

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday 25 November 2024 at 6.00 pm in Council Chamber, Third Floor, Southwater One, Telford TF3 4JG

Present: Councillors S J Reynolds (Chair), G Luter (Vice-Chair), G H Cook, F Doran, N A Dugmore, A R H England, T L B Janke, P J Scott, S Handley (as substitute for A S Jhawar) and J Thompson (as substitute for J Jones)

In Attendance: A Lowe (Director: Policy & Governance), V Hulme (Development Management Service Delivery Manager), M Turner (Area Team Planning Manager - East), M Bailey (Planning Officer), M Rowley (Principal Engineer) and J Clarke (Senior Democracy Officer (Democracy))

Apologies: Councillors A S Jhawar and J Jones

PC9 Declarations of Interest

None.

PC10 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC11 Site Visits

None.

PC12 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/2023/0637.

PC13 TWC/2023/0673 - Land off, Hadley Castle Works, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for the erection of 5no. industrial units (up to 90,951m² of commercial floorspace) (Use Classes B2/B8 and E(g)(iii)) with ancillary office space (Use Class E(g)(i)) with associated parking, ev parking, gatehouses, cycle shelters, attenuation pond, landscaping and all associated engineering works and highway works, including site clearance and enabling works on land off, Hadley Castle Works, Hadley, Telford, Shropshire

This application had been deferred at the meeting of the Committee on 4 September 2024 to enable further consultation to take place and to obtain further information on highways and noise impact.

The application had been requested to be put before the Committee at the request of Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council.

An update report was tabled at the meeting which set out further objections received from the fourth round of consultation.

Councillor P Millward, Parish Councillor, spoke against the application and drew Members attention to the large number of objectors who opposed the application due to the size, scale, highway impact, noise and pollution. They were not opposed to investment, development and jobs and making the area a more attractive place to live but this application was not suitable. It was felt that proper consultation had not taken place despite the deferral. Concerns were raised that the applicant had refused to the reorientation of the unit which would affect the peace and tranquillity of neighbouring properties due to the size and scale, together with the impact of HGVs, vans and cars on the A442 Queensway and Hadley Park Road.

Councillor E Callear, Ward Member, spoke against the application which she considered was not in line with the Local Plan due to the adverse impact on neighbouring properties. Effective engagement had not taken place which was not in line with national planning policy. Concerns were raised in regard to the effects of pollution on health and living conditions and there had been no land contamination investigations. It was queried whether the development would create low skilled, low wage jobs and if any companies coming forward would struggle to fill the positions meaning workers would travel in from surrounding areas. There were unknown factors such as the end users and their operating hours. It was felt that this would set a precedent for applications of this nature in the future. The Council had a vision to protect and care in the borough and for people to live well in their communities and be community focussed. This application was not the right development for this location.

Mr S Bryant, member of the public, spoke against the application although he was supportive of investment, job creation and growth if it was respectful of the local area and community. He raised concerns in relation to the invasion of the green space buffer, industrial noise and disturbance, volume of HGVs and traffic all day every day and the relentless barrage of noise and disturbance. He considered it was against policy EE1 and raised a recent Planning Inspector Inquiry which looked at statutory tests, the control of noise and disturbance, operating hours and the impact which was not possible to mitigate against. Direct consultation with objectors had not taken place and the minimal changes put forward would have no effect. He considered it was a speculative application with unsubstantiated claims and he asked Members to refuse the application.

Mr S Clark, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application and informed Members that there had been further engagement with the public on noise and highway impact. He had met with the Parish Councillor and Ward Councillor since the last meeting and provided further information in relation to noise, viewpoints and supplied GCIs and amended plans which had been submitted as part of the revised plan. Conditions had been agreed voluntarily that had gone over and above that which was expected including setting up a community liaison group. The noise consultant had reviewed the worst case scenario and the Local Highway Authority continued to remain supportive. A travel plan would be conditioned for each unit to be agreed with the local planning authority which would look at shift patterns and the impact on the highway. This was a strategic employment site and had now gone through four rounds of consultation. The application could not be re-submitted as individual units as this would involve considerable costs and time delay. Significant economic benefits would be brought forward from the site including skilled jobs and attracting businesses to come to Telford. Financial contributions would come forward via a S106 Agreement including a bus stop, travel plan monitoring and biodiversity gain.

The Planning Officer informed Members that three meetings had taken place since the deferral of the application with the Parish Councillor and Ward Member acting on behalf of local residents and that the application had been discussed in depth. A list of conditions and information of what would be required, together with amended plans and additional information on mitigation measures, the reduction in floor area by 30,000 square feet, increased separation distance to the north and the proposed elevation and site layout were discussed. The Planning Officer was satisfied that Article 15 had been met in full. This site was considered highly sustainable and a strategic employment area SP1 industrial use and there was no objection to the principle of development. Occupancy of the buildings was a blanket cover of B2, B8 and EG3 until the end users and been identified and legal agreement reached. End users would also be required to submit details of use classification, business model, parking requirements, shift patterns and working hours prior to occupation, together with a noise assessment and further mitigation against noise pollution. Details in relation to distance separation and the amenity of surrounding properties, together with landscaping, scale and design were set out in the report. It was considered that there was limited shading and had no significant detrimental impact. The Built Heritage Specialist considered there was less than substantial harm on the listed Turner and Hadley Locks and improvement works would be undertaken. No technical objections had been received in relation to highways, drainage or ecology. Work to improve capacity on the highway network due to the increased demand was being undertaken by the Strategic Transport Team. On balance and in accordance with national and local planning policy, it was recommended that Members approve the application.

During the debate, some Members felt that this application was a difficult one as there were a lot of people who did not want it to go forward, but the Committee were bound by material planning conditions that needed to be applied. They asked if the Planning Officer was satisfied that there had been

sufficient discussions with residents and were the changes acceptable. Other Members asked how the Committee could be assured that what was going into the units would not be detrimental to the local residents. Concerns were raised in relation to hours of operation, noise and highway impact, the height of the building and the impact on the surrounding infrastructure and improvements to pedestrian and bus routes. It was also suggested that the application come forward as outline planning permission.

The Planning Officer was satisfied with the consultation that had taken place. The applicant had attended all meetings and was clear on the viable scheme that had come forward and a 10% reduction in square footage had been achieved. The orientation of unit 1 was discussed and if the building had been rotated the separation distance to neighbouring properties would reduce and would have a more visual impact. In relation to the individual units, a noise assessment would be required from any tenant and any mitigation measures carried out in full prior to occupation. The applicant had agreed to noise surveys being undertaken once the units were occupied in order to ensure compliance. The application before Members was to consider full planning permission.

The Highways Officer explained to Members that the route between Trench Lock and Leegomery roundabout was undergoing modelling work and a significant amount of progress had been made in relation to improvements. The detailed design of the scheme was expected by March 2025 with the Strategic Transport Team looking to deliver the full scheme over the next two years.

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 (with the authority to finalise any matter including condition(s), legal agreement terms, or any later variations) subject to the following:

- a) the applicant/landowners entering into a Section 106 Agreement with the Local Planning Authority (subject to indexation from the date of committee with terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to:
 - i) Travel Plan Monitoring (£5,000 per unit);
 - ii) Strategic Highway Network (£449,348.68);
 - iii) Enhancements/Upgrade to off-site Bus Stops on Hortonwood 30 and Hadley Road (£75,000);
 - iv) Delivery of off-site Biodiversity Net-Gain Mitigation and 30-year monitoring fee of Biodiversity Net Gain Mitigation Plan;
 - v) 1% Monitoring Fee for Section 106 Contributions; and
- b) the condition(s) (with authority to finalise Condition and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager) set out in the report and the update report.

The meeting ended at 6.53 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday 11 December 2024