise**

- 8.9.5 The application is supported by a Noise Assessment (November 2020) and additional commentary provided by the applicants Noise Consultants in March 2021, at the request of Environmental Health.
- 8.9.6 The Assessment concludes that the site is suitable for the proposed residential use, with a low to medium risk of adverse effects due to existing nearby noise sources (road traffic on the A442 / Halesfield 1). It is likely that any adverse noise impacts could be fully mitigated through a process of good acoustic design as outlined in the Noise Assessment.
- 8.9.7 Given the noise information available in the initial assessment and the additional commentary it is clear that the assessor has considered the impact of noise thoroughly at this stage in the planning system and proposes additional information at reserved matters stage. This approach is considered to be acceptable to Environmental Health.
- 8.9.8 Consideration of positioning of affordable dwellings has been acknowledged by the applicants, and it is advised that affordable dwellings would be located in areas where they can be provided with levels of noise which meet BS8233:2014 standards in all cases including any external amenity area. The occupants of such properties may not have the financial means to compensate against the impacts of environmental stressors, and this consideration therefore future proofs these properties. This has been conditioned accordingly.

#### **Environmental Health – Air Quality**

- 8.9.9 The application is supported by an Air Quality Assessment (Nov 2020) and additional commentary in respect of air quality in the document referred to as Technical Note – AQ response to EHO, dated 16/03/2021.
- 8.9.10 The Air Quality Assessment concludes that a review of existing air quality conditions indicated that the proposed development is situated in an area of relatively good air quality and that the development would not exceed the AQS objectives.
- 8.9.11 It further concludes that the construction phase of the Proposed Development has the potential to generate dust and emissions, which may have a short term adverse impact at nearby human receptors but as with all development, these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan.
- 8.9.12 On the basis that this is not an Air Quality Monitoring area, no further information is considered necessary at this time. It is suggested however that a compliance condition is imposed to ensure that the development accords with the submitted AQA.

### **Healthy Spaces**

- 8.9.13 In accordance with LP Policy NE4 this size of development triggers the need for a Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) and Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP). The current indicative proposal provides an onsite Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) and a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP). This is acceptable in principle subject to details.
- 8.9.14 There is little reference in the application to what the NEAP is to include, but it is appreciated that this is an outline application. A NEAP facility should include equipped play for older children, a ball court and wheeled sport (BMX or skate park) or outdoor gym. The indicative area proposed for the NEAP is sloping and these facilities need to be relatively level (particularly a ball court). As the proposed locations for the LEAP and/or NEAP are only 'indicative' at this stage, these facilities and/or contributions would need to be secured through a S106 agreement. If it isn't possible to secure a NEAP on-site, then we would secure an off-site financial contribution.
- 8.9.15 Please note that the landscape detail also impacts upon equipped play use, in that the access to these facilities need to be made accessible to all (DDA).
- 8.9.16 There is insufficient detail provided for landscape proposals to determine whether these are acceptable at this outline stage, but this is a matter reserved for later approval.
- 8.9.17 Given the current indicative layout, constraints plan and site levels it is not believed possible to meet the needs arising from the development for sport

with onsite provision. It is therefore recommended would therefore suggest that the development should provide off-site contributions of £650 per 2 bed property, to meet these sporting needs in accordance with Policy NE4.

8.9.18 There is no detailed phasing plan proposed for the development and Healthy Spaces would wish to clarify specifically when the NEAP and/or LEAP are proposed within the phasing of the development, by use of conditions and/or S106 agreement. The S106 agreement with secure the implementation and timetable of this facility, with the recommended condition ensuring its construction prior to the commencement of any development overlooking (or within 30m) or the play area.

### **Contamination & Coal Mining**

8.9.19 The application is supported by a Land Contamination Assessment and Coal Mining Risk Assessment (CMRA).

8.9.20 The Land Contamination Assessment advises that the results of the contamination testing on-site indicate that the risks to human health are low and no remedial measures are required.

8.9.21 The site falls within a Coal Mining Development Low Risk Area and the Coal Authority were therefore not consulted.

8.9.22 The submitted CMRA concludes that *“based on the information available, it is highly unlikely that the development would be affected by mine workings”*

8.9.23 As such, it is considered that contamination and coal mining are not a constraint to development and can be conditioned accordingly.

### **Agricultural Land Classification**

8.9.24 Natural England concluded in their consultee response that the development would not appear to lead to the loss of over 20ha of ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land and therefore complies with paragraph 170 and 171 of the NPPF.

### **8.10 Planning obligations**

8.10.1 The proposed development meets the requirement to provide contributions as directed through the Local Plan. Officers consider that these contributions are necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development.

8.10.2 The proposed contributions to be sought via a S.106 agreement are therefore as follows:

- xiv) On-site provision affordable housing (25%);
- xv) Financial contribution towards primary & secondary education provision (*figure TBC dependent upon number and mix of housing proposed at REM*)
- xvi) Financial contribution of £121,328.00 towards the Telford Transport Growth Strategy;
- xvii) CCTV Provision at a cost of £42,500.00 along Nedge Lane ;
- xviii) Financial contribution of £10,000.00 towards the Green Routes Strategy;
- xix) Travel plan monitoring at a cost of £5,000.00;
- xx) Financial contribution towards the planting and management of street trees at a cost of £350/tree, plus 5 year management plan;
- xxi) Financial contribution towards off-site sports provision (*figure TBC dependent upon number and mix of housing at REM - £650/dwelling of 2bed or larger*)
- xxii) Financial contribution of £32,700.00 towards woodland management at Halesfield 1;
- xxiii) Financial contribution of £70,200.00 towards woodland management and safety surveys/management at The Nedge;
- xxiv) S106 monitoring fee (*1% of the total value of S106 contributions, or capped at £20,000.00*)
- xxv) Implementation timetable for the on-site play provision and/or financial contribution towards off-site NEAP provision (*figure TBC dependent upon number and mix of housing at REM*)

8.10.3 The applicant has confirmed that despite the viability issues facing the scheme that in order to mitigate the impact of the development, these contributions will be met.

8.10.4 In determining the required planning obligations on this specific application the following three tests as set out in the CIL Regulations (2010), in particular Regulation 122, have been applied to ensure that the application is treated on its own merits:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) directly related to the development;
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

8.10.5 It is considered that the financial contributions required for this application meet the relevant tests. The above obligations will be secured by a S106 Agreement attached to the planning permission.

## 9 CONCLUSIONS

9.1 The Local Planning Authority have taken all matters into account in order to determine whether the proposed (outline) application is acceptable in planning terms and in doing so worked closely with the applicants and technical consultees to resolve issues that have arisen.

9.2 The impact on the setting of the non-designated asset (the locally listed building known as Nedge Farmhouse) has been quantified as less than substantial and this is considered to be outweighed by the significant public benefits of the scheme, in addition to the efforts made within the indicative masterplan to retain an open-setting to its frontage. As such, on balance, the scale of the impact on the non-designated heritage asset in consideration of para 203 of the NPPF, is considered acceptable.

9.3 The proposal is considered to be a sustainable form of development on an allocated housing site, which is deemed to be compliant with the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 and the guidance contained within the NPPF.

## 10.0 DETAILED RECOMMENDATION

10.1 Based on the conclusions above, it is recommended that Delegated Authority be granted to the Service Delivery Manager to **GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION** (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions, legal agreement terms, or any later variations) subject to:

- C) The applicants/landowner entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Local Planning relating to the following (subject to indexation from the date of committee with terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager):
- xxvi) On-site provision affordable housing (25%);
  - xxvii) Financial contribution towards primary & secondary education provision (*figure TBC dependent upon number and mix of housing proposed at REM*)
  - xxviii) Financial contribution of £121,328.00 towards the Telford Transport Growth Strategy;
  - xxix) CCTV Provision at a cost of £42,500.00 along Nedge Lane ;
  - xxx) Financial contribution of £10,000.00 towards the Green Routes Strategy;
  - xxxi) Travel plan monitoring at a cost of £5,000.00;

- xxxii) Financial contribution towards the planting and management of street trees at a cost of £350/tree, plus 5 year management plan;
- xxxiii) Financial contribution towards off-site sports provision (*figure TBC dependent upon number and mix of housing at REM - £650/dwelling of 2bed or larger*)
- xxxiv) Financial contribution of £32,700.00 towards woodland management at Halesfield 1;
- xxxv) Financial contribution of £70,200.00 towards woodland management and safety surveys/management at The Nedge;
- xxxvi) S106 monitoring fee (*1% of the total value of S106 contributions, or capped at £20,000.00*)
- xxxvii) Implementation timetable for the on-site play provision and/or financial contribution towards off-site NEAP provision (*figure TBC dependent upon number and mix of housing at REM*)

D) The following conditions (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):-

A01: Time Limit Outline  
 A03: Time Limit – Submission of REM  
 B0001 – Standard Outline – all reserved matters  
 B0003: General Details Required  
 CUSTOM: Internal Highways Network  
 CUSTOM: Roundabout Details  
 CUSTOM: Non-vehicular Sustainable Corridor  
 B045: Travel Plan  
 B150: SEMP  
 B106: Greenfield Foul & Surface Water  
 B076: SUDS Management Plan  
 CUSTOM: Modelling for Future Urban Creep  
 CUSTOM: Exceedance Flow Routing Plan  
 CUSTOM: Mapped Surface Water Flood Risk  
 CUSTOM: Culvert Design & Modelling  
 CUSTOM: Riparian Ownerships  
 B141: Ecological Mitigation Strategy & Method Statement  
 CUSTOM: Bat/Bird Boxes  
 B142: Habitat Management Plan  
 B145: Lighting Plan  
 CUSTOM: Badger pre-commencement inspection  
 CUSTOM: Updated Site Surveys  
 CUSTOM: Biodiversity Net Gain  
 CUSTOM: Biodiversity Monitoring Strategy  
 B110: Archaeological WSI  
 B126: Landscape Management Plan  
 B155: Details for LEAP and/or NEAP

CUSTOM: Air Quality Monitoring  
CUSTOM: Affordable Housing Noise Levels  
CUSTOM: Updated AIA & Shading Assessment  
CUSTOM: Character Plan  
CUSTOM: Phasing Plan  
CUSTOM: Non-approval of Layout  
CUSTOM: Approved plans/general principles  
CUSTOM: Maximum Housing Numbers  
CUSTOM Specifying: Strategic Newt Licensing – EPS  
CUSTOM Specifying: Land Contamination Assessment  
CUSTOM Specifying: Landscape & Visual Appraisal