

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 12 November 2025 at 6.00 pm in Council Chamber, Third Floor, Southwater One, Telford, TF3 4JG

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

In Attendance: A Annett (Senior Planning Officer), J Clarke (Senior Democracy Officer (Democracy)), A Gittins (Area Team Planning Manager - West), S Hardwick (Lead Lawyer: Litigation & Regulatory) and V Hulme (Development Management Service Delivery Manager)

Apologies: Councillors F Doran

PC50 Declarations of Interest

In respect of planning application TWC/2025/0534, Councillor J Thompson advised that he was a member of Wrockwardine Wood and Trench Parish Council but had not been involved the Planning Committee or in any discussions on this application.

PC51 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10 September 2025 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

PC52 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC53 Site Visits

None.

PC54 Planning Applications for Determination

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

PC55 TWC/2025/0534 - 22 Bridle Walk, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 7SJ

This was an application for the change of use of dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to residential home for up to 2no children (Use Class C2) at 22 Bridle Walk, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 7SJ

This application was before Planning Committee due to the number of objections received during the consultation period.

Councillor O Vickers, Parish Councillor, spoke against the application on behalf of local residents. Although it was understood that it was essential for good and decent homes he raised concerns regarding the suitability of the property. He considered that the parking was ambitious and imprecise and must be installed before any residents were in situ and given the 24hr intended use and in particular at staff change overs and during visits from social workers, inspectors and family members who would access the site regularly. The road was not a wide road and had very limited space with a number of parked cars and it was felt that the residents parking issues would be exacerbated.

Mr S Pierce, member of public, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the recent increase in C2 care home conversions, the suitability of the provider, "pop-up" homes lacking the proper wrap around support or community integration and once granted councils could not easily intervene or close them down when serious problems emerged. The proposal was for children with emotional and behavioural difficulties including absconding and aggression and he felt placing such a cohort in a 79 home cul-de-sac raised safeguarding concerns. Further concerns raised were recent crimes on the estate, parking provision, disruption, congestion, the hardstanding would commercialise the frontage of the property and forever change the character of the street scene, the 24 hour operation of a business in a semi-detached property. He asked Members to consider how the provider would be held accountable, what was the physical accessible route for residents to raise complaints and would the Committee be the point of contact for residents once the home was opened.

The Applicant/Applicant's Agent were not in attendance at the meeting for their public speaking slot.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the application was situated in the urban area of Telford and considered to be in a highly sustainable location. During the application process, amended documents were received outlining the proposed provision of care. Initially, the proposal was to accommodate four children with this being amended to a maximum of two children, with two staff members and a manager present on site at any one time. Staggered staff changeover times were proposed, with two shift patterns and four changeover periods per day, resulting in minimal traffic impact. Policy HO7 supported development designed to meet residents' needs in sustainable locations. The council's Commissioning Team confirmed a need for this type of accommodation and raised no objection to the amended scheme. Officers considered the proposal was compliant with policy HO7. The existing driveway could accommodate two cars, and amended plans proposed extending to four spaces, similar to nearby properties. The Highways Officer confirmed the layout was sufficient and the operator was committed to monitoring parking and avoid on-street parking. It was considered that the scheme would not cause significant harm to

neighbour amenity, noting the fallback position of family occupation. Given the low number of children and staff, limited parking, and staggered changeovers, the proposal was considered acceptable. Approval was recommended subject to conditions and informatives. It was noted that this was a change of use application, not a personal consent, so another operator could manage the site under the same conditions. Ofsted registration and monitoring would apply, and the Commissioning Team confirmed the scheme was appropriate.

During the debate some Members raised concerns regarding the semi-detached property, noise levels and the thickness of the walls, the size of the driveway, the timings of the shift patterns and wagons making deliveries to the property. Other Members felt that there was a growing need for community care providing a stable environment and setting. There had been a reduction in the number of children and staff parking and the proposed scale would mean little visible change. The proposal met Policy HO7 and had been mitigated by reduced occupancy and management controls. It was asked in relation to soundproofing of the walls would Building Control be able to verify compliance prior to occupation and were there other similar C2 uses in the vicinity leading to over concentration of the building use. Some further concerns were raised in relation to clinical waste bins and if there was sufficient space for these and for the wagons on delivery/collection and what mitigation measure would be put in place in order to keep the children safe. It was considered that a semi-detached property was not the most ideal property for the proposed use and a question arose as to whether a wheelchair would fit the access the pathway.

The Planning Officer confirmed that they had proposed soundproofing as a condition under Part E of the Building Regulations and would ask the applicant to submit details prior to use which would be assessed. The Commissioning Specialists would raise oversaturation if this was considered to be of concern and the application was considered acceptable following the reduction of the number of children with the remaining bedrooms being used for staff areas. Despite the property not having the largest garden/amenity space, the application could not be refused on that basis. There were no commercial bins required and this application would be consistent with a typical residential property. The end user was not currently known and it was for the regulators/providers to make a decision on the children residing at the property and this was outside of the planning jurisdiction. If the property was not wheelchair accessible it was unlike a child requiring a wheelchair would not be placed, but it was a modern house and it could be adapted.

Following the debate, a discussion took place as to whether the Applicant/Applicant's Agent could be allowed their speaking slot. The Chair asked Members for a proposer and seconder to allow the Applicant/Agent to be allowed to speak due to their late arrival and missing their slot within the public speaking allocation.

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

RESOLVED - that the Applicant/Applicant's Agent be granted their speaking slot.

Mr Andrew Blake, Applicant, apologised for their late arrival and gave a brief background about their experience. The organisation would be regulated by Ofsted and they understood the health, safeguarding and development of the children. As the property lacked wheelchair facilities it was not likely to be recommended and the Applicant, local authority and NHS meet and agree who will reside at the property. Children deserved a chance in the community and it was important that they were not raised in institutions.

The Chair asked Members to consider the suggestion that had come forward that the application be deferred for a site visit to take place in order to address some of the issues that had been raised during the debate.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred in order that a site visit could take place.

On being put to the vote the vote was tied and the decision was made by way of the Chair's casting vote. It was, by a majority:

RESOLVED – that the application be deferred for one cycle in order that a site visit could take place.

PC56 TWC/2025/0653 - Land adjacent Hillside, Middle Lane, Cold Hatton Heath, Telford, Shropshire

This application was for the change of use of land from agriculture land to private garden land at land adjacent Hillside, Middle Lane, Cold Hatton Heath, Telford, Shropshire.

The application was before Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Stephen Bentley, Ward Councillor.

The Planning Officer informed Members that some additional photographs had been received since publication of the report and that these would be shown in the presentation.

Councillor S Bentley spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the natural boundaries, the use of agricultural land and Hillside being a smallholding, the gateway into a larger open field, change of use would allow potential development and development rights needed to be considered. A Certificate of Lawfulness had been refused as it was considered to be in open countryside and there had been an installation of a large play area which had been subject to removal by enforcement, this application had come forward within three months and he failed to see what had changed. He felt that agricultural land needed to be protected and a change of use to garden land took away from this and that Hillside had increased its footprint three-fold. The application was not supported by Policy

SP3 and it was not supported by the NPPF and he asked that the Committee refuse the application.

Ms T Luckman, member of public, spoke against the application and asked Members to refuse the change of use from agricultural land. She raised concerns that this would wrap the eastern and rear boundary of her property along the full length. It conflicted with the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan, the Waters Upton Neighbourhood Plan and the NPPF, it fell within the Green Network Framework which protected green spaces, rural encroachment into agricultural land was considered harmful without a justified need. The land remained part of the agricultural land within Cold Hatton and continued to be farmed at the rear and was highly visible from Middle Lane and contributed to its undeveloped character a change of use would introduce suburban characteristics permanently altering the street scene. It was contrary to Policy SP3 and BE1 and once the land became residential curtilage it would be easier to justify future development proposals.

The Applicant spoke in favour of the application explaining that they had purchased Hillside in 2022 as a complete renovation project and that the property had been a dilapidated bungalow with no kerb appeal. The land in question had been maintained as a mown lawn and was intended for use as a garden and a play space for their children. It was confirmed that the hedgerows and gates would remain in place and regular maintenance would take place and the existing laurel hedge provided privacy at one metre thick. This parcel of land had not been used for agricultural purposes for a significant period and had not been physically separated from the current garden land. There had been no objection to the change of use from the Parish Council and that the remaining field would continue to be used for livestock as part of their small holding. This area was vital for family use and enjoyment and that the property footprint had not been extended other than a few minor additions.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the parcel of land was situated to the west of the existing dwelling, forming an infill plot between the dwelling and the neighbouring property, Lindale. It was confirmed that no built structures, including outbuildings, were proposed as part of the application. Since the report was produced, the applicant had submitted a block plan showing the existing boundary treatments, which were not proposed to be altered. The site was located within the rural area and, although previously used as agricultural land, the application sought to change its use to garden land. The land was classified as Grade 4 agricultural land, and policy SP3 of the Local Plan related only to Grades 1, 2 and 3a and the loss of agricultural land was therefore considered minimal and the proposal acceptable in principle. Members were asked to note that the proposed boundary line aligned with the existing amenity area and would maintain a strong and consistent boundary without encroaching into open countryside. While the parcel was large, the Planning Officer considered it proportionate to the dwelling and consistent with the character of the area. Existing landscaping and hedgerows would remain, and permitted development rights for outbuildings, fences, gates, walls and hard surfacing would be removed by

condition. A further condition would require retention of existing soft landscaping. It was considered that the proposal would not impact on neighbouring amenity or privacy. Comments raised during consultation had been addressed, including clarification that a previously refused Lawful Development Certificate was materially different from the current application and no objections had been received from statutory consultees. The proposal was acceptable in principle and would not cause significant harm to the character or amenity of the area. It was therefore requested that delegated authority be granted to the Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to conditions.

During the debate, some Members considered that the scheme fit in well with the surrounding area and turning the land into garden was a positive change. It was necessary to protect agricultural land where possible but that as the land had been assessed as grade 4 land and sat as an infill plot between two residential properties it was not viable farmland and did not harm the agriculture or rural character. The removal of the permitted development rights was welcomed. Other Members asked why the application was being considered as it had only been two months from the refusal of the Lawful Development Certificate as the policy had not changed and also asked whether the access would be retained to the buildings on the land.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Lawful Development Certificate was assessed differently and was evidence based and not decided on policy grounds. Access to the agricultural building on the land would be retained.

The Legal Advisor confirmed that the Lawful Development Certificate considered whether an action that was already taking place was considered lawful or whether planning permission was required. This being the case the previous Lawful Development Certificate did not meet this criteria and the subsequent full planning application was before Members for consideration.

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 (with the authority to finalise any matter including conditions or any later variations) subject to the following:

- a) The conditions (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager) set out in the report.**

The meeting ended at 7.23 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday 10 December 2025