

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 15 January 2020 at 6.00 pm in Meeting Rooms G3/4, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford, TF3 4NT

Present: Councillors C F Smith (Chair), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, A S Jhawar, J Jones, K Middleton, P J Scott, C R Turley and E M Callear (Reserve) (as substitute for J Loveridge)

In Attendance:

Apologies: Councillors J Loveridge

PC51 Declarations of Interest

None.

PC52 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 18th December 2019 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

PC53 Deferred/Withdrawn Applications

None.

PC54 Site Visits

None.

PC55 Planning Applications for Determination

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding TWC/2019/0753 and TWC/2019/0833.

PC56 TWC/2019/0753 - Land between Arleston Lane & Dawley Road, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire

This was an application for the Erection of an Extra Care Facility containing 70no. self-contained flats (Use Class C2) and associated communal/public facilities and erection of 103no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated access, landscaping and ancillary works.

This application was heard at a previous planning committee meeting on the 18th December 2019, whereby it was agreed by Members that the application

would be deferred in order to allow further negotiations to take place regarding density and overdevelopment, the cumulative effect of traffic, staff parking, highway safety, visibility splays and drainage and to allow a public consultation on the drainage update.

Councillor A McClements, Ward Councillor, spoke against the application. She was concerned that residents didn't receive consultation letters nor were English Heritage consulted on the application. She noted that although extra parking had been added, she raised concerns regarding the size of the proposed application, traffic increase and drainage issues.

Mr Glyn Davey, Member of the Public spoke against this application. He raised concerns regarding over development, density and environmental impact. The outline plan was approved in 2012, since then climate conditions changed and a large number of houses were built. He believed the application was weak and that viability was driving it rather than good design.

The Applicant Mr Justin Howell (Countryside Properties Ltd) and Ms Leanne Taylor (Housing 21 proposed providers of the Extra Care) , spoke in favour of the application. They stated that the density was similar to other developments in the area. Highway issues were addressed by a Travel Plan and bus stop improvements. Severn Trent were in agreeance with the scheme. There was a need in the area for high quality extra care for facilities.

During the debate, some members raised questions for clarification from Officers. Members requested information on parking figures relating to parking standards, location of a service bay and refuse collection, number of staff, the traffic levels on Dawley Road and some elaboration on why Historic England were not consulted on the application.

Members raised concerns that the existing sites used as comparisons were not comparative as the location proposed for the application was in a semi-rural area. There was a Grade 2 listed building in proximity and Telford's Local Plan stated that historic buildings needed to be protected. Concerns were raised regarding the foul drainage and Severn Trent's involvement.

A Member stated that the application had been brought to Committee previously and was deferred due to parking and drainage, these issues were then addressed.

The Planning Officer stated that the development satisfied policy. Officers didn't consult Historic England formally as they had no objection to the outline plan in 2012 and were not a statutory consultee. It was acknowledged there was slight harm to the setting due to the sighting of new dwellings, this was balanced with the benefits of the scheme which include the delivery of housing, an extra care facility provided by a registered provider and the opening up of public space. There was no specific category for extra care in regards to parking standards but there was a 64% parking provision and space which doubled up as a delivery, refuse collection, service and ambulance bay.

The Highways Officer explained the parking provision figures of similar sites were 63 rooms with a 32 space carpark. The Local Plan parking standards are one space per 2 units plus a provision for staff. The proposals are for 70 extra care units and 45 parking spaces are now shown. This allows 35 spaces for residents and their visitors and 10 remaining spaces for staff. Consideration was also given to the parking information provided by the extra care operator indicating that 45 spaces would be sufficient for the proposed use scenario. A full transport assessment was conducted in 2019 and an estimated seven percent rise in rush-hour traffic wouldn't have a severe impact on the area.

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager summarised the application for Members and explained that previous concerns for the application had been addressed. The proposed site would address the local need for an extra care unit without having a detrimental impact on the surrounding area.

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

RESOLVED – that in respect of planning application TWC/2019/0753 the updated 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 - £340,720 towards nearby primary and secondary educational facilities
- ii. Open Space - provision of open space and an off-site play area contribution of £150,000 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 conditions set out in the report (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager)

(a) TWC/2019/0833 - Site of The Dell, Cherrington, Newport, Shropshire

This was an Outline Planning Application for the erection of 1No. dwelling on land adjacent to The Dell, in Cherrington near Newport. The application site formed the domestic garden associated with 'The Dell,' with residential properties to the north and south, and the B5062 to the north. The site comprised of grassed area, with a border of soft landscaping.

Officer recommendation was to refuse the proposal as it was considered to be contrary to a number of planning policies.

Mr Adam Ray, Agent, spoke in favour of the Application. He explained his client was a member of the community and had been employed in the area for 40 years. The proposed dwelling would enable his large family home to be utilised by another family. He believed it was a sustainable plot for a dwelling and objections regarding trees and drainage could be addressed in finer detail if given approval.

Councillor Jim Berry, Parish Council Representative, spoke in favour of the application and stated there were no objections from the Parish Council or neighbours. He explained there was existing access for vehicles and a reservoir in close proximity to alleviate any issues regarding drainage.

During the debate, some Members spoke favourably about the application and suggested Outline Planning Permission should be granted to give opportunity for a more detailed plan that addressed the drainage and arboriculture concerns be drawn up and then brought back to planning at a later date.

Some Members spoke against the application and reminded others that the Council's planning policies should be adhered to and therefore the application should be refused on that basis.

The Legal Adviser advised members that, if members were minded to approve this application, they needed proper planning reasons to do so and that the Council's planning policies must be considered when determining this application. The applicant's personal circumstances as set out in the report are of little or no relevance in the consideration of this application which was for a permanent dwelling. It was pointed out that members needed to be satisfied that the site could be adequately drained before approving this application and that, because this had not been established, members could not conclude that conditions would properly address this concern.

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager explained that the Council's planning policies set out exceptional circumstances where approval for residential development in the rural area could be allowed but that the circumstances of this application were not exceptional to justify a departure from policy. The Applicant had previous opportunity to address policy but this application was resubmitted with no further information.

Upon being put to vote, Members voted by a majority to support the recommendation to refuse the application.

RESOLVED – that the application be refused on the following grounds:

1. The proposal is located in the rural area where residential development will be strictly controlled in line with the overall strategy to limit development outside existing urban areas and identified villages, of which Cherrington is not one. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HO10 of the TWLP 2011-2031.

2. The Applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not cause any detrimental harm to the trees which are located on/adjacent to the application site. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment has not been supplied as part of this application and as such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy NE2 of the TWLP 2011-2031.

3. The Applicant failed to demonstrate that the site can be adequately drained and would not cause significant detrimental impact upon the drainage systems in the immediately surrounding area. No drainage information has been submitted as part of this application and as a result the proposal is contrary to policies ER11 and ER12 of the TWLP 2011-2031.

The meeting ended at 7.30 pm

Chairman:

Date: Wednesday, 12 February 2020