

TWC/2019/0753

Land between Arleston Lane & Dawley Road, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire
Erection of an Extra Care Facility containing 70no. Self-contained flats (Use Class C2) and associated communal/public facilities and erection of 105no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated access, landscaping and ancillary works
AMENDED DESCRIPTION AND AMENDED PLANS / INFORMATION RECEIVED

APPLICANT

Countryside Properties (UK),

RECEIVED

19/09/2019

PARISH

Wellington

WARD

Arleston

THIS APPLICATION HAS BEEN REFERRED TO PLANNING COMMITTEE AS A MAJOR DEVELOPMENT ENTAILING A S106 AGREEMENT

1. SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 Full Grant subject to a Section 106 legal agreement, conditions and informatives.

2. APPLICATION SITE

2.1 The application site comprises 7.26ha of private open land roughly 'U' shaped at the southern edge of Arleston, just north of the M54 between Dawley Road to the west and Arleston Lane to the east. To the north sits the residential properties of Kingsland forming the northern boundary of the site, with properties of Arleston Village sitting in the centre of the 'U' shape. A gated access drive flanked by an avenue of established Leylandii trees forms the south-eastern boundary of the site leading to the Grade II* Arleston Manor House and gated properties of Arleston Manor Drive and Arleston Manor Mews at the south eastern corner. Residential development lies to the east of Arleston Lane, with the Wrekin Retail Park further east.

2.2 Residences of Arleston also sit to the west of the site, on the opposite side of Dawley Road, with Shortwood Primary School and Ercall Wood Technology College beyond. The surrounding residences comprise a mix of detached and semi-detached two storey buildings, with the occasional bungalow. The northern and eastern boundaries principally comprise of hedges and being open to the wider site to the south and west. The site is formed of higher ground in the context of the wider site. There is a factory (Serchem) adjacent to the site, with an access road to it and adjacent properties off Dawley Road, which dissects the site.

- 2.3 Access to the application site can currently be gained through the wider site from an existing access on Dawley Road running between Arleston and Lawley, which also forms a Public Right of Way that runs through the wider site through to Toll Road and beyond to Arleston Lane with a pedestrian link through to the Wrekin Retail Park to the east. The existing access serves residential properties and the Serchem factory, which are located to the immediate west of Arleston Village.
- 2.4 Within walking distance of the site there are numerous community facilities, including the aforementioned schools and retail park, together with Telford College of Arts & Technology, community centres, shops, doctor's, dentist, open space, public houses, restaurants and play facilities. Also within this distance is Wellington District Centre with bus and rail links, and a wide range of additional community facilities.
- 2.5 The topography of the site is complex, with the western area of the site generally falling in a southerly direction and the eastern area of the site generally falling in a northerly, and north westerly direction. The site consists of broadleaved woodland, semi-improved grassland fields and stands of dense tall ruderal vegetation bounded by hedgerows.

3. APPLICATION DETAILS

- 3.1 This is a full application seeking permission for 105 two storey dwellings comprising a mix of open market and private rental units, amended from 106 dwellings at the outset of the application, together with a 70 self-contained apartment Extra Care facility. The latter is proposed to be delivered by the 'not-for-profit' provider of retirement accommodation 'Housing 21', further to provision of a serviced parcel by the developer of the housing 'Countryside Properties' who now own the site. It would comprise 19no. One bed apartments for affordable rent, 21no. Two bed apartments for affordable rent, and 30no. Two bed apartments for shared ownership, for occupation by people aged 55 and over with communal facilities, parking and a landscaped garden within a central courtyard. Within the communal areas, a bistro/dining area, lounge, hair salon, motorised scooter store and laundry are proposed. The lounge and bistro have direct access through bi-fold doors to the central courtyard, these would be fitted with 'moveable walls' to provide flexibility for a range of uses and functions.
- 3.2 The dwellings would comprise 17no. 2 bed units, 55no. 3 bed units and 33no. 4 bed dwellings. Plots 1-44 comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached properties, with one terrace of three units, would be accessed off a new entrance to the site from Dawley Road together with the Extra Care, its entrance and parking sitting to its southern side then flanked by the track

serving existing properties towards the centre of the site. Plots 45-86 would further be served off the northern access point, comprising a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached properties. A pinch point feature is proposed adjacent to the existing track to act as a traffic calming measure for vehicles traversing to this section of the development.

- 3.3 A second access point is proposed from the eastern edge of the site with a new arm off an upgraded mini island that already serves the residential area of Lidgates Green. The internal service road would then split to serve a lower level section of development comprising 11no. detached properties sitting between Arleston Lane and Arleston Manor Mews in a cul-de-sac arrangement. A second cluster of development configured around an arc'd cul-de-sac arrangement would sit on higher ground to the north comprising 8no. detached plots. A footpath link would then be created (notably there is evidence of informal access within this area of the site already) through an area of retained open space and a woodland area linking through to the central section of the development.
- 3.4 Related to drainage, the application identifies that foul sewage would be conveyed to mains sewer, with surface water to mains and sustainable urban drainage system, the site layout showing the provision of three dry attenuation ponds generally in line with previous applications for the site. The application material advises that Severn Trent Water have confirmed that there is capacity within their network to supply water to both the residential element and the care home proposed on site. Connections can be provided from both Dawley Lane and Arleston Lane.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 TWC/2016/1190 - Erection of an Extra Care Facility containing 50no. self-contained flats and associated communal/public facilities including a shop, lounge / dining / activities room, hairdressers, residents lounge / multi use room, buggy store, and the erection of 92no. Residential dwellings with associated access landscaping, drainage and all ancillary and enabling works. Withdrawn following committee resolution to approve 23/11/2018
- 4.2 TWC/2015/0836 - Reserved matters application for layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for the erection of an Extra Care Facility containing 50no. self-contained flats and associated communal/public facilities including a shop, restaurant, café, hair & beauty salon and hobbies/meeting room and the erection of 95no residential dwellings. Reserved Matters Granted 02/06/2016
- 4.3 TWC/2014/0057 - Outline planning permission for the erection of 30 No. bungalows for the elderly, replacing the provision of 50 No. extra care housing

units permitted under planning permission TWC/2012/0240. Outline Refused 17/06/2014. Appeal Dismissed 18/05/2015 (APP/C3240/A/14/2224981)

- 4.5 TWC/2012/0240 - Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 103no. new dwellings (Use class C3) and 50no. extra care housing units (Use class C2), Provision of 2no. new access roads and associated drainage, open space and landscaping ***Amended Parameter Plans***. Outline Granted 05/10/2012
- 4.6 TWC/2011/0261 – Outline Planning permission for up to 125 dwellings (Use Class C3) a 50. bed extra care facility (Use Class C2) and 2no. new accesses and associated open space and landscaping. Withdrawn 01/06/ 2011
- 4.7 2001/0746 – Change of use from agricultural land to private garden area to include trees, lawn, meadow and pond – Full Granted on 03/10/2001
- 4.8 W91/1161 – Outline planning permission for up to 142 dwellings. Refused 15/01/1993
- 4.9 W91/1138 – Outline planning permission for up to 95 dwellings. Refused 15/01/1993
- 4.10 W91/1137 – Residential development for about 95 dwellings. Withdrawn 05/06/1992
- 4.11 W90/0031 – Outline planning permission for 257 dwellings. Refused 11/04/1990
- 4.12 W79/567 – Outline planning permission residential development. Refused 01/11/1979

5. RELEVANT POLICY DOCUMENTS

- 5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- 5.2 Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (TWLP) 2011-2031

6. NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.1 The application has been subject to two rounds of public consultation, the first of which raised 39 objections (a number of which are from parallel households) comprising the following summarised feedback:
 - Risk of crime and antisocial behaviour – existing problems and development would worsen, limit the quality of life of current residents, advice of police

should be included; walkway connecting two halves of development hub for antisocial behaviour and should be removed, opening up access to otherwise gated development with lack of need for path, if retained needs to be stepped back to dipped area

- Highway safety and traffic pollution – existing problems of traffic incidents / pedestrian safety / capacity on match days / narrow width / poor condition Arleston Lane, speed and volume of traffic along Dawley Road – study of the effects at peak time needed, increased congestion Watling Street, Dawley Road / Holyhead Road junction already stretched to maximum capacity during morning and evening rush hour, gridlock and poorer air quality for residents
- Impact on cartway to existing factory (Serchem) regularly served by HGVs and residential properties (Midfields and Heatherset) - crossing by new road will create a dangerous situation with through traffic, HGVs reverse along road due to lack of turning area
- Lack of need – new development at Lawley Village less than one mile away, fifty new dwellings being built by the local authority 800 metres away, quota of homes already built, should be left as woodland for dog walkers and an open space with protection of Green Network, proposed to build on Green Network when plenty of brownfield land in Telford area, removal of valuable green area, many care homes in Telford some struggling to stay viable
- Removal of extra care - not wanted by developers and local residents, blot on the landscape, unsympathetic to the unique character of Arleston Village recognised by the Inspector in the (dismissed) 2015 appeal for the site, overshadow existing and proposed buildings, negative affect on the Wellington Gateway currently identifiable with a tree lined boulevard, increase in number of properties – to make it more viable with increase in vehicles and insufficient parking, repositioned and even more dominant, no funding for extra care, increase 40%, alternative better for 1.5 storey properties for over 55s similar to development at Carvers Close off Holyhead Road in Wellington with local authority controlling the sale price to ensure they remain affordable on re-sale, lack of community benefit
- Increase in houses to previous applications – increase the number of vehicles and pollution
- Design not in keeping – no other three storey buildings within the vicinity, proposal fails to align with quality of existing adjacent properties including Grade 2* listed 16th century property, all previous developments adjacent to Arleston Manor either refused or carefully controlled to ensure the quality of build complements the manor, all previous development required a brick perimeter 2m high wall to the border with the manor and should apply to the north west perimeter, questioned whether the proposal falls in line with latest government guidelines stating that any development should enhance the area, extra care blot on the landscape, proximity plot 105 to Arleston Lane, overdevelopment

- Impact on listed buildings in Arleston Village – development would dominate the village, would be like an amphitheatre
- Loss of privacy from plots 87-92 on Arleston Manor Mews properties – number of plots need to be removed / built further away, impact of headlights
- Lack of buffer to Arleston Manor Mews – needs to be year round screen
- Planting removed to rear of Callow House needs to run at the side of the proposed houses – blocking view to natural greenspace
- Central open space to be left rough grassland and not landscaped
- Tree no longer present in garden of Haddon House
- No street lighting at top of Arleston Lane – needs to be catered for
- Intrusiveness of roads – particularly to the south of Arleston Village having an encircling terraced effect being extremely intrusive, roads to the west having a straight regimental impact with headlights shining directly into Arleston Village with its lower elevations
- Overbearing impact on Midfields – low old property, surrounded on three sides, swamped, impact on quality of life for disabled resident spending lots of time in the bedroom, if allowed request for 8 foot wall around the western side of property
- Destruction of rural outlook of Arleston Manor Drive on one side – back fences of 23 properties along boundary
- Proximity of buildings to drive of Arleston Manor Drive
- Future demands for reduction in height of mature trees forming the edge of the driveway serving Arleston Manor
- Loss of woodland and trees – at a time when everyone asked to plant more trees felling of woodland unjustified, home to mature trees, insufficient replacement, woodland role in holding back groundwater that would naturally flow downhill, climate change impact, future requests removal of trees Arleston Manor Drive
- Impact on wildlife – wildlife would not return once gone
- Area within development currently affected by Japanese knotweed
- Greenspace and Green Network – originally / is designated as Green Network, when previous permission expired should have been returned to that status, amount of green lung in the Wellington area decreasing rapidly, this is an ideal site, candidate for Green Guarantee which seems to have completely missed out south Wellington, application should be rejected if TWC seriously committed to promoting health communities and the provision of green space, open spaces do not have to be manicured / fully accessible to the public to be of benefit to the community
- Form of eco zone adjacent to 20 Arleston Village – welcomed but narrower than the allotments [previous schemes], and lacks green links to other green areas important for the movement of birds and mammals known to forage and take over the area, suggested it should be wider to provide decent habitat cover particularly in the winter

- Impact on drainage – dramatic increase in volume needing disposal, existing capacity issues pipework and stream through Arlestone Village, recent failure and foul system had to be drained out during the last month, drop in water pressure over past few years
- Risk of flooding – removal of green areas with rain falling on tarmac and hardstanding
- Timing of extra care – at the end and may be no funds, understood was a concession to development
- Lack of local infrastructure – difficult to get into Drs and dentist, downgrading of hospital, A&E closure
- Need for controls over construction phase – traffic control, no evenings / night work assumed, parking of construction workers, avoidance of mud on the roads
- Requests if development is approved – restrictions and rules under S106 agreement adhered to with number of houses limited to 20 and no more built until the extra care is completed, 3 houses to the rear of The Woodlands removed to reduce the number of houses and to prevent the intrusion of privacy – looking directly into house and at a higher level, footpath should be abandoned and replaced with open grassland with wild plants and flowers, people still be able to walk in this area without the need for tarmac that will encourage motor cycles / quad bikes and cyclists, rat run and increase in crime, already right of way no requirement for another
- Lack of consultation contrary to NPPF – many in the village and surrounding area excluded from the mailing list by TWC and developers, every resident should have had a letter
- Existing right of way – application should be referred to TWC Public Rights of Way Officer
- Encroachment of site – land to rear of Serchem Works and Heatherset comes in quite a lot past the property boundary and would seriously impact on access to the emergency fire exit to the rear of the Serchem factory, access required in all times in case of emergency, boundary seems to enter onto Arlestone Manor Drive access road, questioned whether this could have future implications
- Say of local residents - development not wanted by local residents as seen by massive opposition in the past and present, should have their say not just planners
- Source of food production – previously farmed, could be with little effort again.

In response to the 2nd consultation (amended layout including 106-105 dwellings, further technical evidence), a total of 15 objections (a number of which were received from the same household) were received raising the following additional summarised issues:

- Swapping of plots – plot 88 swapped for similar size with plot 87, moving

garages away from boundary of Callow House

- Arleston Manor Mews
- Recent issue of drains having been unable to cope with effluent overflowing onto property, other recent new developments where residents suffering runoff / sewage flooding, many existing properties lie at a lower level than the development
- Concern regarding potential number of rental properties - notorious for not having the same level of care and management as owner occupiers, knock-on effects to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building
- Inappropriate landscaping – more akin to a parkland character around Arleston Manor
- Lack of supporting evidence – lighting design, landscape and visual appraisal including impact on the AONB / Wrekin Forest Strategic Landscape, existing versus proposed levels, Environmental Impact Assessment
- Lack of ecological net gain
- Lack of consultation with Historic England
- Contrary to planning policy in the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan
- Does not constitute sustainable development
- Unallocated site with no current planning permission – exceeds small windfall allowance of the Local Plan
- Concern over delivery standard of developer
- Request for advance receipt of Officer recommendations and wording of draft conditions.

7. STATUTORY REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Ward Councillor Angela McClements – Object:

- Concern about the increase in size of this development from previous applications, one of the key concerns of previous applications was the size and dominant nature of the Extra Care Home and the increase in units will only create and increased dominance on the skyline, important to remember the unique character of Arleston Village and this development will surround the village on three sides and have a detrimental effect on the outlook
- Drainage – a problem over many years with flooding in the village due to inadequate drains, overdevelopment will only serve to cause more problems
- Increase in traffic and congestion, build up down both Dawley Road and Arleston Lane has been significant in the past few years
- Unsuitable access on brow of hill, lack of view coming in and out dangerous

- Impact on wildlife
- Conclude cannot support this application as it stands on a number of key planning issues – overdevelopment, layout of houses, drainage and access roads.

7.2 Wellington Town Council: Object

- Exception for development – outline planning had been originally approved on the basis that there had been an exception for the proposed development for an Extra Care Facility. The proposed development as a Well Being Facility did not provide the minimum requirements of being considered a suitable exception to accordingly permit development in the Green Network
- Unsuitable access – difficult access to and from the development site
- Increase in traffic movements both along Dawley Road and Arleston Lane
- Lack of additional community facilities that had been included in the original outline planning approval
- Site had not been designated as housing land in the new draft Local Plan
- Increase in adverse impact within immediate vicinity from increase in the number of residential and extra care units.

7.3 Highways: Comment

Requests conditions for the provision of highway features construction details, on-site construction details (parking of construction personnel, storage of plant and materials, etc.), provision of visibility splays, detailed designs of off-site highway works, details of public right of way works, delivery of parking, loading, unloading and turning prior to development being brought into use, Travel Plan. S106 monies requested - £10,000 towards improvement works to three bus stops along Kingsland, £5,000 for the provision of support and monitoring of the Travel Plan £7,000 towards the re-location of the 40mph speed limit along the Dawley Road.

7.4 Arboricultural: Support subject to conditions

Requests conditions to secure additional information from the landscaping plans submitted, conditioning of Tree Protection Plans, presence of Arboricultural Clerk of Works to set out fencing and oversee certain operations, suitably appointed tree contractor to fell trees in the TPO'd woodland, and a replacement planting scheme for the section of trees to be removed in this woodland

7.5 Ecology: Support subject to conditions

Requests conditions for the erection of a range of nesting/roosting boxes for bats, birds and hedgehogs, the obtainment of a badger disturbance licence, submission of a lighting plan, submission of a Habitat Management Plan, and

work to be in accordance with submitted Ecological Method Statements on bats and badgers.

7.6 Affordable Housing: Comment

Provides an overview of the need for specialist housing for older people in Telford & Wrekin, with the number of people in the borough aged 65 and over set to increase 47% (+12,900) from 2014 to 2030, and aged 90 and over will go up by 900 (+150%), sets out the benefits of extra care housing providing a 'home for life' as far as practicable. Mix of sized and tenure apartments proposed by an operator known as a leading national provider of specialist housing, existing provision mainly in the south and centre of Telford with additional provision needed, suitable location. The Council will seek to agree a nominations agreement with Housing 21 which would include giving priority to local residents or those with a strong local connection to the borough.

7.7 Environmental Health – Support Subject to conditions

Request conditions seeking a Dust Management Plan (can be part of Construction Management Plan), Post Mitigation Noise Report, working hours with no working on public or bank holidays, extraction details for the restaurant serving the extra care, lighting plan, reporting of unexpected contamination.

7.8 Drainage: Object subject to conditions

Broadly happy with most of the drainage principles in the Flood Risk Assessment and welcome proposed rates of surface water discharge and provision of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, missing several pieces of information required before willing to support the proposals – capacity of the existing watercourse through Arleston Village, or addressed what impact the proposed development will have on the volume of surface water runoff from the site, reduction in size of the surface water attenuation from previous drainage layouts. Developer asked to revise the drainage proposals for the site, area known to be vulnerable and volume control should be considered in line with the latest guidelines.

7.9 Built Heritage Conservation: Comment

Guides that the proposed scheme has the potential to impact on listed buildings at Arleston Manor (grade II*), The Old Pump House and Nos.12 & 13, Arleston Village (grade II). Permission has previously been granted for development of similar basic layout. The relationship to the two grade II listed buildings on Arleston Village has not significantly altered in the current scheme. However, at Arleston Manor, there is some creep of development to either end of the northwest boundary to the Manor House. Objection was initially raised in this respect, subsequent correspondence from the applicant's archaeologist has been reviewed. Comments that this has not provided any further information to

demonstrate the potential impact of the buildings at plots 66 & 67 on the setting of the grade II* listed building at Arleston Manor. It is appreciated, however, that the consultants are reliant upon views of the heritage asset from the application site, and have not had access to the listed building or its grounds, where the impact on views of or from the Manor and its curtilage would be experienced.

The Conservation Offices does not agree with the statement that the only significant aspect of setting to Arleston Manor is its relationship to the village, given its origin as a hunting lodge in an open forested location. Precedent for development in close proximity to the north and east of the site should also not be taken as justification for further harm to its setting through further surrounding development. Notes that there will be some opening up of views of the Manor along the proposed footpath, which are not currently accessible and would better reveal its significance; but the setting in relationship to the village would be largely unaltered due to the retention of existing intervening trees.

Identifies also conscious of the previous permission for development of this site on much the same footprint as the current scheme, with the exception of plots 66 and 67, and that planning policies in respect of the setting of listed buildings have not significantly altered since. Also acknowledge that the views of plots 66 & 67 are currently largely screened by mature trees. Whilst mindful that the tree cover is of a temporary nature, the additional development on plots 66 & 67 is a very slight increase on the whole, bringing the built form just 20m closer to Arleston Manor beyond the existing tree boundary.

Concludes that on balance there is some slight increase in the harm to the setting of Arleston Manor. In accordance with NPPF 196 this should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme as a whole.

7.10 Education: No objection

Request a contribution of £349,223 towards primary provision, and £150,573 towards secondary provision.

7.11 Healthy Spaces: Support subject to conditions

References the increase demand upon existing play / recreational resource from new residents to the area, with number of properties contributing to the need of recreational facilities for the area, with number of dwellings proposed triggering the need for onsite NEAP provision, onsite provision particularly important as a number of properties have rear gardens in full shade and would impact upon recreational use and increase the importance of public open space.

Proposed change from onsite children's play together with an offsite contribution for older children as agreed on the outline application will limit access to children's play facilities, nearest children's play facilities exceed recommended minimum distance (570m to recommended 400m), distance

likely to create a barrier to participation for some children. Cited that during community consultation the community supported a contribution towards offsite improvements.

Whilst providing no onsite provision will limit the opportunity for some new residents, improvements together with an extension to the range of opportunity to the existing play facilities will both partially serve the new community and significantly increase use from the existing community, position therefore reluctantly accepted with provision of an offsite contribution towards upgrading and enhancing existing community play / recreation provision, sum proposed of £150k is an acceptable sum and should be provided prior to commencement if at all possible.

The significant amount of proposed Public Open Space and shared space requires management / maintenance, believed to be proposed to be maintained by a Management Company, essential that a Long Term Management Plan included as a condition, vehicular access to the woodland off Arleston Lane may be impeded as result of the development, may be resolved by reduction in the size of the perimeter gardens, details landscape plans required by condition.

- 7.12 Shropshire Council Archaeology: Comment
Confirms approval of a Written Scheme of Investigation for a programme of archaeological work and requests conditioning of this.
- 7.13 Coal Authority: Support subject to conditions
Request a condition for the undertaking of intrusive site investigations to further assess the potential risks posed to the development by past coal mining activity, the submission of a report of findings arising from those investigations, and implementation of remedial works.
- 7.14 Shropshire Fire Service – Comment:
As part of the planning process, consideration should be given to the information contained within Shropshire Fire and Rescue Service’s “Fire Safety Guidance for Commercial and Domestic Planning Applications” document.
- 7.15 West Mercia Police: Comment
Provided general design guidance.

8. APPRAISAL

- 8.1 Having regard to the development plan policies and other material planning considerations, including comments received during the consultation process,

the planning application raises the following main issues:

- The principle of the development;
- The design and layout of the proposal;
- Heritage and Archaeological issues;
- The impact on neighbours and the living conditions for the occupiers of the proposed houses;
- Ecology and Trees;
- Highway Impacts;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Contamination and Geotechnical Issues;
- Planning obligations and Viability;
- Other matters.

The principle of the development

- 8.2 The application site lies within the urban area of Telford as established through the Adopted Proposals Map of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (January 2018), as the principal focus for growth in applying policy SP1. Through adoption of this plan the context of the site altered, from previously Green Network in the preceding Wrekin Local Plan (January 2000) to being identified as whiteland. This revision was led by planning permission being granted on the site for residential development, this was further to planning permissions which provided exceptional circumstances for the proposal.
- 8.3 These included the provision of an extra care use with a range of facilities open to the public, together with the high proportion of the site to be retained as open space, much of which would be made more accessible to existing residents in the locality. The site has further been included in the Council's 5 year housing land supply since this monitoring mechanism came into play during 2015, and is cited in the latest statement covering the period 2018-2023. Here it is noted that it would not have been allocated as a housing site having already obtained planning permission, and the historic context of food production derived from the site is not considered material to the determination of the application, recognising local representation on this matter.
- 8.4 In considering the current planning application, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has sought to balance the context of the planning history of the site with its context now as whiteland in the Local Plan. Representation by TWC Affordable Housing confirms a sustained need for extra care accommodation in this location in such a respect. Quantitatively, in the period from 2014 to 2030 the number of people in the borough aged 65 and over will increase by 47% (+12,900). Those aged 90 and over will go up by 900 (+150%). Most older people want to stay in their own homes with help and support where

needed. National planning guidance encourages local authorities to provide homes to meet the increasing and diverse needs of older people (notably paras 59 and 61 of the NPPF). Part of Telford & Wrekin Council's approach has been to work with partners to develop a network of extra care housing schemes across the borough.

8.5 Extra care housing (noting that this is not a wellbeing facility as cited by Wellington Town Council) provides a 'home for life' as far as practical, primarily for older people. It is an important part of the integrated provision of housing, health and care services. Qualitatively, key features of extra care housing include: accessible design to promote independent living and support people to 'age in place', fully self-contained properties where residents have their own front door, communal spaces and facilities, access to care and support services 24 hours a day. Some of these facilities may be open to the wider local community. The Council has worked with partners to provide 7 extra care housing schemes for older people to date (over 400 homes), mainly, in the south and centre of Telford. Additional provision is needed in order to keep pace with the level of need and also to address the shortfall in the north of the borough, where there is a large population of older people.

8.6 This proposed scheme by Housing 21 will provide a mix of 70 one and two bedroom apartments – these will be wheelchair accessible, have level access bathrooms and be for affordable rent or shared ownership. The design of the accommodation will offer self-contained private accommodation that would enable occupants to live independently, incorporating design features taking into account:

- Restricted reach
- Restricted dexterity
- Sensory impairment
- Physical disabilities and restricted mobility
- Cognitive impairment e.g. dementia, loss of memory, depression and confusion
- Functional impairment e.g. temperature, balance, continence.

8.7 Notably there is currently very little accommodation of this form for shared ownership in the borough, with 30 of the apartments proposed for this tenure being a particularly welcomed feature of the proposal. This is considered to be a suitable location for the scheme both in terms of the need for the type of housing entailed and spatially - where there is good access to a range of

facilities in the locality and public transport to the wider area from nearby Kingsland. Housing 21 are a leading national provider of specialist housing and already provide sheltered homes for local people in the Wellington area.

- 8.8 Whilst the S106 cannot explicitly reference the extra care as affordable due to the nature of the grant funding required to secure provision, here notably historically Homes England (as the grant provider) have confirmed during the course of the application that this position is set with precedent of being included and grant funding provided in the borough, essentially they have tightened up on this, and similarly cannot be controlled through planning condition.
- 8.9 The viability evidence has in turn been provided by the applicant to demonstrate that the scheme is unviable were affordable housing required, this would as a starting point amount to 25% as required by TWLP policy HO5. The Council's consultant 'Turleys' have undertaken an independent review of the appraisal submitted by Countryside Properties generates a viability deficit of -£296,815 (subsequent to accounting for profit as is standard practice) such that there is no scope for provision of affordable housing within the scheme in addition to provision of planning contributions which are now greater than that accounted for in the review with a greater education request made than through previous schemes.
- 8.10 In order to maximise certainty as to the delivery of this component, Housing 21 are proposed to be a signatory of the legal agreement which incorporates triggers around the delivery of the extra care, the aforementioned proposed tenure mix has been set out by Housing 21 who have provided the design (internally and externally) for the extra care building. Furthermore, the Council will seek to agree a nominations agreement with Housing 21, which will include giving priority to local residents or those with a strong local connection to the borough.
- 8.11 The mix of open market dwellings and extra care provision will facilitate meeting the housing target defined by TWLP policy HO1, and help satisfy the need for specialist elderly accommodation in the Borough as set out in TWLP policy HO7 respectively, alongside the NPPF, in a sustainable location. The extra care will create employment for 5 full time staff for the commercial uses along with care staff recognising the economic benefits derived through development. The principle of residential development on the site has been established for a number of years, albeit planning permission has now lapsed (June 2019) with the previous proposed developer Redrow not pursuing purchase of the site and completing the S106 of the 2016 residential and extra care proposal; falling within the urban area boundary and now identified

as whiteland. Collectively, the principle of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable.

The design and layout of the proposal

- 8.12 The nature of the application entailing a new developer has enabled certain elements of the historic approaches to the proposed layout - led by a parameters plan of an original outline consent - to be reassessed. This includes the position of the extra care, having previously been set away from the frontage of the site. The proposal follows the previously accepted approach of a three storey unit, recognising local representation around existing development being two storey in form, now relocated to a frontage position on Dawley Road.
- 8.13 The building is bigger as proposed, entailing an increase in the number of apartments. Relating to the last proposal (TWC/2016/1190 considered favourably at Planning Committee, although subsequently withdrawn) the height of the building is marginally taller at 14m on the south east, relating to a section of the elevation as opposed to the ridge height of 13.75m across the building as historically proposed. For the 2016 application, the building measured 48.3m in length along the internal road frontage, and would now measure 66.4m. The building has been orientated differently with the historic application measuring 61.4m in width and is now proposed as 51.7m.
- 8.14 The applicant has however notably sought to mitigate its scale and mass. The concept leading this approach is defined in the application material, this identifies that initial analysis of the local area highlighted that the building of most significance and local interest is Arleston Manor, a Grade 2* listed building with gables dated from 1614 and 1630. By understanding this building and distilling elements of the design, the provider identifies that they have been able to develop a design language that can be considered and applied in a modern way. This process provides a tool-kit of parts that can then inform the design and its concept.
- 8.15 In turn, the mass of the building is duly reduced through four interconnected configuration in a U-shape form, a mixed materials pallet with red brick and grey slate coloured (HardiePlank) inset panelling, a brick soldier course between the ground and first floor linking with brick headers for a number of first floor windows to provide an element of horizontality. Feature red hanging tiles are included at the upper level for a number of the projecting sections across the elevations, as a feature that will be dotted around the wider residential development. This would sit alongside variation in the building line that will help create areas of shadowing across the facades, in conjunction

with notable variation to the eaves and ridge level. The style seeks to echo the Tudor streetscape with an overall modern take on this architectural period.

- 8.16 A mix of vertical and horizontal emphasis windows, with picture style dormer windows are integrated within the central section along Dawley Road, and the northwest elevation. Sections of the proposal have lower wall plates and the windows partially set into the roof seek to reduce mass and further break up the elevations. The inclusion of balconies will further add to the active nature of the elevations.
- 8.17 From the northwest the building will also be read against the adjacent two storey development and proposed landscaping, with upper level interest through inclusion of a section of hanging tiles and projecting dormers. When approached from the south east, the upper level would again be subject to a hanging tile arrangement and variation in the roof arrangement, alongside being read against landscaping at the southern edge.
- 8.18 To the rear (north east), the mass would be broken up by the U-shape of the building, with projecting elements designed as both gable fronted and side gabled to add variety, these would then be read against the varied ridgeline and form of the setback sections of the building. The presence of soft landscaping around the perimeter of the building, including extension of the boulevard treed approach to this area of the site - appreciating local representation regarding this context along Kingsland more widely, and particularly the communal garden within the inner expanse, will further reduce the visual impact of development.
- 8.19 The proposal has sought to positively address the scale and mass of the extra care building that would generally be anticipated to have a frontage presence when one is available in a gateway position to the town, and a context of public access entailed.
- 8.20 A greater setback from Dawley Road has been sought but this would mean that the building would be closer to the residence of Midfields (No. 24) to the east and would prejudice the achievability of sufficient separation for the three storey building. The main entrance to the building, including access to those facilities open to the public, is proposed to be cited off the south east elevation.
- 8.21 Preferably this would be positioned off the Dawley Road frontage, the location however sits adjacent to the parking area. Were this to be relocated, this would not allow sufficient separation distances from neighbouring proposed or existing properties. The applicant has suggested an indicative position of signage regarding public access to the building, whilst this is an appropriate

position for waymarking once within the development, it is considered that additional signage on the roadside frontage would be required to make apparent the open to the public nature of the building, it is considered that this could be sensitively controlled appreciating the wider residential context of the site.

- 8.22 A more traditional approach has been adopted to the overall design of the wider site, including plots with upper level hanging tiles. This will ensure a synergy with the extra care building related to the northern parcel, through to Arleston Village, Arleston Manor, Arleston Manor Drive and Mews related to the central and eastern parcels. The LPA had sought the provision of semi-detached properties along Dawley Road bearing in mind the prominence of this dwelling type along the road, this has ultimately not been achievable due to levels changes and the viability stance on the site.
- 8.23 A mix of hipped, gable ended, and gable fronted units are proposed across a total of 18no. housetypes, including brick soldier courses, brick arches and cills, varied forms of porches, a mix of brick and tiles with feature render plots. The mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced units, provision of integrated and detached garages, wide and narrow frontage plots, varied ridge heights, will add variation within the streetscenes, with nodal plots dotted at key positions with the inclusion of dual frontages and feature bays to promote passive surveillance and ensure active facades onto the streetscene. With the exception of one area – plots 68-73, dwellings would face onto public space, keeping the backs of private space away from public realm.
- 8.24 Further variation in the building line has been added to the plots fronting the immediate stretch of units off Dawley Road bearing in mind the lack of punctuation of this vista by built development, supplementary planting has been added to the area to provide more of a feature edge. Likewise in the central section further variation has been added to the building line to make a less formal context of development. Amendment had nonetheless been sought to the southern stretch to introduce further hipped roofs at the eastern end but has not been revised as requested. Plot 67 adjacent to the open space has had further side windows added to create a better relationship with the open space following removal of a side bay. Where amendment had been sought and has not been secured, whilst regrettable, they do not in this instance constitute a reason for refusal.
- 8.25 The level of development is higher than previously sought on the site, the number of dwellings having increased from 95 dwellings through grant of reserved matters application TWC/2015/0836, with the principle of up to 103 agreed through grant of the original outline TWC/2012/0240, to the 105 dwellings now under consideration. Notably here there is more land available

for development through the omission of an on-site Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) (discussed further below) in the central area of the site.

- 8.26 Densities comprise 28 dwellings per hectare (dph) for the western area (excluding the extra care), 35.7dph for the central area, and 18dph in the eastern area. It is considered that the western and eastern areas are in keeping with the immediate built development – noting that Kingsland is the greater reference for the former with Arleston Village sitting at a lower level and streetscene context. The central area is higher than the remainder of the development, adopting a more urban form and entailing a number of terraced properties with smaller gardens, on balance this approach is acceptable with a lesser presence in the wider streetscene, and bearing in mind the viability position for the site, whilst retaining feature landscaping and nodal feature plots. The eastern section comprises all detached dwellings and the lesser density as a softer edge related to the development adjacent to Arleston Manor, the TPO'd woodland and Arleston Village. The height of the dwellings has been raised i.e. that they look high, the LPA can confirm that fairly standard heights are entailed, The Grantham and Oakham as two of the larger housetypes are 8m to the ridge for instance.
- 8.27 The boundary treatments show a mix of treatments to define public and private spaces within the site, with brick screen walls at key locations in the streetscene as an uplift from close board fencing as the principal means of bounding rear gardens, Officers would further expect to see hit and miss fencing in other areas of the site. The indicative levels plans show the potential locations of retaining walls, these are a frequent feature across the site and substantial in parts appreciating that the nature of the site is such that building the site up or digging down to a level position is not a realistic proposition, particularly bearing in mind the viability position. Final levels would be a condition on any planning permission and it is hoped that a number of these can be screened out, whilst securing a sympathetic approach to residential amenity and the aesthetic appearance where remaining necessary. Hard landscaping would be interspersed with and flanked by soft landscaping to reduce the harshness of these edges.
- 8.28 Tree lined avenues are a notable feature of the development and would afford a positive relationship with Kingsland, the central woodland and TPO'd eastern woodland in such a respect. The first segment of the spine road incorporates at least one 2m verge to allow for a landscaped avenue, which will complement the entrance buildings and enhance the quality of the first streetscenes.
- 8.29 Retention of a significant level of open space remains a feature of the proposed development of the site, public consultation at the pre-application

stage by the applicant reflected that there is no longer considered to be a demand for the allotments locally, a position that was confirmed to the LPA, this area is now proposed to be a green buffer, which in combination with the balancing pond in the northern corner will reduce the impact of the development on Arleston Village with properties sitting approximately 1-2 metres lower. The central woodland section will assist in breaking up the scale of the development overall, and will secure a more accessible form of open space than presently exists in the locality. The north eastern edge of the site will retain a treed backdrop through retention of the majority of the TPO'd woodland.

- 8.30 The wider context of landscaping offers a wildflower mix around the periphery of the two larger balancing ponds, and a wet mix for the ponds themselves; adjacent to Arleston Manor and plots 98-105, a further wildflower mixture is proposed. A grass seed is proposed to bound the central footpath link with a boulevard of trees either side. The existing hedgerow and trees along Kingsland Road would be retained and rear gardens of dwellings along the northern boundary situated immediately behind the retained trees and hedges seeking to minimise the change of outlook for residents along Kingsland.
- 8.31 Front boundaries would be demarked by evergreen and deciduous planting between plots, along exposed side gables and screen walls to clearly de-fine private space, whilst adding value, softening the streetscene, creating visual and sensory interest.
- 8.32 The emphasis of the landscaping serving the extra care scheme has been designed to promote community within the site, good quality defensible spaces and a sense of place. Green space is provided to the central courtyard, with additional areas of planting surrounding the building. Each ground floor apartment has been provided with a private patio, and all apartments on the first and second floor either have a Juliet or walk-out balcony. Landscaping is identified as indicative only on the site plan, with detail controlled through condition.
- 8.33 A landscape maintenance programme would be adopted to ensure the long-term survival of existing and proposed features in order to enhance their biodiversity and amenity value, and duly controlled through condition, and understood that all on-site open space is to be transferred to a residents' management company.
- 8.34 The application material confirms that national space standards have been met (or exceeded) in accordance with TWLP policy HO4. The proposal has adopted a traditional approach to the architectural style of properties, entailing a higher level of development with a varied density provided across the site to

reflect different character areas and having regard to the wider development context. Development provides a good number of housetypes including nodal plots, a mixed materials pallet, varied building and ridgelines, these factors are particularly key to the extra care building bearing in mind its prominent position on the site. On balance, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the development provides a design quality that looks and functions in a manner in keeping with its setting, and where further amendment has been sought and not achievable, that this is backed by a viability case or technical constraints of the site, according with the requirements of TWLP policy BE1.

Heritage and Archaeological Issues

- 8.35 The area adjacent to the listed Arleston Manor (and notably not the principal elevation) - a Grade II* listed building - is proposed to be retained as open space within the scheme. The nearest plots comprise No's 87-91, with a number of plots having been removed adjacent to plot 87 from the pre-application dialogue, and a further plot relocated to adjacent to the earlier plot 100 during the course of the application. Plots 89-90 entail a back to side / side to back relationship with the residences of Haddon House and Callow House (relating to enabling development of the Manor house), the scheme incorporates landscaping between and sufficient separation distances.
- 8.36 The remaining plots back directly on to the open space flanked by a proposed wall and areas of planting, the units are set away from the existing properties, and entail separation distances just under 27 metres. A minimum separation distance of 41 metres to the boundary of the garden for Arleston Manor applies related to plot 87, with residential gardens and properties between where related to views from the Manor itself.
- 8.37 Plot 67 sits 57m related to its building line to the edge of the southern principal elevation of the listed building, this plot together with plot 66 has raised concern from the Conservation Officer, reflecting that it is more important to retain a sense of green space to the southwest given that this forms a backdrop to views of the front elevation from the southeast. Development is positioned in closer proximity than previous schemes along this edge - through the aforementioned two plots, whilst mindful that the tree cover is of a temporary nature, the additional development is a very slight increase on the whole bringing the built form just 20m closer to Arleston Manor beyond the existing tree boundary. This is such that on balance there is some slight increase in the harm to the setting of Arleston Manor, necessitating that this should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme as a whole.
- 8.38 Here the quantum of development is led by a viability case, whilst enabling a development comprising a varied mix of dwellings in conjunction with an extra care facility, which as previously set out, is in great need as a specialist form

of location in the Wellington area. The Heritage Assessment accompanying the application further identifies that setting of the other two listed building (grade II) in close proximity of the site within Arleston Village will not experience a change to its setting, this position is not disputed by the Conservation Officer.

- 8.39 Archaeological remains relating to the medieval settlement of Arleston may survive within the application site. An archaeological assessment accompanies the application with newly available LiDAR imagery of an earthwork feature within the site which it interprets as a single surviving furrow of former medieval ridge and furrow ploughing, and which together with the negative results from an earlier geophysical survey undermines the case for this part of the site being the location of the former chapel, ultimately concluding that there is low potential for below ground archaeological remains across the site. It is nonetheless considered possible that remains may survive in part of the site – the assessment being desk based, and therefore recommends that a programme of archaeological work in accordance with the submitted Written Scheme of Investigation be made a condition of any planning permission.
- 8.40 The LPA are satisfied that the scheme pays due regard to the heritage and archaeological assets present in the locality, thus satisfying the requirements of TWLP, and section 16 of the NPPF with particular regard to the setting of listed buildings, as further required by section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; and the potential impact of a proposed development on archaeological remains with reference to paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

The impact on neighbours and the living conditions for the occupiers of the proposed houses

- 8.41 The proposal involves appropriate separation distances and relationships with existing properties, together with proposed properties. At the north western edge of the site, the minimum distance entailed is just under 23m between plot 11 and No's 63 and 65 Kingsland, notably this involves a side elevation with no windows proposed. Relating to plots 13-16, and 27-28 front elevations towards Arleston Village with a minimum separation distance of 32m related to plot 13 and The Cottage and incorporates retained planting along this edge of the site. Relating to plots 28-31 and plot 35, the minimum distance comprises 26.8m between plot 28 and Heatherset, with no habitable windows present relating to an en-suite only. In terms of on the opposite side of Dawley Road, the minimum distance entailed is 30.5m relating to plot 1 and No.7 Harrison Gardens, and 48m for the extra care (No. 1 Hillside Close).

- 8.42 Stepping back of the extra care building from the nearest neighbour of Midfields (shown as No. 24 on the layout), has been further sought through shifting it northwards, as had been the preferential position suggested through pre-application dialogue. This would however not leave sufficient separation from the new properties to the north to avoid being overbearing, with the extra care sitting on a flat area of the site, the collective constraints mean that just over minimum levels of acceptability at 27.6m represents what is achievable. The applicant has further confirmed that the extra care would be positioned at a parallel ground level to Midfields.
- 8.43 Related to the central area, the minimum separation distance of 23m applies between plot 74 and Midfields, relating to the centralised position of a bathroom window on the northern side elevation as the only opening present on this elevation. Moving east, the side elevation of plot 67 would sit 56.8m from the southern edge of Arleston Manor.
- 8.44 For the eastern parcel of development, no habitable windows are present on the projecting side gable of Callow House and a separation of 20m applies to this section of the rear elevation of neighbouring plot 90; and a distance of 24.6m relating to the setback section of the existing dwelling, this distance is marginally less relating to plot 89. The request to swap plot 88 with a similar size to plot 87 would have viability issues and therefore not taken forward, sufficient separation applies in this instance and improvement to residential amenity secured through relocation of what is now plot 98 which previously bound Callow House.
- 8.45 Plot 91 provides a separation distance of just over 15m between the rear and side of the existing and proposed properties. Relating to the proposed new dwelling a flank side wall is proposed, and additional planting secured in the front amenity area to provide a greater level of privacy and enhanced outlook for the existing neighbour. Notably, the principle of a dwelling in a similar position has been accepted through previous applications.
- 8.46 At the north-western corner of the eastern part of the site, the land is approximately 2-3 metres higher than the gardens of neighbouring properties in Arleston Village. There is a sufficient separation distance between existing and proposed dwellings on plots 98-100, with a minimum of 29.4m with the presence of mature trees at present. Revision to the site layout has however reflected provision of a buffer and replanting zone that extends to the rear of these plots with detail yet provided as to what is entailed here. The LPA is mindful that the rear gardens are shown to extend in close proximity to this boundary, with neighbour concern as to an intrusive encircling terraced effect, and the indicative levels further suggesting the need for substantial retaining walls. An update is to be provided for Planning Committee in this respect to

avoid an overbearing impact on existing residents, the LPA would be seeking retention of the existing landscaping along this edge.

- 8.47 A number of residents neighbouring the site have raised a concern as to the loss of privacy and potential overlooking related to the opening up of areas of presently private greenspace. Concerns are particularly raised with regard to the provision of a footpath link through the north eastern end to the central area, the omission of a landscape buffer between the existing properties off Arleston Manor Mews and proposed properties in line with previous proposals.
- 8.48 The inclusion of a footpath link was considered key to the loss of green network through the original outline application for the site in delivering a more accessible form of open space. Whilst the applicant is not bound by the parameters plan or previous consent, its inclusion maintains this position, and improves links for existing and proposed residents to facilities in the wider locality. In order to mitigate the impact of the link, provision of close board fencing has been added to the enclosure details for the site relating to the neighbouring property of The Woodlands, with a graded approach proposed to planting adjacent to Callow House. Final details of the footpath are controlled through condition.
- 8.49 In terms of Midfields, a stretch of 2m high brick wall is proposed along its western edge where adjacent to the internal service road, to address the concern raised by the resident.
- 8.50 The intrusiveness of the form of roads is raised as a concern in neighbour representation, here it is appreciated that a more regimental alignment is proposed than previous schemes for the site. The setback of development, proposed and retained landscaping will nonetheless minimise the impact of this. Relating to the positioning of the turning head and parking for plot 91 and Haddon House, the position of the garages on both properties, the introduction of landscaping sought by the LPA, level difference with the proposed development sitting at a lower level, should help alleviate this concern.
- 8.51 Bearing in mind proximity of the site to the M54 and Dawley Road, the application is accompanied by a Noise Assessment. As anticipated, the assessment identifies road traffic sources as the predominant background noise source, but based on the data obtained will have a fairly modest impact on the proposed development. Relating to the impacts from nearby commercial activities (the neighbouring Serchem factory), no significant noise was measured through the survey, nonetheless some acoustic mitigation measures (principally relating to upgraded glazing and boundary treatments –

2m acoustic barrier) are warranted along this edge of the site to take into account noise sources typical of the sites use or future use to safeguard the business interest of the premises, and is considered a sensible recommendation.

- 8.52 A further condition relating to a post mitigation, pre-occupation noise testing report to be submitted, this is considered unduly onerous with the proposed mitigation having been modelled and if installed correctly would not result in any adverse noise impacts, and where not installed correctly would be subject to enforcement action, and therefore would not satisfy the tests of conditions set nationally. Predicted noise levels indicate that the site is suitable for residential development, conditioning delivery of the recommendations of the noise report is considered to be sufficient in this instance. The exact location of which would be confirmed, together with a prospective noise barrier, once proposed ground heights are finalised with a recommendation that the noise model be rerun and a mitigation strategy finalised. Subject to conditioning on this basis, Environmental Health are supportive of the scheme in respect of noise.
- 8.53 Controls around the level and form of noise generated through the construction activities on the site are further recommended by TWC Environmental Health, with concern raised in local representation on this issue. Construction hours - including no activities on bank and public holidays, would duly be conditioned. A construction management plan would further be imposed to ensure sufficient and appropriate parking would be provided on site to avoid spillover onto the neighbouring road network and residential streets recognising local concern and comments of the Local Highways Authority. Notably here no access would be afforded from the western section (plots 1-86 and the extra care) of the site to the east (plots 87-105) as raised in neighbour representation.
- 8.54 The application is further accompanied by an Air Quality Impact Assessment in respect of residential amenity, its scope again including the impact of the construction phase, emissions associated with the operation of the proposed development with a particular emphasis on road traffic movements on the local road network, and the existing baseline. For the construction phase, the proposed development is predicted to have a medium to high risk on dust soiling of nearby sensitive receptors and a low risk on human health from dust emissions.
- 8.55 The impact of vehicle emissions during the construction phase is predicted to be negligible from the three main pollutants and the considered effect at sensitive receptors to be not significant, with pre-existing monitoring data held by TWC considered in this calculation. The impact of the development when in use on nearby human sensitive receptors for the three main pollutants is considered to be negligible and not significant. On this basis, a dust

management plan is requested to ensure the identified risk is managed and mitigated.

- 8.56 The extra care unit includes a commercial kitchen with no information provided as to the form of fume extraction from the food preparation areas, a condition necessitating submission of these details would be duly imposed to protect residential amenity. The extra care as a substantially sized building, together with the varied levels of the site to the surrounding area, will require sensitive handling of the lighting on the site to ensure a satisfactory arrangement between the proposed dwellings themselves, as well as existing neighbours. The requested external lighting condition by TWC Environmental Health is duly considered necessary.
- 8.57 The application has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that subject to appropriate conditioning that there would be no significant adverse impact on nearby properties relating to noise, dust, odour and light pollution in accordance with TWLP policy BE1.

Ecology and Trees

- 8.58 The application is accompanied by a series of ecological supporting documents providing an overall assessment of the biodiversity context of the site, then detailed information relating to badger and bats, and ecological components of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
- 8.59 This confirms that the site comprises broadleaved woodland, semi-improved grassland, dense tall ruderal vegetation and hedgerows. The woodland blocks hold significant ecological value, particularly the mature woodland in the central area of the site and the continuous woodland in the north east corner and the appraisal recommends that these woodlands should be retained and protected where possible. The hedgerows on the site also have intrinsic value and provide connectivity and should be retained where possible. The central woodland area also contains a stream with an area of increasing botanical diversity which it is recommended should be protected and retained within the scheme design. The grassland on the site is unmanaged with a tall sward, the herb diversity has decreased since 2016 when grazing on the site stopped.
- 8.60 TWC Ecology note that the central woodland and stream are retained within an area of open space and the retention of a portion of the north eastern woodland block, there are also ponds and swales and areas of landscape planting shown on the proposed plans. The majority of the hedgerows are retained with acceptable losses in small sections (mostly under 30m) to facilitate access and visibility. Whilst the impacts of the scheme will include loss of some of the less diverse woodland areas and impacts upon areas of

scrub, grassland and individual trees. The most ecologically valuable woodland is to be retained, protected and appropriately managed.

- 8.61 The site is within 3km of the Wrekin SSSI but no effect pathways have been identified by which the proposed development could impact upon the SSSI. There are Local Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves within 3km but again no potential effect pathways have been identified. No impacts upon designated sites are considered likely to occur appreciating neighbour concern in such a respect.
- 8.62 Japanese knotweed is identified on the site and the Construction Environmental Management Plan will need to address the removal and appropriate treatment of this invasive plant species.
- 8.63 Bat activity transect surveys have been undertaken, together with an assessment of the trees for potential to support roosting bats with four trees with moderate and high potential were identified and are shown as retained in the proposed site layout. T26 towards the centre of the site has however, has received significant damage since the 2019 survey and the ecology consultant have subsequently visited this tree with the arboriculturalist to determine how to safely retain the tree. It is understood that a 50% reduction of the tree is proposed and a letter provided outlining reasonable avoidance measures relating to bats for works to this tree.
- 8.64 Lighting on the site will need to have regard to foraging and commuting bats and dark areas should be maintained within the site particularly around the areas of retained woodland, with area of night time lighting as requested by the police authority not being appropriate and may include the rear elevations of some of the properties neighbouring the woodlands, details are duly requested through condition, with further mitigation secured through a scheme of bat boxes.
- 8.65 Regarding the presence of active badger setts on site these sit within the retained central woodland area with the site layout amended to retain connectivity for badgers to their wider foraging territory. It will be necessary to destroy sett B on the site and to temporarily disturb sett A, this will be done under a Badger Disturbance Licence from Natural England and in line with the Badger Mitigation Strategy which has been prepared for the site. The impacts upon the badger setts result in works to lay a footpath through the proposed open space rather than directly resulting from the construction activities. In addition, site clearance work will occur in line with the reasonable avoidance measures set out by the ecology consultant. On this basis TWC Ecology are

satisfied that badgers will be protected during the works and that the level of mitigation and habitat retention proposed is appropriate.

- 8.66 The habitat on the site is broadly suitable for dormouse but the site is isolated and no further consideration of dormouse is required, the stream on the site has very low value for water vole or otter, contains no bankside vegetation and is poorly connected to other suitable habitat, these species have been identified as not likely to be present. The site is considered sub-optimal for reptiles and full surveys in 2016 and 2019 were negative for reptile species. There are no suitable breeding ponds on the site or within 250m of it, the site is considered unlikely to support a notable assemblage of invertebrate species and no detailed surveys are recommended. It is considered likely that hedgehog are present on the site, connectivity and protection measures would be controlled through condition. The site has potential to support a common assemblage of nesting birds. Vegetation removal should occur outside of the bird nesting season, landscaping should include a mix of berry and fruit producing species and a suite of nest boxes should be provided.
- 8.67 TWC Ecology identify that the submitted ecological information relating to the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) covers some of the elements which would be required but is not considered complete at this point, on that basis the submission of a fully detailed CEMP would be required as a condition of planning permission, together with further development for a landscape management plan, including the significant areas of woodland habitat.
- 8.68 The Ecologist raises no objections subject to a number of conditions to ensure the protection of species and habitat improvements. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal complies with local plan policy NE1.
- 8.69 The application is accompanied by an updated Arboricultural Assessment with accompanying Tree Protection Plans, alongside a Tree Method Statement regarding remedial work required to weather damaged mature oak tree T26 sitting towards the centre of the site. The application material identified that the development has sought to retain all trees where possible. Due to trees on site not having been managed for a period of time, there will however, be an impact on tree cover within the body of the site, with the scale of development and the provision of accesses further entailing the need for tree removal.
- 8.70 The report outlines that 26 trees will be removed by the proposed development, 8 of which are category B and 18 are category C trees. Trees to be retained are proposed to be managed and protected during construction,

with no dig construction techniques used. Trees protected by a TPO are largely retained, at the back of plots 98-105 the nature of the trees is such that they will need to be removed and more suitable species replanted, with further detail to be confirmed.

- 8.71 The majority of the proposed residential plots will not be affected by shading from retained trees. However, where trees are located along or outside the site boundary, with housing proposed to the north, there will inevitably be shade cast onto the site. This will affect plots 28-31, and 35 to the north of the bank of landscaping G3, and plots 45-67 from neighbouring G15, development in such locations has been accepted through previous consents.
- 8.72 The proposal is supported by TWC Arboriculture subject to conditions necessitating an additional layer of information around the landscaping plans, key being ensuring the survival and growth to maturity of the greater proportion of the 207 proposed trees being within or adjacent to hardstanding, paths, roads, driveways, etc. with details of the design of planting pits to be used requiring control. Root barriers would also be mandatory to abate potential future surface rooting. Reconsideration of the heavy reliance on certain species in condensed areas, species selection of the avenue planting the size of the verges is further requested. The planting of trees under existing mature trees is also questioned, with a number of examples around the scheme.
- 8.73 Further tree planting will also be required to the rear of plots 100-105 once the area has been felled and the TPO'd woodland restructured, with an Arboricultural clerk of works in attendance on site to set out the fencing and oversee certain operations on site. Officers are therefore satisfied that the development has sufficiently addressed the potential impacts on trees, with controls around the protection of retained trees and hedgerows with measures to mitigate the loss of planting in place as required by TWLP policy NE2.

Highway Impacts

- 8.74 Representations received have raised highway concern related to increased traffic and congestion in the locality that would be worsened by the development, including the Bucks Head and Cock Hotel junctions, together with Bennetts Bank; the narrowness of the carriageway leading to Lawley and restricted views, the relationship with the Serchem factory and neighbouring residences.
- 8.75 The principle of residential development in combination with an extra care facility has been established through previous permissions on the site. Appreciating that a greater quantum of development is now proposed, the

Transport Assessment accompanying the application provides an updated assessment in such a respect. Whilst the Local Highways Authority recognises that there has been an increase in traffic congestion in the locality of the site, due to the planning history associated to the site – particularly recognising that the 2016 application was considered acceptable, it is considered that a highways refusal based on limited capacity would be difficult to sustain. Without an objection on these grounds with particular reference to TWLP policy C3, the Local Planning Authority would be open to challenge at appeal.

- 8.76 An approach of two accesses with an upgraded island from Arleston Lane is accepted. The first from the western edge of the site off Dawley Road serving plots 1-86 together with the extra care. The second from the eastern edge of the site off Arleston Lane opposite Lidgates Green with a replacement roundabout provided with a further arm added which would then serve plots 87-105. Both accesses connect the site with Wellington and the wider area.
- 8.77 Pedestrian access to the site can be gained along Dawley Road from the new access, which would be related to a new traffic signal controlled pedestrian crossing provided (as previously required), with pavements then provided either side of the internal road off the back of a landscaped verge. A new footpath running through the site (as established through the original permission) links through to Arleston Lane thus affording access to and from the site at the eastern edge. An existing pedestrian access from Dawley Road towards the south western corner of the site also exists, linking through to Arleston Village and then through the eastern half of the site again through to Arleston Lane, with a link through to the back of the Wrekin Retail Park.
- 8.78 The application maintains the position that the development would secure improvement to the existing public rights of way that runs through the site, to be secured through conditioning requested by the Local Highways Authority. This is together with details of the crossing points of the rights of way across the residential roads, particularly to address concerns over the interaction between pedestrians using the existing paths and the commercial vehicles accessing the Serchem factory, a conflict with the existing neighbouring residences is also made within the representations.
- 8.79 The improvements are likely to include passing places and a widened footpath to mitigate as far as possible any conflict between commercial and residential traffic. A design led approach of the junction making it difficult for residential traffic to use the rights of way as a means of access to the dwellings within this development applies. There shall also be a requirement for a formal rights of way diversion to be applied for to facilitate the revised route of the rights of way. The LPA is duly satisfied that the proposal accords with TWLP policy C4.

- 8.80 A S106 contribution is to be sought for improvement works to three bus stops situated along Kingsland with a greater demand for provision arising from the development.
- 8.81 The proposal therefore provides good connectivity with the wider local highway network with a clear route to the publicly accessible facilities available at the extra care facility; the new pedestrian link will improve accessibility through the site and green space which will be opened up for public access, as well as permeability through the site to the neighbouring residential areas and the facilities beyond in accordance with TWLP policies SP4 and C1.
- 8.82 Parking comprises a mix of frontage, side and garage provision related to the dwellings. A total of 32 spaces set around a shared parking court is proposed to serve the extra care facility, with a covered ambulance and taxi drop-off provided adjacent to the main entrance for ease of access. A number of visitor spaces are proposed opposite the extra care building. Cycle storage for each dwelling would be within the garages and secure cycle parking would be provided within the extra care building.
- 8.83 Access is afforded to the rear of each property for the purpose of refuse storage. The LPA are satisfied that this approach ensures safe and convenient storage within a close proximity to the highway, allowing for refuse collection to take place at the roadside and seeks to prevent the ad-hoc storage of bins on the pavement.
- 8.84 A number of parties have raised concern during the consultation process relating to motorised vehicles using the proposed walk through the central area of the site - as was the case through previous applications. Again it is reiterated that this shall not be adopted as public highway and shall be privately managed. Through the course of a previous application, options to limit access were considered including use of metal elephants ears (hoops), kissing gates as per a neighbour suggestion; however, without fully fencing in the open space or indeed the footpath itself, the impact of these measures would likely be ineffective.
- 8.85 The background to the applications highlights the importance of creating public open space as to the acceptability of the proposal, with a general need to avoid hindering access by those who are less mobile, in mobility buggies, or pushing prams for instance. The nature of the area entailed would duly be notably altered by the installation of fencing. A number of units are orientated towards the open space to create active frontages to facilitate self-management.

8.86 The access points for the site were defined and approved through the previous outline permission. The proposed development has been assessed in relation to the detailed layout and parking proposals. The proposed level of parking in this location, when taking into account allocated, visitor and garages is deemed sufficient for the number and type of development proposed (noting a condition around the retention of garages for vehicular parking to be controlled through condition) and is designed to accord with TWLP policy C5. Refuse arrangements are duly acceptable. A Travel Plan will be submitted and monitored within six months of the Extra Care unit becoming occupied and targets will be reviewed and monitored on an annual basis for a period of five years. This will further assist in ensuring the parking provision for the extra care unit is sustainable. In response to the current application, the Local Highways Authority (LHA) has not raised an objection, and accords with the relevant policies of the local plan.

Flood risk and drainage

8.87 The Flood Risk Assessment accompanying the application confirms that the site lies fully within Flood Zone 1 (land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding (<0.1%); the lowest classification of flood risk. Other origins of flooding have also been assessed and it has been guided that there will be no increase in risk of flooding from land, groundwater or sewers, as a result of this development. TWC Drainage have guided that whilst they are broadly happy with most of the drainage principles set out in the Flood Risk Assessment there are several pieces of information missing from the application material required prior to support being shown for the proposals. The applicant is presently seeking to address these requirements with an update to be provided to Members of Planning Committee, a satisfactory response is required in order to ensure compliance with TWLP policies ER11 and ER12, together with the NPPF, particularly appreciating the known vulnerable nature of the local area to flooding.

Contamination and Geotechnical Issues

8.88 The site has a legacy of mining history with a potential risk posed to the development stemming from this. The application is accompanied by a Geoenvironmental Assessment as the site lies within the defined Development High Risk Area, the Coal Authority confirm that this assessment is informed by an appropriate range of sources of information. A potential of shallow mining issues with unrecorded shall coal workings likely to be present in the south of the site is identified. The assessment recommends that before any development works are carried out on site a programme of investigation by open hole rotary drilling should be undertaken to confirm if there is

evidence of any coal seams present at shallow depth beneath the southern portion of the site, determine their thickness, and assess whether they have been worked.

- 8.89 The Coal Authority recommends that this mitigation be controlled through a condition for the undertaking of intrusive site investigations, this encompasses foundation design as a recommendation of the assessment guiding that assuming no significant impact associated with shallow coal workings, that strip/trench fill foundations should be viable for the proposed development; however, due consideration needs to be given to volume change potential of the near surface cohesive soils. The Coal Authority also considers that due consideration should also be afforded to the potential risk posed by mine gas to the proposed development.
- 8.90 The need for retaining walls across the site, due to localised level changes, is anticipated to be a feature of the site; the extent of which would be dictated by the finalisation of service arrangements. In order to assess the extent and detail of the final position, a condition requiring final details would be imposed, accompanied by a slope stability declaration form, to demonstrate that the structural integrity of the development will not be compromised by slope instability in accordance with TWLP policy BE9.
- 8.91 No visual evidence of potential significant contamination was recorded during the fieldwork, with the majority of test results for the contaminants of concern being below the relevant assessment criteria, an exceedance of lead was identified in ashy Made Ground in one of the trial pits, with concentrations for zinc are locally elevated above those considered to present a risk to plant growth in a number of the trial locations, recommendations are made to address these concentrations.
- 8.92 There is a historical well on the site, its location is identified in the topographical survey and site layout sitting within the open space between plots 87 and 98, the assessment identifies that depending on the finalised site layout it may be necessary to infill and/or cap this off with a suitable concrete slab to ensure no stability issues arise. There are two historical ponds on site which historical mapping has shown as infilled by the 1950s, the assessment recommends that localised deepening may be required if these features are encountered at formation level.
- 8.93 TWC Environmental Health are satisfied that the application material has characterised the nature and extent of any contamination on site, provided a remediation scheme, with the implementation of the remediation and reporting of unexpected contamination to be resolved through conditions. Officers are therefore satisfied that the application has satisfied the requirements of TWLP policy BE10 in ensuring the protection of human health and the buildings / services from potential sources of contamination.

Planning obligations and viability

- 8.94 The proposed development meets the requirements to provide contributions relating to Education, Recreation and Highways, these collectively amount to £671,796. The application is accompanied by a viability appraisal, which has been subject to independent review instructed by the LPA. This concludes that a viability deficit is generated by the development, such that there is no scope for the provision of affordable housing (as required by TWLP policy HO5) in addition to the provision of planning contributions amounting to £542,720, much of which would be funded through a reduced profit margin, the applicant has agreed to this amount. The proposed distribution of monies is proposed as follows:

Education: Local Plan Policy COM1 recognises that major new housing development will generate additional demands upon existing levels of education provision. A portion of the above amount would be attributed to education comprising £370,720 (£349,223 towards primary provision and £150,573 for secondary provision having been requested by Schools Organisation, this is significantly higher than previous education requests for the site).

Highways: As required by Policy C3, the Local Highways Officer has confirmed the application meets the trigger to provide a contribution towards improvement works to three bus stops that are situated along Kingsland, in close proximity to the site. A contribution of £5,000 for the provision of support and monitoring of the Travel Plan required under condition 6 above. A contribution of £7,000 towards the re-location of the 40mph speed limit along the Dawley Road, which will cover the costs associated to the necessary amendments of the associated signing and lining and the amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order.

Children's Play / Recreation / Open Space: Local Plan Policy NE4 requires that the development provides open space on site, together with a contribution towards the enhancement of public open space. The Council's Healthy Spaces Officer advises that an off-site play area contribution of £150,000 would be utilised for the Windsor Road play area, and / or John Broad Avenue play area, and / or Watling Community Centre play area in lieu of an on-site LEAP.

This is accepted as the compromise position towards upgrading and enhancement of existing community play / recreation provision further to consideration of the applicant's submission of a document seeking to justify an offsite contribution. The material includes the outcome of community consultation where onsite provision was not supported, alongside the lack of a suitable alternative position on the site with the previous site having not been supported due to shading issues, backed by a viability case that further units cannot be lost in order to create a large enough space to position a facility to

support the required buffer from proposed and existing units, and not impact on the setting of the listed Arleston Manor.

8.95 In determining the required planning obligations on this specific application the following three tests as set out in the CIL Regulations (Amended 2019), in particular Regulation 122, have been applied to ensure that the application is treated on its own merits:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) directly related to the development;
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Other matters

8.96 The boundary line of the application site has been raised in local representation. This is firstly in relation to Arleston Manor Drive in that the boundary seems to enter onto the Arleston Manor Drive access road, and questioned whether this could have future implications for Arleston Manor Drive. The applicant has confirmed that the redline follows the legal title plan information relating to ownership of the land and is correct. This is solely to indicate ownership and does not mean that there would be any physical demarcation on this line, or any change to legal rights such as access rights.

8.97 Representation of the site encroaching onto the Serchem factory grounds is made. Here the applicant advises that the location plan/layout they took to the public consultation was incorrect as it did encroach on the factory yard area, but this was corrected for the application.

8.98 Concern has been raised in local representation as to the impact of development on oversubscribed medical facilities. Here it is advised that Doctors surgeries are private practices and where the demand arises, the market would duly respond to this.

8.99 Issues of existing water pressure issues at Arleston Manor Mews, and a need to cater for street lighting at the top of Arleston Lane have been considered but do not raise any issues that would warrant a review of the analysis of this proposal.

8.100 A landscape appraisal has not been an evidence requirement of the application, being a fairly contained site flanked by development on three sides, then evergreen landscaping and the motorway on the remaining side to the south, with sufficient separation distance to landscape designations in this respect. It is again noted that the principle of development of the site involving

residential development (albeit at a slightly lesser scale) together with a three storey extra care facility has been accepted previously on the site.

- 8.101 It is confirmed that the extra care is classed as C2 use. The LPA guides that an EIA Screening Opinion was undertaken for the site (basis 103 dwellings and 50 unit extra care), further to a request in 2012 and did not necessitate the provision of an EIA, this proposal is not such a significant step away for this position to warrant reconsideration.
- 8.102 The LPA confirm that West Mercia Police have been consulted on this application, providing a standard response that the applicant should aim to achieve the Secured by Design (SBD) award status for this development and coverage of this; together with the Rights of Way officer forming part of the Local Highways Authority. Whilst a historic agricultural context of the land is recognised, this is not considered to be a material consideration for this application.
- 8.103 Concern has been raised over the delivery standard of the developer. Mitigation measures would be in place through conditioning of a construction management plan, and further details around the materials to protect residential amenity and ensure a quality finish to the development; anything beyond this would be outside of the control of the LPA. The applicant has identified provision of rental properties (Sigma) through the submission, this is developer led and not a material consideration of the application.
- 8.104 The triggers for delivery of the extra care are led by the viability context of the development; as described earlier in this report, additional measures have been taken to seek to ensure its delivery and it is further understood that negotiations are well underway for transfer of the land to Housing 21. A broad consultation has been undertaken for this proposal through direct neighbour notification including those having made comment on preceding applications for the site, press notice, and four site notices in the neighbouring areas to the site. Invitations to any public consultation event would be down to the applicant. This report is made publicly available ahead of Planning Committee and includes anticipated conditions coverage, but the LPA is unable to provide draft conditions in full for public comment.

9. CONCLUSIONS

- 9.1 The site is located within the Telford Urban area, it is identified as whiteland in the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan and has previously been granted planning permission for residential development in combination with an extra care facility. Despite a number of constraints across the site, the principle of development on the site is considered acceptable in terms of design, technical trees, ecology, contamination, and ground stability issues; the principles of drainage set out in the Flood Risk Assessment accompanying the application are acceptable with further detail anticipated prior to Planning Committee.

Details of the development layout, scale and design will be provided at the reserved matters.

- 9.2 The proposal generates the requirement for financial contributions towards education, children's play/recreation, highway improvements which will be secured through a S106 agreement.
- 9.3 Having regard to the above considerations, the proposal represents a sustainable form of development and complies with the National Planning Policy Framework, together with relevant policies within the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan.

10. DETAILED RECOMMENDATION

- 10.1 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 FULL PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the following:

A.) The applicant together with Housing 21 entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to the following:

- i. Education - £370,720 towards nearby primary and secondary educational facilities
- ii. Open Space - provision of open space and an off-site play area contribution of £150,000 towards enhancement / upgrading of the Windsor Road play area, and / or John Broad Avenue play area, and / or Watling Community Centre play area
- iii. Highways - £10,000 towards improvements works to three bus stops along Kingsland, £5,000 provision of support and monitoring of the required Travel Plan, £7,000 towards re-location of the 40mph speed limit along Dawley Road covering the costs associated to the necessary amendments of associated signing and lining and amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order
- iv. Provision of a Landscape Management Plan and transfer to / appointment of a Management Company relating to the retained open space
- v. Marking out and safeguarding of the land to be used for the Extra Care Facility, the Owner entering into a contract with Housing 21 for the transfer of the Extra Care Land from the Owner to Housing 21 prior to commencement of development, prior to the Occupation of the 50th dwelling the transfer of the complete Extra Care Land to Housing 21, who following the transfer covenant that they shall provide the Extra Care

Facility.

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

1. A04: Time limit – Full
2. B010: Details and samples of materials (notwithstanding details submitted)
3. B011: Sample brick panels
4. B032: Road design
5. B036: Off-site highways (details to be approved)
6. B045: Travel Plan
7. B049: Details of Public Rights of Way works
8. B057: Land contamination (implementation of remediation scheme, reporting of unexpected contamination)
9. B059: Levels and Retaining structures
10. B059: Coal Authority
11. B061: Foul and surface water (including Micro drainage models in .mdx format)
12. B076: SUDS Management Plan
13. B079: Exceedance flow routing
14. B086: Details of extraction (extra care facility restaurant kitchen)
15. B110: Programme of archaeological work
16. B121: Landscaping Design (notwithstanding details submitted) – to include replacement planting scheme for W39, details of landscaping for extra care, footpath details
17. B126: Landscape and Habitat Management Plan
18. B131: Trees – services root protection
19. B145: Lighting Plan
20. B149: Badger Disturbance Licence
21. B150: Construction Environmental Management Plan (including on-site construction details, dust management plan, Japanese Knotweed removal and treatment)
22. C13: Parking, loading, unloading and turning
23. C14: Visibility splays 2.4m x 65m
24. C050: Completion of noise attenuation
25. C071: Trees – soil levels
26. C072: Trees – material storage
27. C074: Tree Protection
28. C079: TPO Tree – suitable contractor
29. C089: Trees – works in accordance Arboricultural Method Statement (section 6)
30. C101: Erection of ecology boxes
31. C109: Ecological Method Statement – working in accordance with (bats and badgers)
32. C38: Development in accordance with deposited plans (materials, soft

and hard landscaping, boundary plans not agreed)

33. D03: Domestic garage restriction on residential use urban area
34. D06: Restriction on use of Extra Care facility.