INFORMATION RECEIVED SINCE PREPARATION OF REPORT

Application number	TWC/2025/0314
Site address	Land adjacent Oak View, Sugden Lane, Sugden, Telford, Shropshire
Proposal	Full planning application for a Gypsy/Traveller site with 2no. mobile homes and hardstanding (Retrospective) *** Planning Statement received ***
Recommendation	Full Grant

1. ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED

1.1 Following the production of the report, but prior to publication, further representation has been received in response to the representations of Telford & Wrekin Council Development Plans and Drainage. A full copy of the representation can be found here:

https://secure.telford.gov.uk/planning/pa-applicationresponses-public.aspx?Applicationnumber=TWC/2025/0314

1.2 In respect of comment around the TWC Development Plans representation, and reference to emerging policy as justification for the proposed development, here Officers clarify, through the Committee Report that the proposal has been assessed against existing Local Plan policies in the 2011-2031 Local Plan namely Policy HO8 and Policy HO9 in coming to the Recommendation made to Members. This is in accordance with the as requirements of Section 38(6) of the Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and paragraph 2 of the NPPF. Additionally, in accordance with paragraph 49 of the NPPF limited weight has been given to the emerging local plan. For clarity, it is noted that whilst the Committee Report references commentary of Development Plans, which is available in full on the website, in error their comments were not summarised in the consultee section of the report.

1.3 With reference to representation around the site specific commentary of TWLP Policy HO9, Officers draw the attention of Members to paragraph 8.6 of the Committee Report as to coverage of the rural location of the application site – criterion i. with services available within the settlements of Rodington and Longdon upon Tern which are within a mile of the site.

1.4 Related to commentary around criterion ii. that the proposal would not provide accommodation of an unacceptable quality for residents occupying the site. The objection is based an opinion that the thought of living in a mobile home/static caravan would be unappealing for most individuals . The form of comment is not pertinent, with the emphasis here being on the accommodation being served by amenity and the context of the site – there being no harmful air or noise environmental factors for instance e.g. not sitting adjacent to an industrial site. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) is obliged to consider the application before them with the Applicant having recorded their Gypsy & Traveller status, with any future intentions not being second guessed, and each planning application considered on its merits.

1.5 In respect of commentary around criterion iii, that the proposal would not unacceptably prejudice the amenities of adjoining or adjacent occupiers, coverage is provided in the Committee Report at paragraph 8.12-8.14, 8.20, and 8.26 around the amenities of adjoining or adjacent occupiers alongside the *Highway Impacts* section at paragraph 8.18+.

1.6 Around the criterion for the provision for an appropriate means of vehicular access iv., the further representation raises concerns around visibility issues along Sugden Lane. The additional representation outlines that this has been raised in a number of the representations objecting to the application, and is exacerbated when the hedgerows are fully grown in season. It is suggested that the Highways Officer has never driven along the road through identifying that there are no issues. Here the LPA can confirm that in providing a no objection representation with commentary around this, the Local Highways Authority Officer has driven along the road through visiting the site, with coverage of the visibility context provided in paragraph 8.19 of the Committee report.

1.7 Criterion vi. relates to a scheme incorporating well-designed landscaping and other features to safeguard visual amenity. The additional representation identifies that the site is largely obscured by high fencing installed previously by the applicant, but there are other open aspects from which the site can be observed with visibility of plant and equipment, temporary structures, vehicles and other paraphernalia. Within paragraph 8.15 of the Committee Report Officers have advised how the provision of the fencing was deemed permitted development through previous applications for the site, and that this will be retained and in combination with the frontage hedging provides substantial screening of the site in question. Officers are unclear about where these additional views are from given the existing fencing/hedging on the northern and eastern boundaries, with the topography to the west screening the site from the nearest neighbours.

1.8 Related to not detracting from the undeveloped open and rural character of the locality through criterion vii. Coverage is provided around this point through paragraph 9.1 of the Committee Report, notably the position being led by the site as it stands as opposed to pre-any planning applications having been applied for and implemented on the site.

1.9 The additional representation notes that TWC Drainage have supported the application to the subject to conditions which largely relate to how the site would be drained in respect of foul and surface water. The additional representation raises concerns around this given the application is retrospective. The site currently discharges surface water to an existing ditch and foul water to a septic tank. Therefore, the principle of the approach is satisfactory with capacity issues to be addressed through condition.

1.10 The representation concludes with a request for a site visit further to technical representation on the site and questions around these. Officers have visited the site and surroundings on a number of occasions to assess the policy

compliance of the scheme and are content to recommend to Members that the scheme is supported subject to conditions based on Officers assessment.

1.11 The LPA have also received an additional e-mail from a member of the public, since publication of the Committee Report, wishing to draw Members attention to the content of an e-mail in respect of a planning enforcement investigation on the site. This does not form part of the proposal before Members and is therefore not a material planning consideration.

1.12 A further submission has been made by the Agent for the proposal confirming that all parties are registered at the local GP in Shawbirch, that there is broadband on site, and the family hope that the child residing on site will be able to attend the local school when of age.

2. CONCLUSION AND DETAILED RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Officers are satisfied that the Recommendation of the Committee Report still stands.

2.2 Based on the Conclusions section of the Committee Report, together with the above commentary, the recommendation to the Planning Committee on this application is that **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions or any later variations) subject to the following conditions and informatives (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager):-

Conditions:

B061a Foul and surface water

B079 Capacity and condition of the septic tank

B079 Proof acceptable condition of the drainage ditch

B145 Lighting Plan

C038 Development in accordance with plans

D01 Removal of permitted development rights

D06 Gypsy & Traveller Use

DCustom Maximum caravan numbers

Informatives:

I32 Fire Authority

I35Custom Equine S73 variation application required

I39h Biodiversity Net Gain

I40 Conditions

I41 Reason for Grant

RANPPF1 Approval – NPPF.