

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 27 July 2022 at 6.00 pm in 4th Floor, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford TF3 4NT**

**Present:** Councillors G H Cook, N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, A S Jhavar, J E Lavery (as substitute for J Jones), J Loveridge, G L Offland (Vice-Chair), P J Scott and C F Smith (Chair)

**In Attendance:** ML Bailey (Planning Officer), J Clarke (Senior Democracy Officer (Democracy)), Sarah Hardwick (Lead Lawyer – Litigation and Regulatory), H Rea (Legal Advisor), P Stephan (Principal Planning Officer), M Turner (Area Team Planning Manager - East) and S Yarnall (Democracy Officer (Scrutiny)).

**Apologies:** Councillors J Jones

#### **PC286 Karen Denmark**

The Chair paid tribute to Karen Denmark, Principal Planning Officer, who had recently passed away following a short illness.

#### **PC287 Declarations of Interest**

Cllr G Cook declared an interest in planning application TWC/2021/0473 because he was a member of Wellington Town Council Planning Committee and had been involved in discussions on the application and indicated that he would withdraw from the meeting during determination thereof.

#### **PC288 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 1 June 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

#### **PC289 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications**

None.

#### **PC290 Site Visits**

None.

#### **PC291 Planning Applications for Determination**

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

**PC292     TWC/2021/0473 - Site of former Haygate Pub, 26 Haygate Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire**

This was an application for the erection of 18no one and two bedroom apartments together with associated parking and external works on the site of the former Haygate Pub, 26 Haygate Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This application was before Planning Committee as it required a S106 Agreement.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this application was a mix of one and two bedroomed apartments on brownfield land in the heart of Wellington. It was in easy walking distance of transport links, convenience stores, the market and the town centre. There was an under provision of five car parking spaces but it had ample indoor storage for bicycles and electric vehicle charging points. The design had evolved from the original submission, it was a three storey building, predominantly finished in brick with render detailing to emphasise the entrance. As there was no set design pattern in the local area, a modern approach had been taken which picked up on features from the local vicinity such as the render banding. All but one property met the national design space standards (NDSS). The existing boundary wall would be retained. Although there would be a loss of two low quality immature ash trees, the hardstanding around the remaining TPO trees on the west boundary would be removed which would be beneficial. Financial contributions were sought for education, recreation and sports facilities. On balance it was considered to be a viable development.

During the debate some Members raised concerns regarding the lack of parking spaces and whether there would be any scope to renegotiate the level of parking and the positioning of the bin store. They raised that as the public house had been demolished it would be an improvement to the site and they could see no reason for the application to be refused. Other Members raised concerns about the removal of trees and these not being replaced and what assurances were in place in relation to the replacement of trees. Further concerns were raised in relation to the double yellow lines and that the building was demolished without permission and should be rebuilt. Some further concerns were raised regarding the lack of affordable housing, on street parking, the entrance tunnel and access for emergency vehicles and the bin wagon. It was also felt that the levels could be amended to a flat roof in order it was not so imposing on neighbouring properties. Viability and design also raised concerns, together with the access and egress from the flats out into the parking spaces.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this was the maximum of parking spaces that could be provided. The TPO on the trees were outside of the development boundary but a tree protection plan and method statement would be in place. It was predominantly a loss of two immature ash trees with a wealth of landscaping over and above what was currently on site. In relation to the demolition of the building without permission, retrospective permission had since been granted. The site layout had been designed to incorporate a

tree root protection area and the retention of the TPO trees. In relation to bins these would be brought out to the highway at the relevant time. An independent assessment on viability had taken place. With regard to design, this was subjective and there was no set street design but key features from the surrounding area had been incorporated with a modern approach.

The Area Team Manager commented that with regard to the bin store, there was a separate bin store for eight large capacity industrial bins which would be for the whole complex. In relation to collection of the commercial bins, this would be undertaken by the contracted company and not the residents themselves, being brought out to the Highway and returned on the relevant bin days.

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

**RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to the following:**

**a) the following contributions to be agreed through a s.106 Agreement (with authority to finalise the planning obligations to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):**

- £43,114 towards primary education facilities
- £17,988 towards secondary education facilities
- £5850 towards improvements to recreational facilities
- £5850 towards improvements to sports facilities
- Financial Contribution s160 Monitoring Fee (1% of total s106 Contributions); and

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

**PC293 TWC/2022/0162 - Former Dairy Crest Ltd (Phase 3), Crudgington, Telford, Shropshire**

This application was for the erection of 55no. dwellings with associated amenity space and car parking with the formation of new roundabout to the existing cross roads on the former Dairy Crest Ltd (phase 3), Crudgington, Telford, Shropshire.

This application was before Planning Committee as it required a S106 Agreement.

Councillor G Cook left the meeting.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this application was for full planning permission on an agricultural field which fell between the former Dairy Crest site and the A442 and proposed to facilitate a four arm roundabout to replace the existing Crudginton crossroads. This was a much sought after improvement to the highway by the local community, due to it being an accident hotspot.

Councillor S Bentley, Ward Councillor, spoke in favour of the application and the importance of public engagement on this application and the opportunity for him to explain, on balance, why he was in favour of the recommendation despite it being contrary to policy. The strategic junction had and continued to have minor shunts, accidents with injury, road closures and fatalities. This was exacerbated by the increase in traffic and the size of the vehicles, agricultural vehicles and speed of traffic. It would have been preferable if funding for the installation of the roundabout could have been obtained in other ways with affordable housing being set aside for families with local connection. There was a demonstrated need for safety improvements for all users of this junction including cyclists and pedestrians which would be complimented by the pedestrian crossing which had now been installed and was operational. It was hoped that this would also help reduce the speed of vehicles. He requested that a central refuge be installed on the pedestrian crossing and that if adjustments to the S106 were sought that the junction improvements were not compromised in any way.

Mr A Sheldon, Applicant's Agent, spoke in favour of the application and acknowledged that under normal circumstances this application would not have gained the support of the Officers but due to the exceptional circumstances and the significant public benefit of the construction of the roundabout and the approval of the Parish Council it was considered, on balance, acceptable. A viability assessment had been undertaken and it was not possible to provide both affordable housing on site as well as the education contribution of £450k due to the cost of providing the roundabout. The contribution would provide additional classroom spaces and the Primary School were in support of the application. The development would be of high quality design with a mix of housing types and sizes. He asked that Members approve the application which would bring about a resolution to the long standing dangerous junction arrangements.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this application brought a significant community gain. There had been no objections from statutory consultees. Extensive negotiations had taken place and the application was supported by the Parish Council. There was an over provision of five parking spaces and all properties would have EV charging points which has been confirmed by the Applicant and would be conditioned. The design had been amended during the course of the application, particularly to the A442 streetscene in respect of house types and the landscaping. The viability had been independently assessed with the cost of the roundabout and the re-location of utilities being around £2m. The viability assessment concluded that some contributions could be provided and it was considered by Officers that more appropriate to provide education contributions on this scheme due

to the capacity of the local primary school and secondary education. The scheme would therefore not provide any affordable housing although two additional pieces of outdoor gym equipment would be installed on the play space from the earlier phases and this had been agreed with the Healthy Spaces Officer. Whilst the scheme was contrary to policy, the significant benefits which had been sought by the local community and the Parish Council for many years on balance it was the Officer's view that the application should be supported.

During the debate some Members felt that the roundabout was a long overdue, was supported by the Ward and Parish Councillors and it was whole heartedly supported due to safety concerns and EV charging points were welcomed. Some concerns were raised in relation to flooding and the representations from neighbours and the capacity of the local schools. Other Members raised concerns regarding the lack of solar panels. Concerns were also raised in relation to the application being used to fund the cost of the roundabout instead of the highway authority and this had an impact on the local affordable housing need. It was asked that the emergency exit and access to the A442 be conditioned as set out in the report.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the contribution towards education had been assessed on the standard formula for the primary school new class base together with a 5% buffer for future growth of the local community.

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

**RESOLVED – that delegated authority be granted to the 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:**

- i) Financial contribution of £286,711.00 towards primary school expansion at Crudgington Primary School;**
- ii) Financial contribution of £131,452.00 towards secondary school expansions in the North Telford Planning Area;**
- iii) Financial contribution of £46,854.00 towards secondary school transportation;**
- iv) Installation of two pieces of outdoor gym equipment at the existing 'Former Dairy crest' LEAP, and;**
- v) S106 Monitoring Fee of £9,300.34.**

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

The meeting ended at 6.41 pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** Wednesday, 31 August 2022