

Chairman - Councillor R M Sutherland

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

Councillors:

C A Baron	E G R Jones
G R Collier	D B Price
B M Cross	J K Price
I E Davies	G O Rowlands
A S Harp	C V Trowbridge
W J Kemp	

Also present - Councillors A M Loughran and J M Pert

Officers in attendance:-

Mrs S Poxon	-	Development Lead
Ms S Borgars	-	Small Scale Planning Officer
Mr I Curran	-	Legal Services Manager
Mr A Bailey	-	Scrutiny Officer

**PC10 Minutes**

Minutes of the last meeting held on 30 May 2018 were submitted and signed.

**PC11 Declarations of Members Interests/Lobbying**

Councillor G O Rowlands indicated that he would be speaking as a Ward Member in respect of Application No 18/28463/HOU.

Councillor R M Sutherland indicated that he would be speaking as a Ward Member in respect of Application No 18/28373/HOU.

Councillor C V Trowbridge indicated that she had been lobbied in respect of Application No 18/28463/HOU.

*Councillor R M Sutherland left the meeting at this point and attended as a Ward Member.*

**PC12 Application No 18/28373/HOU - Proposed First floor side extension over existing integral garage with provision for disabled person's lift and integrated wet room- Syracuse, 24 Mount Pleasant, Derrington, Stafford, ST18 9NB**

(Recommendation approve).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter. The Development Lead reported upon a typographical error in the report.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr M Woodhead raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- The proposal would have a profound impact on the neighbouring property
- Objected on the principles of scale, size, magnitude and terracing effect
- The proposal would result in there being only 890 mm between the two properties and they would appear almost connected
- The proposal was not acceptable and would be overly dominant
- It would not be in keeping with the street scene
- The proposal would contravene the Supplementary Planning Document concerning design
- There was no implied right for development
- Urged the Committee to refuse the application

Mr A Grant Tait raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Spoke as the Agent that represented the applicant
- The proposal was to modify the property for a disabled amputee
- Alternative options had been discussed with planning officers
- The proposal would allow for independent living and ease of movement throughout the property
- All the planning issues had been addressed
- Requested the Committee to favourably consider the application

Councillor R M Sutherland, Seighford and Church Eaton Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- Requested by the owner of 22 Mount Pleasant and the Parish Council to address the Committee about this application
- It was a difficult situation for the neighbours
- Understood the need for the extension
- The original proposal had been revised to reduce the massing effect

- The proposal was felt to significantly harm the character of the surrounding area
- The main objections were concerning the terracing effect on both the street scene and the properties
- A site visit was necessary to witness the issues raised by the proposal and give the objector and applicant the satisfaction that it had been adequately considered

It was subsequently moved by Councillor J K Price and seconded by Councillor E G R Jones that Application No 18/28373/HOU be deferred pending a site visit in order to assess the potential massing, over hanging and terracing effect of the proposal.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 18/28373/HOU be deferred pending a site visit in order to assess the potential massing, over hanging and terracing effect of the proposal.

*Councillor R M Sutherland re-joined his seat at the table.*

*Chairman - Councillor R M Sutherland – In the Chair*

PC13 **Application Nos 18/28431/HOU and 18/28436/LBC - Proposed retention of demolition works already carried out for timber lean to extensions and incidental outbuildings and proposed two storey side and rear extension, new brick wall and demolition of existing former pigsty - Park View, Park Lane, Chebsey, Staffordshire, ST21 6JU**

(Recommendation approve).

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

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr D Butlin raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- Lived next door to the proposal at the Old Post office
- They were effectively a pair of semi-detached properties
- The proposals would have an affect on the property and there were concerns of the potential harm to the neighbouring property
- There had been no surveys undertaken of the Old Post Office and no mitigation of the potential risks
- Would not allow trespassers on the site
- The affect on the Old Post Office should be considered by the Committee

Mrs A Gray raised the following points during her support for the proposal:-

- Represented her husband
- Had lived in Chebsey for 40 years
- The property was a Grade II Listed building
- Purchased the property at auction in 2017
- An extension had already been approved
- This revised application facilitated the repositioning of the living room
- The extension would be 3 feet shorter than the adjoining property
- Had consulted planning officers who had recommended approval
- Did not intend to move away from this property
- Appreciated the heritage of the building
- Requested the Committee to concur with the recommendation

Councillor J M Pert, Eccleshall Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The site lay within the Chebsey Conservation Area
- The Chebsey Conservation Area Appraisal specified that the character of the area should not be diluted
- This was a Grade II Listed building that should not be subject to heritage vandalism
- Referred to Policy C5 of the Plan for Stafford Borough that stipulated that any additions should not result in additions of more than 70% to the dwelling originally built
- The proposal would affect the type and character of the dwelling that was originally built circa late C18
- A previous resident of Chebsey had recently confirmed that in 1955/56 the cottage had been extended with a two storey rear extension
- This would therefore result in almost a 200% increase to the originally built dwelling
- This new information could have meant that the proposal may not have been recommended for approval
- If approved this could set a precedent for residents in adjoining areas

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

- Clarification that the total net increase to the property since originally built was 197%
- Properties in rural areas were often not originally large enough, which is why they required extensions
- Should adhere to the Council's policies
- The present family home was unviable, which acted as mitigating circumstances
- Clarification that this proposal was 11.6 m<sup>2</sup> (2%) additional to the previously agreed application

*(NB figures provided of 11 sq.m. over previous approval, present proposal = 160 sq.m., therefore % increase over previous proposal (11.6 / 149.6) now calculated to be 7.7%)*

- The Conservation Area Appraisal did not specify that Chebsey should remain as it was

It was subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by Councillor J K Price that Application No 18/28431/HOU and Application 18/28436/LBC be refused on the grounds of size, massing and the impact it would have on the Grade II Listed Building.

On being put to the vote both the proposals were declared to be carried.

- RESOLVED:-
- (a) that Application no 18/28431/HOU be refused on the grounds of size, massing and the impact it would have on the Grade II Listed Building;
  - (b) that Application no 18/28436/LBC be refused on the grounds of size, massing and the impact it would have on the Grade II Listed Building.

*Councillor G O Rowlands left the meeting at this point and attended as a Ward Member.*

PC14 **Application No 18/28463/HOU - Proposed two storey extension to side and rear with external and internal alterations – 12 Manor Square, Rising Brook, Stafford, Staffordshire, ST17 9QL**

(Recommendation approve).

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

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr T Seipel raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- Lived at 13 Manor Square and represented neighbours
- The proposal would lead to a lack of privacy and a loss of daylight
- The proposed extension would overlook neighbouring properties leaving no private areas
- There would be a reduction in daylight
- The extension was too large
- An application for an extension was refused in 2004 on the grounds of massing and dominance
- This proposal was 27% larger than the previously refused application
- The proposal contravened Section 8 of the Burton Manor Conservation Area Appraisal document

Mr P Clayton raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Had been in consultation with planning officers about this proposal since 2017
- The proposal had been designed as a result of negotiation
- Most of the extension was to the rear of the property, was well designed and sympathetic to the existing building
- The proposed works would remove any unsympathetic works and restore the building to its former glory
- The design had been welcomed by the Conservation Officer
- Most of the design was in the spirit of the Article 4 Direction
- Would adhere to all of the recommended conditions
- All of the brick works would be matched
- The potential benefits of the proposal would outweigh any harm
- Requested the Committee's support for the proposal

Councillor A M Loughran, Manor Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The objections to the proposal had been clearly stated
- This was a Conservation Area
- Local people had worked hard to achieve this status
- The proposed wrap around extension would be a blight on the Conservation Area
- The extension did not come to the front of the house but would still be visible from the road
- The proposal did nothing to enhance the Conservation Area
- Requested the Committee to reject the application

Councillor G O Rowlands, Manor Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- Had visited neighbouring properties to assess the impact of the proposal
- The unsympathetic flat roof would still be retained
- It should not take this proposal to restore the building to its former glory
- Queried whether there were any public benefits by this proposal
- Referred to paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework
- If this proposal was approved it could open the flood gates for similar proposals in the area
- Requested the Committee to refuse the application on the grounds that it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area

It was subsequently moved by Councillor W J Kemp and seconded by Councillor E G R Jones that Application No 18/28463/HOU be deferred pending a site visit approved in order to assess the potential impact of the proposal on the Burton Manor Conservation area.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application no 18/28463/HOU be deferred pending a site visit in order to assess the potential impact of the proposal on the Burton Manor Conservation area.

*Councillor G O Rowlands re-joined his seat at the table.*

PC15 **Planning Appeals**

Considered the report of the Head of Development (V1 11/6/18).

Notification of the following appeal decision had been received:-

<b>App No</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>17/26258/FUL</b> <b>Appeal Allowed</b>	School House Newport Road Haughton	Proposed two storey side extension and single storey garage extension to existing dwelling and retention of change of use of land at rear as residential garden.

CHAIRMAN