

Chairman - Councillor B M Cross

Present (for all or part of the meeting):-

Councillors:

A G Cooper

A P Edgeller

A T A Godfrey

A D Hobbs

E G R Jones

W J Kemp

R Kenney

B McKeown

Officers in attendance:-

Mr J Holmes	-	Development Manager
Mr E Handley	-	Senior Planning Officer
Mr I Curran	-	Head of Law and Administration
Mr A Bailey	-	Scrutiny Officer

#### **PC54 Minutes**

The Minutes of the previous meetings held on 27 and 29 October 2021 were submitted and signed.

#### **PC55 Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Hood (Substitute R Kenney), P W Jones, G P K Pardesi (Substitute A T A Godfrey) and M Phillips.

*At this point, the Chairman indicated that only Councillors A G Cooper, B M Cross, A D Hobbs, and W J Kemp could participate and vote in the following application as they were the only Members present when the proposal was considered at the Planning Committees held on 1 September and 27 October 2021.*

*Councillors A P Edgeller, A T A Godfrey, E G R Jones, R Kenney and B McKeown did not take part in the debate or voting of the application thereafter.*

**PC56      Application 20/33371/FUL - Proposed residential development of 117 dwellings - Land Off Little Tixall Lane, Lichfield Road, Great Haywood, Stafford**

(Recommendation approve, subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr A Dunn raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- The original application for 157 houses was rejected
- 77 properties had been considered acceptable
- This proposal was for 117 new dwellings, which represented a 52% increase from the agreed 77 dwellings
- The 1200 houses in Great Haywood exceeded the provision Borough Wide for Key Service Villages
- Quoted Spatial Principle 3 of the Plan for Stafford Borough relating to the provision Borough Wide for Key Service Villages
- The proposal was contrary to Policy N1 of the Plan for Stafford Borough due to a lack of connectivity
- The proposal would create a cul-de-sac and gated community
- The improvements to the scheme were only cosmetic
- Pedestrians would need to use Little Tixall Lane where there was no footpath
- There was only one local bus stop with no buses
- The proposal would create unnecessary traffic
- Referred to Spatial Principle 7 in relation to flooding concerns
- There would be an unnecessary strain on local amenities
- Density of dwellings was a concern

In response, the Development Manager clarified the following:-

- Spatial Principle 3 of the Plan for Stafford Borough relating to the provision Borough Wide for Key Service Villages did not mean that an application should be refused if the target was met
- The target was 12% and not 1200 dwellings
- The target was a minimum and not a maximum

Mr Steve Ulfig raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Spoke on behalf on Lovell Homes
- The proposal met all policy requirements
- The proposal met Policy N1 of the Plan for Stafford Borough in terms of design intensification and had been approved by officers
- Intensification was reduced in other areas of the site

- The application preserved the local character of the area
- All statutory consultees had approved the scheme
- The proposal should be a welcome addition to the local area
- There was no reason to refuse the application as it was fully compliant with planning policy

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor B McKeown, Haywood and Hixon Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The Committee were being asked to support a proposal that they did not like
- In 2013, a proposal for 157 dwellings had been refused because of a lack of vehicular connectivity
- In 2017, 77 dwellings were approved on the provision that Little Tixall Lane would remain open to vehicular traffic and that cycle connectivity was provided
- In 2019 the developer had brought forward a scheme that was too close to Little Tixall Lane
- The report played down any increase in density of the development
- The proposed density of 25.5 dwellings per hectare was felt to be brutal
- Referred to Page 107 of the Plan for Stafford Borough relating to the Borough Wide housing provision for Key Service Villages
- Believed that there was no point in developing a policy if the Council was not going to implement it
- Explained that a 3 m easement was not achievable as only 1.72 m was available

In response, the Development Manager clarified the following:-

- Enforcement had inspected the new bungalow adjacent to where the 3 m easement would be located and reported that a new fence had been erected on the boundary
- The new bungalow had been legally constructed in that position
- Confirmation that there was sufficient room on the site for the easement

The Committee discussed the application and raised a number of issues, including:-

- Clarification of the 5 year housing land supply
- Confirmation that the site was no longer considered to be in the open countryside
- Concern over the density of the site, particularly in the bottom half of the development
- Clarification that assessment of the level of density should be measured over the site as a whole

- Clarification that any assessment of the density of the development should be made taking into account the density of other developments in the surrounding area.
- Concern that connectivity of the proposal had not been resolved, particularly as Little Tixall Lane was closed
- Confirmation that all of the proposed dwellings met the Design supplementary planning document
- Clarification that the Transport Assessment was based upon 159 dwellings
- Concern that the A51 was a dangerous road to cross
- Clarification that any refusal on the grounds of highway safety needed to be supported by evidence

It was then subsequently moved by Councillor A G Cooper and seconded by Councillor W J Kemp that Planning Application Number 20/33371/FUL be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policy N1(O) of the Plan for Stafford Borough due to a lack of connectivity to services and facilities in Great Haywood.

On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 20/33371/FUL be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to Policy N1(O) of the Plan for Stafford Borough due to a lack of connectivity to services and facilities in Great Haywood.

*The Chairman declared a short comfort break at this point and the recording was paused and re-started when the meeting re-commenced.*

*Councillors A P Edgeller, A T A Godfrey, E G R Jones, R Kenney and B Mckeown re-took their places at the table at this point.*

**PC57      Application 21/34731/HOU - Proposed retrospective application for retention of existing triple garage with hard surfacing to front driveway – 1 Walnut Tree Farm, Ash Lane, Yarnfield, Stone, ST15 0NQ**

(Recommendation approve).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter.

The Development Manager reported that since the production of the report, drainage had been installed at the front of the property that resulted in the need to amend Condition No 2.

The Committee discussed the application and raised a number of issues, including:-

- Clarification of the neighbouring properties
- Confirmation of the age of the properties
- An explanation of the application for a Lawful Development Certificate made under Permitted Development Rights

It was subsequently moved by Councillor E G R Jones and seconded by Councillor A P Edgeller, that Planning Application Number 21/34731/HOU be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, together with an amended Condition No 2.

On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 21/34731/HOU be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, together with the following amended Condition No 2:-

- 2 The surface water drainage provision as shown on Drawing No 03 Revision C to include the new ACO drainage channel shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

## **PC58 Planning Appeals**

Considered the report of the Head of Development (**V1** 24/11/21).

Notification of the following new appeal had been received:-

<b>App No</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>20/33273/HOU</b>  <b>Delegated refusal</b>	Bracken Barn Long Lane Haughton	Replacement of windows and doors with UPVC

Notification of the following appeal decisions had been received:-

<b>App No</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>USE/00178/EN19</b>  <b>Notice to be Varied</b>	Land Opposite The Homestead Gnosall Road	Caravan and access
<b>20/32341/FUL</b>  <b>Appeal Dismissed</b>	Norbury Manor Barns Norbury	Conversion of Dutch Barn to provide garaging and domestic storage/home office
<b>19/31094/FUL</b>  <b>Appeal Allowed</b>	Beacon Business Park, Unit L Weston Road	The demolition of existing outbuildings, proposed KFC drive through and restaurant with associated external works, A3-A5 use classes.

Concern was expressed in relation to the allowed Appeal for Application Number 19/31094/FUL as the proposed KFC drive through was opposite a school, which was not in accordance with Health in All Policies.

CHAIR