

INFORMATION RECEIVED SINCE PREPARATION OF REPORT

Application number	TWC/2024/0612
Site address	Land north/east of Greenways Farm Shop, Off Church Street, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire
Proposal	Outline application for the erection of around 80no. dwellings with associated infrastructure and landscaping works on land North of St Georges Bypass, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9LF***AMENDED DESCRIPTION, AMENDED ILLUSTRATIVE MASTERPLAN AND NEW PARAMETERS PLAN***
Recommendation	Outline Grant

1.0 RECEIPT OF FURTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS

- 1.1 Since the Committee Report was prepared a further 20no. letters of objection have been received from 18no. addresses.
- 1.2 The majority of the issues raised in the additional letters of objection reflect the comments made previously and summarised in the original Committee Report within para. 6.2 and the Addendum Committee Report at para. 2.1.
- 1.3 The following summarised comments are additional to those received previously:
- the site would be a loss of Green Belt land;
 - there is an easement around the existing pumping station preventing development within 10 metres;
 - access for disabled persons has not been shown or considered;
 - developing this site would mean the loss of a dog walking location;
 - negative impact upon climate change
- 1.4 All objections have been taken into account and have been commented upon where they represent material planning considerations. Non-material planning considerations cannot be taken into account in the determination of a planning application.

2.0 COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY CONSULTEES

2.1 St Georges and Priorslee Parish Council: **Object:**

- notes a number of positive changes in the proposed plan such as the reduction in density, removal of the apartment block and the increase in green space, including the addition of the green corridors;
- remains opposed to any development on this site;
- the proposed development is not required to meet the Local Plan requirements and should therefore be rejected;
- the proposed development is purely speculative, aiming to make a profit for the developers and landowners at the expense of the local community;
- infrastructure in the area is already stretched to breaking point and s.106 funding would not be sufficient to address the current shortfall in GP and dentist

- provision, let alone bring it to a position where it could cope with the additional demands that these additional homes would bring;
- roads in the area are extremely busy at peak times. The additional load during construction and afterwards would not be in anyway beneficial to local residents. The proposed signal-controlled junction with the A5 will negatively impact traffic flow in the area and is likely to increase traffic loads on other roads when drivers avoid the tailbacks it will cause around Limekiln roundabout;
- there has been no 'spades in the earth' archaeological assessment. This should be carried out if development is eventually approved.

2.2 Cllr. Richard Overton (St Georges Ward): Object:

- object to this planning application to develop 80 houses in the revised application as it is still on agricultural land and a site of historic interest;
- not an allocated site;
- the number of houses proposed is still over development of the site;
- lack of existing provision for GPs, school places for current residents;
- impact of more traffic and more congestion on the highway network;
- no drainage plans or enough capacity. Connecting to the pumping station will be a challenge;
- Climate Change considerations;
- no real alternatives to the car are being offered with the site being where it is located;
- are the developers proposing to pay for a bus route through s.106?;
- the proposed disabled access to Priorslee tries to deal with an issue but would need added consultation;
- the site is by an historic moat and had a public right of way through good agricultural land which will be required in future food production and the protection of the moat is needed;
- the land is currently owned with public access with wildlife corridors and accessible green space with good biodiversity will be lost;
- no real buffer zones are proposed between this development and the current residential properties.

2.3 Cllr. Paul Thomas (Priorslee Ward): Object:

- this revised application represents a reduction in housing density from 120 to 80 homes considered at a recent Planning meeting. It also addresses some of the concerns expressed by residents including on site play facilities and type of housing;
- this is a speculative application that is not included - or identified as a need for housing - in the Local Plan and is, therefore, unnecessary. There are currently already very large, circa 2000 dwellings being developed, within the Priorslee area. Although not all complete, these have already put significant strain on support services such as GPs and dentists which are unable to cope with the significant increase in demand whilst local primary schools are already oversubscribed;
- the increased traffic along Telford Way and the major arterial route, Castle Farm Way, will increase noise and pollution and impact traffic flow as more traffic light-controlled junctions and pedestrian crossings are introduced;
- although it is not public land, it is rich in history, diverse flora and fauna and enjoyed by the community;

- Transport Assessment refers to access to buses 'within a 400 metre range.' In reality, this isn't achievable. It is worth noting that the lack of bus services in the area is a continued source of complaints. Further, there is no bus service that currently serves Telford Way and no provision within the application for any additional bus service;
- residents on this development will be reliant on their own transport – this will result in the need for adequate car parking which is not addressed within the application;
- in summary, this application should be rejected on the basis that it is speculative, is not required, fails to address transport, the importance of the archaeological heritage of the site and the overwhelming objections from residents.

3.0 OFFICER COMMENTS

3.1 Members of the Planning Committee are reminded that this is an application for Outline Planning Permission (and not full planning permission). This means the application is seeking permission for the principle of developing this site for residential purposes and therefore no details are being submitted at this stage.

3.2 Were Members to accept the Officers Recommendation and approve the application, it would be followed by a Reserved Matters Application which would contain full details such as location and type of houses, position of windows, number of parking spaces and landscaping, amongst others. As these details do not comprise part of the Outline Application being considered they cannot form part of the decision in determining this application.

3.3 Most of the additional public objections received refer to matters that have already been raised in previous objections and commented on in either the original committee report or the addendum committee report produced in response to the amendment of the planning application. No additional commentary is provided on these in this written update.

3.4 The additional comments listed in para 1.3 above are addressed as follows:

Loss of Green Belt: The site is not Green Belt - there is no Green Belt within the Borough of Telford & Wrekin. It is classed as White Land and may be considered for windfall development under the adopted Local Plan;

10 metre Pumping Station Easement: The submitted plans show a 10 metre easement around the pumping station where no development is shown, demonstrating this has been taken into account.

Access for people with disability has not been taken into account: As this is an Outline Application, this is not a detail to be considered at this stage. Please see para. 3.2 above for further explanation.

Loss of dog walking location: As discussed at the previous Planning Committee this site is privately owned with a Public Right of Way (PRoW) running through the site. The public have access to the PRoW and this will be retained and enhanced as part of the proposals (shown on the Parameters Plan). Therefore the fall-back position in planning terms is that the landowner

could fence off the land prohibiting public access across the site for walking their dogs or any other purpose. As long as access to the PRoW remains the access rights of the public would be unaffected. If members of the public have been able to walk their dogs across the land anywhere other than the PRoW to date this has been at the discretion of the landowner rather than a right to access public land.

Negative impact upon climate change: As this is an Outline Application any material benefits to mitigate climate change would form part of a Reserved Matters Application and cannot be considered at this stage as the application is limited to seeking the principle of development of residential purposes.

3.5 Density

Concerns have been submitted regarding the perceived overdevelopment of the site and the proposals consisting of too great a density. To understand whether the proposed density of approx. 80 dwellings is acceptable in planning policy terms, Members' attention is drawn to the Council's Density and Net Site Area Study July 2015, which is a Technical Paper that supported the evidence base for the Council's adopted Local Plan (also known as Development Plan).

3.5 The Density and Net Site Area Study describes how residential sites within the Telford Urban Boundary have an average density of 40 dwellings per hectare (dph). For context, Newport tends to average at a higher density of 49dph.

3.6 In keeping with national planning trends, density can be considered in the following way:

- Less than 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) = low density
- 30 to 40dph = low to medium density
- 40-50dph = medium density
- 50-70dph = medium to high density
- 70dph and above – high density

3.7 When the whole site contained within the redline application boundary is calculated for its density based on 80no. dwellings, the density works out as 16.7dph. This is very low when considered in the context of the scales of density above.

3.8 How the proposed site density compares to the density of surrounding development:

- St Georges surrounding the site = approx.19.7dph
- Park Close immediately north of the site = approx. 25dph
- New development (TWC/2023/0565) under construction north of Zone D = approx. 23.5dph
- Church Street = approx. 16.7 to 24.2dph depending on the section

3.9 From this comparison it can be seen that the proposed density based on 80no. dwellings is commensurate with the existing density along parts of Church Street and lower than existing development developments adjoining the site as well as the overall St Georges area surrounding the site when considered holistically.

3.10 In the interests of balance, if the one hectare of open space from the application site is removed and the proposed density is calculated based on the built areas shown on the indicative masterplans, the density is 21.1dph. This is still at the low end of density shown in the scales of density in para. 3.7 and notably lower than the average density for sites within the urban boundary Telford as well as lower than surrounding developments around the site.

3.11 Based on the above assessment, Officers' recommendation to Members of the Planning Committee is that the proposed density based on 80no. dwellings is acceptable when considered in the context of surrounding existing development.

3.12 Archaeology

The Council's Archaeology Officer is satisfied that the Applicant has done everything that has been requested of them with regards to archaeological studies at this stage. Intrusive investigation would not normally take place as part of an Outline Planning Application.

3.13 Detailed planning Condition(s) have been recommended at the request of the Council's Archaeology Officer, to ensure a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), Archaeological Management Plan and detailed designs to preserve the moat are incorporated as part of any Reserved Matters Application in the future.

3.14 Based on the above, Officers' recommendation to Members is that the Applicant has satisfied the archaeological requirements of this site appropriate to the scope of an Outline Planning Application.

3.15 Drainage

The Council's Drainage Officer and Severn Trent Water are both satisfied that detailed drainage designs can be secured by planning condition and dealt with through a Reserved Matters Application. This is appropriate for an Outline Planning Application.

3.16 Public Transport

The site is located in a sustainable location in transport terms, being situated on a cycle route and PRow that connects Newport to Telford. Whilst it would be unreasonable and outside the scope of planning regulations to require a developer of a site for only 80 houses to pay for a bus route to be used by all existing and future residents, they have agreed to pay for the upgrade of the nearest bus shelter on Stafford Street. This is proportionate to the scale of development and is encapsulated within the recommendation for the s.106.

4.0 **CONCLUSION**

4.1 The application is a white land, or windfall, site within the urban boundary of Telford. Policy SP1 of the Local Plan supports the principle of development within Telford's urban boundary subject to compliance with the other, appropriate, policies of the Local Plan (also referred to as Development Plan).

- 4.2 Technical consultees have confirmed they are satisfied that a future scheme could meet the requirements of the Local Plan Policies should detailed proposals be brought forward at Reserved Matters stage.
- 4.3 The density of the proposed development would be approx. 16.7 dwellings per hectare based on 80no. dwellings. This is equal to or lesser than the density of existing development in St Georges surrounding the site.
- 4.4 The Applicant has offered full financial contributions as described in the Detailed Recommendation and these would be secured via s.106 Agreement. For avoidance of doubt the Detailed Recommendation includes the Council's s.106 Monitoring Fee.
- 4.5 None of the commentary above warrant a review of the recommendation contained in the main report and the application is recommended for approval.

5.0 DETAILED RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 Based on the conclusions above, the recommendation to the Planning Committee on this application is that **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** be granted to the Development Management 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 the following:

A) The applicant/landowners entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Local Planning Authority (subject to indexation from the date of committee), with terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager, relating to:

- i) Education: £710,275 (Primary £524,559; Secondary £185,716) (based on 80no. dwellings or pro rata to reflect the number and type of dwellings being proposed at Reserved Matters stage);
- ii) Highways: £68,146 (based on 80no. dwellings or pro rata to reflect the number of dwellings being proposed at Reserved Matters stage);
- iii) Affordable Housing: 25% to be provided on-site;
- iv) Healthy Spaces: £166,561.96 (Play); £52,000 (Sport and recreation) (based on 80no. dwellings or pro rata to reflect the number and type of dwellings being proposed at Reserved Matters stage);
- v) Ecology: £80,000 (The Flash Local Nature Reserve) (based on 80no. dwellings or pro rata to reflect the number of dwellings being proposed at Reserved Matters stage);
- vi) NHS: £71,661 (based on 80no. dwellings or pro rata to reflect the number of dwellings being proposed at Reserved Matters stage);
- vii) Bus Shelter upgrades: £20,000
- viii) Monitoring Contribution: 2%

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

Condition(s)

- Time Limit Outline
- Time Limit Reserved Matters
- Time Limit – Submission of Reserved Matters
- Standard Outline – Some Matters Reserved
- Reserved Matters in accordance with Parameters Plan
- No more than 85no. dwellings to be permitted as part of Reserved Matters
- General Details Required
- Details of Materials
- In accordance with Ecological Survey
- Erection of artificial nesting/roosting boxes
- Lighting Plan
- Site Environmental Management Plan
- Landscaping Plan
- Landscape Management Plan
- Scheme for Foul and Surface Water Drainage
- SuDs Management Plan
- Provision of Sewer Easement for Severn Trent Water
- Exceedance Flow Routing Plan
- Interim/Temporary Drainage and Sediment Run-off Control Measures
- Full details of the main access to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development
- Full details of off-site improvements to the PRow linking the site to Church Road (north) and Dean Close (south) to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development
- Phasing and completion plan to be submitted
- Construction of any new streets shall not be commenced until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed street/s within the development have been submitted
- Construction of any new estate street to be adopted shall not be commenced until full engineering details have been submitted and approved
- Construction of any new estate street shall not be commenced until full details of the proposed street tree locations, species and planting method have been submitted to and approved
- No dwelling shall be occupied until private roadways have been fully constructed
- Any reserved matters application to include details of diversion of PRow
- Written scheme of investigation for a programme of archaeological work
- Detailed design to maximise the surviving earthworks as a feature of the amenity space
- Archaeological Management Plan to ensure the long-term survival of the moated site
- Noise assessment to accompany any reserved matters application
- Details of acoustic noise barrier
- Geotechnical desk study, ground investigation and mitigation report
- Details of foul sewer connection to be agreed with Severn Trent
- Development in accordance with plans