

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 10 December 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 and J Thompson (as substitute for F Doran)

In Attendance: A Annett (Senior Planning Officer), J Clarke (Senior Democracy Officer (Democracy)), S Hardwick (Lead Lawyer: Litigation & Regulatory), V Hulme (Head of Development Management), M Turner (Area Team Planning Manager - East) and C Edgington (Senior Planning Officer)

Apologies: Councillors F Doran and T L B Janke

PC57 Declarations of Interest

None.

PC58 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 November 2025 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC59 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC60 Site Visits

None.

PC61 Planning Applications for Determination

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

(a) TWC/2025/0534 - 22 Bridle Walk, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 7SJ

This was an application for a 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 had been deferred at the meeting of the Committee on 12 November 2025 to enable Members to undertake a site visit.

A site visit took place on the afternoon prior to the meeting.

Councillor O Vickers, spoke on behalf of the Parish Council and the residents of Donnington who understood the need for a good decent home for children, but raised concerns in relation to the suitability of the property, standard of care, lack of parking, arrival and departure times of staff, professionals and family members at regular times which would exacerbate the current parking difficulties. He asked that the Committee refuse the application.

Mr S Pierce, member of public, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the unsuitability of use class C2 and felt this was driven by investment rather than care. He raised further concerns regarding the true pattern of the on street parking and the precedent that would be set for such use on a cul de sac, the antisocial behaviour and the risk of absconding, the commercial frontage of the premises, round the clock care and change over patterns in relation to noise from car alarms, doors and windows. He considered that children needed to be in a safe and secure home but this was not a suitable property.

Mr A Blake, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application which would be a care home for two children with disabilities and would provide the young people the opportunity to unlock their potential. The property would not be suitable for wheelchair users. The company was not new to Telford and had not had complaints and had care homes in various locations within the borough. He understood the concerns of the community but advised that there were four weekly inspections and unannounced inspections made by Ofsted. Community liaison was important and he would work with the local community with any feedback.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this application was for a childrens care home for up to two children with two staff and a manager present. There would be a staggered changeover pattern being 6.30am and 7am and 6.30pm and 7pm in order to limit car movements. Policy HO7 supported sustainable development which related well to the local context. The scale, design and form was highly sustainable and the Commissioning Team had raised no objections. Amended plans had been submitted in relation to parking and the vehicle arrangements would be in character with nearby properties. Highway Officers supported the application and the Applicant had made a commitment to ensure that parking was monitored and that spaces were utilised in order to prevent on street parking. The fallback position was that the premises could be occupied by two adults and four to six children on which the Council would have no control. It was considered that there was no detrimental impact in relation to parking and traffic and the amended plans were sufficient to accommodate four vehicles.

During the debate, some Members asked if the parking spaces and the soundproofing would be dealt with prior to any children residing at the property. It was felt there was a lot of fear in relation to these applications but there was nothing to say the children would be delinquent and that they could

not see a reason for this application not to be approved. Other Members felt that the site visit had reaffirmed the suitability of the property, waste removal could be accommodated but they did feel that the parking would be an issue, particularly with the position of the lamp post and that the garden space was limited. It was asked if there were any standards regarding outdoor space as this would impact the ability to support the application. Other concerns raised were who were the owners of the segment of grass used as the pavement area and did the Applicant have permission to cross this, removal of the fence would impact child safety, the pond opposite the dwelling, if the children would be attending school and what would happen if the Applicant wanted to increase the number of children in the property to four.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there would be conditions in place that parking spaces and soundproofing was implemented prior to any occupation. It was acknowledged that the garden space was slightly smaller than would be expected but that the dwelling could be occupied by a larger number of children and it had to be looked at in the context of a general family residence. In relation to the grass verge, it was confirmed that the Council did not own the land but it was for the Applicant to ensure they had the correct permissions in place but this was not a planning consideration. In relation to safety of the children in relation to the fence and the pond, again this would be the same fallback position to that of an existing residential property and the carers would be responsible for the children. If the Applicant wished to increase the number of children, they would have to formally apply in writing to vary the conditions and this would be considered on its own merits and would go out to consultation for comments.

The Area Team Planning Manager – East, confirmed that the application would need to be considered on planning policy and on planning merits. The existing house and garden were appropriate for a typical family who would use the property and garden for comparable uses. Ofsted would regulate the legislation and issues covered by separate legislation were not part of the planning process. There wasn't anything set out in planning documents and this couldn't be taken into account as part of the current application. Ofsted would need to be satisfied on the appropriateness of the use and the Applicant would have several hurdles to get through. If the verge was adopted by the Council then the Applicant would have to apply for a licence to drop the kerb to allow for the parking. In relation to standards for outdoor space, guidance would be applied at the point of the development, as the building was already in existence it can operate as expected regardless of guidance. The Planning Officers could not dictate how the facility operated and children would be able to attend SEN schools or have tutoring at home and the parking spaces provided would be used to accommodate any visitors.

On 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 Condition(s) or any later variations) subject to the following:

a) the Condition(s) and informatives (with authority to finalise Condition(s) and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager) as set out in the report.

(b) TWC/2025/0547 - 10 Emral Rise, Dothill, Telford, Shropshire TF1 3LG

This application was for the change of use of a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a small children's residential care facility (Use Class C2), installation of 1no. window on the first floor north east elevation and creation of an extended driveway and vehicular access at 10 Emral Rise, Dothill, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 3LG.

The application had been called in by Councillor K Tomlinson, Ward Councillor and there had been a notable number of objections received.

Councillor K Tomlinson, Ward Councillor, spoke against the application and raised concerns regarding the lack of transparency, the application was contrary to Policy HO7 in relation to specialist housing, lack of outdoor space and the national guidance for dwellings, lack of parking impeded by bins and the lamp post, the bike store and the lack of access to the rear of the property. She raised further concerns in relation to the number of errors within the documentation, design and access, impact on the highways and the neighbourhood plan, the business plan, safeguarding, the operational statement and staff rotas.

Ms N Pitchford, member of the public, spoke against the application and considered that the application was contrary to Policy HO7 and raised concerns in relation to it being a suitable location, staff rotas, highways impact, parking, safety and access, professional visitors increasing the number of vehicles parking on the street and it was unlikely that staff would travel by bicycle or on foot. She considered that the amendments to the application did not address the fundamental issues and that it would cause harm and disruption and she requested that members refuse the application.

Mr L Jinks, Wellington Town Council, endorsed the comments of the previous speakers and reported that there had been over 50 objections to the application. She raised concerns regarding the lack of traffic assessment, retrospective planning permission, technical issues which included overlooking the neighbour, the change of use to a commercial property in a residential area that housed maturing families who used mobility scooters, frames and assistance dogs, parking and antisocial behaviour. It was recognised that children have to live somewhere in safety, but she felt that this was not the appropriate accommodation for this purpose.

Mr Madumere, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application and sought to allay the residents concerns. Parking spaces would increase for four cars and the highways authority had deemed this sufficient. There had been changes

to the staff rota. Work was undertaken to ensure that the children on site would blend to fit the local area and would be a stepping stone for the children to return to their family or until they were able to leave. There were no changes to the premises and the window would be obscured to prevent any overlooking. Their focus was on the local community it was not about profit and it was the intention to raise children within the community to live independent lives.

The Planning Officer set out that the application was within an existing four bedroomed house and would house up to three young people between the ages of seven and seventeen under the care of full time staff. There were no external alterations to the property and this would not impact the scale and design or cause harm to the street scene and due to the number of children and the level of accommodation this would not intensify the use or cause overdevelopment. The property was within the urban area and with a sustainable location close to local shops, services and primary and secondary schools. It complied with Policy HO7 of the Local Plan and the Commissioning Team had raised no objections and it helped to meet the local sufficiency need. Supporting information had been received which included the staff rota which set out there would be two staff on 48 hour shifts with a manager present between the hours of 9am and 5pm. Shift changeovers were staggered with changeovers at 7.30am and 8am and 10.00am and 10.30am in order to avoid disruption. Some other visits such as Ofsted were likely but the proposal would not adversely prejudice the surrounding area. The additional window would be obscurely glazed and would be subject to a condition so this would not impact neighbour privacy. Work would be taken to extend vehicular access to provide adequate parking and officers were satisfied with the scaled drawing. Objections received during the consultation period had been noted. Officers noted that there had been some inaccuracies within the application and the applicant was given the opportunity to finalise the documents. The property was in a sustainable area and a family home environment which was favoured by Ofsted rather than institutional settings and it met local and national policies. In relation to the lamp post, given the size of the driveway it was not expected that this would impact the access and the Applicant would need to complete a S184 vehicle access application separately to the planning process. In relation to the bike store and the bin store shown to the rear of the property, this was considered beneficial but not necessary for this application to be compliant and there would be sufficient space for two cars to park in tandem.

During the debate, some Members raised concerns regarding on street parking and whether this could be monitored and enforcement action taken if necessary, the impact on the elderly population and would the ages of the children on site and their behaviour be properly controlled. In relation to parking, even with a carefully crafted rota, there would be times when there would be additional vehicles to the four spaces allocated on site and it was felt that this application did not meet parking standards. It was asked what was the purpose of the additional window.

The Area Team Planning Manager – East, informed Members that they could only determine the application and the information set out in front of them and where necessary enforcement action could only be taken if the site was operating outside of the management plan. In relation to the ages of the children, placings would be undertaken by the Commissioning Team who would ensure that the placings were suitable. In relation to parking, the proposed parking was considered sufficient and this was set out in the management plan and there was no technical reason to refuse.

The Planning Officer set out that in terms of the parking, the fallback position was that a C3 dwelling may also be in a similar position with delays and emergencies where off site parking would be occasionally required. In relation to the window, the existing first floor bathroom was being subdivided into a separate bathroom and an additional window was required.

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

RESOVLED – that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission (with the authority to finalise any matter including Condition(s)) subject to the following:

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

The meeting ended at 7.17 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: Wednesday 4 February 2026