

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 9 February 2022 at 6.00 pm in Telford International Centre, International Way, Telford TF3 4JH**

**Present:** Councillors G H Cook, N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, J Jones, R Mehta, G L Offland, K S Sahota, P J Scott and C F Smith (Chair)

**In Attendance:** R Attwell (Democracy Officer (Democracy)), M Bailey (Planning Officer), J Clarke (Senior Democracy Officer (Democracy)), A Gittins (Area Team Planning Manager - West) and J Lyall (Legal Advisor)

**Apologies:** Councillors

#### **PC244 Appointment of Vice Chair**

The Chair announced, following approval at Full Council, that Councillor G Offland had been appointed as Vice-Chair of Planning Committee.

#### **PC245 Declarations of Interest**

Cllr G Cook declared an interest in planning application TWC/2021/0930 as he had sat on the Plans Board at Wellington Town Council when this item had been discussed and indicated that he would withdraw from the meeting during determination thereof.

#### **PC246 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications**

None.

#### **PC247 Site Visits**

None.

#### **PC248 Planning Applications for Determination**

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning application TWC/2021/0930.

#### **PC249 TWC/2020/0356 Land opposite Woodside Farm, Kynnersley Drive, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire**

This application was for the creation of a manege, parking, associated boundary treatments and the erection of stables/equestrian buildings on land opposite Woodside Farm, Kynnersley Drive, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire

The Application was before Committee at the request of Councillor A Eade.

Members had attended a site visit on the afternoon prior to the meeting.

The Area Team Planning Manager presented applications TWC/2020/0356 and TWC/2020/0358 which both related to land opposite Woodside Farm, Kynnersley Drive, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire.

Lilleshall Parish Council had submitted a statement. This had been received after the deadline for additional information, but the statement broadly outlined, highways, policy TA1 of the Lilleshall Neighbourhood Plan, a conflict with Design Policy B1, Policy LE2 in relation to ecology and landscape and the Wealdmoors was a strategic area. Kynnersley Drive was in the Parish of Lilleshall and the development was on the boundary, concerns regarding the public right of way through the site, the gate and hedgerow fronting the land and the impact of nearby residential properties.

Councillor A Eade, Ward Councillor, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding Policy C3 of the Local Plan, access and egress and the impact on the narrow lane, highway safety, the local authority assessment of the visits to the livery yard were underestimated, delivery traffic, intensification of use and lack of passing places, new Highway Code rules regarding the passing of horses at a safe distance and the impact with the narrow land and drainage ditches, limiting horses to within the yard itself, the lack of conditions in relation to the manege being limited to "not for public hire" and it was urged that this condition be added if Members were minded to approve the application.

Ms K Lutner, a member of the public, spoke again the application and raised concerns regarding the detrimental impact on the Wealdmoors which was a strategic area within the Local Plan, landscape the lack of a character assessment, the isolated site that would detract from the land, negative impact on wildlife, in particular badgers and a licence would be required, the impact on Kynnersley Woods and the flat topography of the area, increased traffic on narrow lanes, impact on the special qualities of the area and interruption to the peace and tranquillity.

Mr A Lane, Applicant's Agent spoke in favour of the application which was a small scale livery for a maximum of 10 horses which was an acceptable use of the land within the rural area. The existing field gate and access would be utilised but improvements made to its appearance, visibility splays will be provided, there were no objections from the highways authority, vehicle movements would be minimal with an estimation of 8 movements per day and he considered this would be far less than agricultural vehicles using this field. Ecology and drainage assessments had been undertaken and there were no objections from officers. This was a small scale, sensitive livery set in the rural area which officers had recommended for approval.

The Area Team Planning Officer addressed Members that the application was for a riding area and the erection of riding stables to run a livery yard with

associated, access and limited hardstanding, gravel track and boundary enclosures with the field at Kynnersley Drive. An associated application for the siting of a mobile home on the same site for a maximum period of three years will be discussed later on the Agenda. Additional information had been provided by the applicant in relation to the business and drainage issues which had now been overcome and re-consultation taken place. The site was in the rural area where the running of a livery and stables was deemed acceptable and it would diversify the rural economy and bring investment into the rural area. A business case had been submitted and a letter of support received confirming there would be a maximum of 10 horses on site at any one time with limited visitor opening. It was considered there would be negligible impact on the highway network. A lighting strategy would be required which was accepted in principle but a lighting scheme would need to be submitted prior to the development commencement in order to prevent any adverse impact on local residents and biodiversity and floodlighting would not be acceptable. A small riding area would be built on the existing building area together with stables and ancillary development and would be consistent with other farm buildings within the nearby area and in line with that typically expected in the rural area. The site was within the strategic landscape area of the Wealdmoors but that some development within the rural area was necessary and was not in conflict with Policy NE7 of the Lilleshall Neighbourhood Plan to protect strategic landscape areas. A drainage strategy had been submitted and drainage officers supported this subject to conditions and there were no objections from highway officers. A condition could be imposed limiting the amount of horses on the site to 10 at any one time.

During the debate, some Members asked if horses would be allowed out of the field and onto the highway for recreation purposes and would family and friends be expected to be visiting a manege and who was likely to visit this area. Other Members raised concerns regarding the state of the road and the vehicular impact, the specified amount of horses and whether it was contrary to the Lilleshall Neighbourhood Plan and the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan. Some Members felt it was beneficial to attend the site visit, the Local Plan was a material consideration and was based on local people's views. Concerns were raised regarding access, the deterioration of the road, lack of passing places, lack of deliveries of supplies to the site, impact on badger sets, impact on the level platform and wide open space and felt they could not support the application. Other Members considered that the field already had horses grazing and that food and supplies would already be being delivered, there were passing places and drivers who had trailers would have the ability to manoeuvre their vehicles.

The Area Team Planning Manager informed Members that in respect of Kynnersley Drive, this was an adopted highway and there was nothing that could be done to stop horesriders using the highway. There was an arena and grassed area within the site which horses were currently using to graze and sufficient area for horses to exercise. Family and friends would not be prevented from visiting the manege and this site would be used for the boarding of horses and the running of the stables. With regard to eight vehicular movements, this has been included within the business case and it

may be that some owners would place more than one horse at a time limiting vehicular movements and this was an existing business re-locating from outside of the Borough. There would be ten stables so this would limit the business to ten horses. In respect of the Neighbourhood Local Plan, development was tightly constrained as to where this could take place but it did not prohibit development but considered acceptable usage ie equestrian or agricultural within a rural area.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority:-

**RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the conditions contained within the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).**

**PC250 TWC/2020/0358 Land opposite Woodside Farm, Kynnersley Drive, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire**

This application was for a three year siting of mobile home with modifications to existing access to support the Livery on land opposite Woodside Farm, Kynnersley Drive, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire

The Application was before Committee at the request of Councillor A Eade.

Members had attended a site visit on the afternoon prior to the meeting.

The Area Team Planning Manager presented applications TWC/2020/0356 and TWC/2020/0358 which both related to land opposite Woodside Farm, Kynnersley Drive, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire.

Lilleshall Parish Council had submitted a statement. This had been received after the deadline for additional information, but the statement broadly outlined, highways, policy TA1 of the Lilleshall Neighbourhood Plan, a conflict with Design Policy B1, Policy LE2 in relation to ecology and landscape and the Wealdmoors was a strategic area. Kynnersley Drive was in the Parish of Lilleshall and the development was on the boundary, concerns regarding the public right of way through the site, the gate and hedgerow fronting the land and the impact of nearby residential properties.

Councillor A Eade spoke against the application which was within the strategic landscape area, it went against the Lilleshall Neighbourhood Plan which controlled appropriate development. A mobile home was not acceptable and did not pay due regard to the area and what it stood for. He felt that running this type of business on 8½ acres was not viable and raised concerns regarding the drainage to the field which was wet and boggy. The horses would cause damage and uproot grass and it was felt it was not needed and not necessary and the development was situated in the wrong place.

Ms K Lutner spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the siting of the mobile home that was a distance from the livery. The livery could be monitored via a security camera and it was not felt accommodation was required on site. The proposed site was not within the curtilage of the development some 10 acres away. It was only necessary for a person to be 30 minutes away and lots of businesses had a reliance on camera. Affordable rented accommodation was available nearby. She raised concerns regarding the effect on the Wealdmoors and asked that the damage be contained to one area rather than the whole field, the access, the road and parking for the mobile home, impact of wildlife the nitrates, the sites may be sold later for development, it was against the NPPF and she supported the views of the local community who wished for the application to be refused.

Mr A Lane, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application that this was for accommodation for the owners of the site to care for the horses within the livery on the previous application that Members had approved. A cattery and kennels had recently been approved and a rural workers dorma bungalow completed. The proposed accommodation was a small scale mobile home for a period of three years to help establish the viability of the business and had less impact on the rural area. A specialist independent report had been undertaken which suggested that accommodation was required on site to provide the highest level of care for the horses. There were no objections on ecology or landscape grounds and he welcomed approval of the application.

The Area Team Planning Manager addressed Members that the siting of the mobile home was temporary for a three year period and would be accessed by a gravel track to support the approval of the previous application for the Livery. Additional information had been received regarding the design and the drainage scheme and had been out for re-consultation. The design met the exceptional criteria in HO10 which was for use as a rural worker and an agricultural assessment had been submitted. If the business was successful after the three years a more permanent solution would be sought. It was in the strategic area of Wealdmoors but had no significant detrimental impact on local amenity and brought diversification to the rural economy.

During the debate, some Members understood it was necessary to have the mobile home on site but queried if it should be closer to the livery and if that had been considered. Other Members raised concerns with regard to the possibility of being asked to determine a permanent dwelling after the three years and that the drainage was a problem. The strategic site of the Wealdmoors needed to be protected and it was not necessary to have workers living on the site.

The Area Planning Team Manager confirmed that it had been necessary to strike a balance in order to position the mobile to be screened by the hedgerow and to limit its visual impact. It was for a temporary period of three years and it should be assessed on its merits now and not what will come in the future. In terms of monitoring the horses, the applicants would be alerted by cameras and alarms. With regard to drainage, the mobile home had its own drainage strategy separate to that of the livery and it had been deemed

appropriate by the Drainage Engineers. Foul sewerage had also been accepted by Officers via a biotreatment plant.

Upon being put to the vote it was, by a majority:-

**RESOLVED –delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the conditions contained in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager).**

**PC251 TWC/2021/0930 Site of Former The Wrekin Endeavour Centre, North Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire**

This application was for the erection of a 56no. unit Dementia Care Centre (consisting of 1 bed apartments) with associated parking, communal gardens and SUDs, following demolition of the existing buildings on the site of Former The Wrekin Endeavour Centre, North Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire.

Councillor G Cook left the meeting for this item of business.

This application was before the Committee as it required a S106 Agreement and involved land owned by the Council.

An update report was tabled prior to the meeting which addressed concerns raised by Ward Member Cllr Thompson and gave details of financial contributions sought towards local improvements in the form of a replacement off-grid bus shelter.

The Area Team Planning Manager addressed Members that this was a full application for a 56 bedroom two and three storey dementia care unit for affordable rent. Nomination rights would be secured for the Council by S106 agreement. A written update had been circulated in relation to the bus shelter and the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor J Thompson spoke in favour of the application which was currently an empty property and supported people with dementia and brought employment opportunities forward. He did, however, raise concerns regarding the safety of children from the local schools during construction, help required towards the school signage and fencing. He was pleased that the bus stop would be retained but raised concerns as to where it would be located and asked that the local bus service remain in place during construction.

The Area Team Planning Manager confirmed that the safety of the school children would be secured by an environmental management plan which conditions areas such as parking on site, controlling the hours of deliveries. He confirmed that no money had been secured towards the railings but that the bus shelter had been brought forward as a different piece of infrastructure but at this point it was not sure where it would be positioned. This was likely

to be slightly south of its current position but highway would take the access into account. There would be a temporary bus stop for the continuation of the bus service during construction.

During the debate, some Members asked that Councillor Thompson's concerns were taken on board and that he and residents were consulted on the siting of the bus stop. Other Members requested that school drop/pick up times were avoided during construction so that traffic was not in the area at busy times and that the walkways were important for residents so railing need to be in place for safety reasons. Further comments were that these units were desperately needed and it was a good site to develop, but parking issues were of concern, together with the apartments being below the national space standard. Other Members felt it was good to see that Town and Ward Member supporting the much needed application.

The Area Team Planning Manager confirmed that the safety of school children had been considered and that a traffic management plan would be a condition. They could look at replacing existing railings that were missing or damaged but no contribution from the developer was sought as it did not meet the legal tests all other railings would remaining in place. The Neighbourhood Team would highlight any enforcement issues. With regard to the space standards, the units each had 33-34m which included a shower room which was approximately 3-4m below the standard however each unit would be made up of 10-12 apartments with a central area for dining and a kitchen/living space to encourage independent living and better relationships between the residents so for this reason the units were slightly smaller as there were communal spaces which contribute towards the overall living spaces.

Upon being put to the vote it was, unanimously:-

**RESOLVED – delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions, legal agreement terms, or any later variations) subject to:**

- a) the applicants entering into a S106 agreement to incorporate a
  - i) Local Lettings Plan;
  - ii) Nomination Agreement, and;
  - iii) £250.00 contribution towards S106 monitoring
  
- b) the conditions contained within the report and the update report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager)

The meeting ended at 7.22 pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** Wednesday, 9 March 2022