Minutes of the Planning Committee held at the Civic Centre, Riverside, Stafford on Wednesday 20 February 2019

Chairman – Councillor R M Sutherland

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

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

Also present – Councillors R J Draper and A J Perkins

Officers in attendance:-

Mr J Holmes - Development Manager
Mr R Wood - Development Lead
Mrs J McGoldrick - Solicitor
Mr J Dean - Democratic Services Officer

PC104 Minutes

Minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2019 were submitted and signed.

PC105 Declarations of Members Interests/Lobbying

Councillor J K Price indicated that he would be speaking as Ward Member in respect of Application No 18/29766/ANX.

PC106 Application No 18/29161/REM – Land Between Beaconside and B5066 Sandon Road, Hopton

(Recommend approval, subject to conditions).

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

Prior to his presentation, the Development Manager reported receipt of an additional neighbour letter objecting to the proposal, and a further response from Hopton and Coton Parish Council, the contents of which were summarised.
Public speaking on the proposal was as follows:-

Mr I Roscoe raised the following points during his objections:-

- Noise from nearby Beaconside was above the legal limit for proximity to housing (noise survey noted)
- Developer had suggested closing windows to mitigate noise
- Lived 200m away from the site
- Affordable housing was suggested along Beaconside where the highest levels of traffic fumes would be experienced
- Noted nearby refuse depot
- Security lights on nearby industrial estate would be intrusive
- Ambulance station was close by and in 24 hour use
- Noted provision of a 9” fence proposed to limit noise impact
- Social housing should be evenly spread across the site
- Was only 1 entrance on to the site
- Had concerns re associated traffic
- Committee should reject or defer the application

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

- Thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to speak
- Was present on behalf of the developer
- Outline process had been completed and agreed
- Had held many discussions with consultees
- Was happy to see an extra condition re noise to be added
- Mix of dwelling types mitigated noise impact
- Was no plan to install a 9” fence
- Noted pedestrian access to the site

The Council’s Solicitor read a statement on behalf of Councillor F Beatty, Milwich Ward Member who was not present at the meeting, the contents of which are summarised below :-

- My continuing challenge to this application is on the grounds of the woeful design put forward for the proposed settlement.
- When I originally called in this application the poverty of the design proposals truly shocked me. The changes made have only been achieved thanks to the perseverance of our planning officers.
- For Stafford it’s not good enough. We and our successors will have to live in these communities long after the developers have walked away.
- The degree of officer reservation to the scheme remains obvious. The Design Advisor further states: “It does not represent high quality design”.
- It was recommended to the developer that at least the properties fronting key areas such as the main highways should have enhanced materials and features. The developer refused.
• There are no street trees, no verges to provide for them. It’s very misleading.
• Though the site abuts the Stafford Northern SDL - the major northern urban extension, it is not part of it and the developers are not bound by its approved master plan.
• The parking for each house is on that property’s frontage - the cars have to be parked where the front garden should be. What kind of design is that? It will be bleak.
• The house types are monoculture and drear, just one house design, despite some lip service to variation. The developers were repeatedly encouraged to introduce enhanced materials, but refused to do so.
• This development is a giant 120 house cul-de-sac. It does not comply with our local plan SP N10 on movement, which requires provision of access for pedestrians: Pedestrians wishing to go into town will have to walk the length of the development onto Sandon Road, and onto the new roundabout. There is no footpath alongside the Beaconside edge of the development.
• I respectfully suggest to Members that the reason for refusal should be that the issues relating to design, materials, landscaping and spacing between dwellings are not considered to have been adequately addressed; pedestrians are not adequately catered for; nor does the development align with the northern SDL which is to provide the majority of its services and was agreed at outline.
• If the application is not refused I suggest it should be deferred for improved design; and to ensure that alignment with the northern SDL is clearly indicated in the plans.
• If it is approved, in line with NPPF 130, any attempt to revise the plans by the developer should require (within condition), that the quality of materials is equal to or better than those approved.

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

• Number of houses proposed for the site
• Lack of associated infrastructure (including broadband provision, electrical charging points for vehicles)
• Had concern for removal of trees from the site
• Development would impact on residents of Sandon Road
• Lack of expansion to dual carriage way in the vicinity
• No condition to provide wheel-washing of construction vehicles
• Concerns over entrance to the site
• Strong objections to design of the proposed dwellings

The Development Manager clarified that as this is a reserved matters application any conditions on an approval would be in addition to conditions on the outline planning permission which included, for example, a condition requiring a construction management plan to be approved.
It was subsequently moved by Councillor A S Harp and seconded by Councillor J K Price that the application be deferred to allow for redesign of the site to a higher quality.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 18/29161/REM be deferred to allow for redesign of the site to a higher quality.

**PC107 Application No 18/29660/FUL – Land Adjacent Wheelwrights Cottage, Puddle Hill, Hixon**

(Recommend approval, subject to conditions).

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

Public speaking on the proposal was as follows:-

Mr E Dale raised the following points during his objections:-

- Was the 2nd plan submitted associated to the site
- Noted at least 2 inaccuracies within the report
- Distances/measurements suggested could not be correct
- Would lead to a huge reduction in natural light to neighbouring property
- Adverse impact on neighbours privacy due to new ‘footpath’
- Close proximity allowed views into next door property
- Light/noise/nuisance/privacy would be severely impacted

The Development Manager responded to the comments of the speaker, specifically those referring to measurements associated with the development, and in order to ensure accuracy suggested that the application be deferred to allow for further investigation.

On being put to the vote the suggestion of the Development Manager was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 18/29660/FUL be deferred to allow the Case Officer to verify the figures in question.

**PC108 Application No 18/29766/ANX – 1 Bramall Close, Tillington, Stafford**

(Recommend approval, subject to conditions).

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

Councillor J K Price, Holmcroft Ward Member, at the invitation of the Chairman addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- Had been to see both sets of neighbours
- Was happy with the proposal
• Asked that works be completed during working hours

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

• Loss of light /minimum distance between principal windows
• Additional condition to address hours of work on site

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A S Harp and seconded by Councillor D B Price that the application be approved, subject to conditions and the suggested additional condition.

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 18/29766/ANX be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, and the following additional condition:-

All construction works, including demolition, shall only take place between the hours of 8:00 am and 18:00 pm Monday to Friday inclusive; 8:00 am and 14:00 pm on Saturdays and not at all Sundays, Bank Holidays and other public holidays.

Application No 18/29813/FUL – Victoria Park, Tenterbanks, Stafford

(Recommend approval, subject to conditions).

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

It was reported that since publication of the agenda comments had been received from the Council’s Tree Officer who raised no objections to the proposal.

Public speaking on the proposal was as follows:-

Mr G Atherton raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

• Noted changes from previous design
• Detailed additional scalloped landscaping
• HLF were in agreement with the proposed changes
• Works were due to start as soon as possible

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

• Replacement of lost trees
• Retention of statue
• Size of proposed café
• Provision of additional CCTV/Security measures

It was subsequently moved by Councillor B M Cross and seconded by Councillor C A Baron that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

RESOLVED: that planning application No 18/29813/FUL be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

PC110 Planning Appeals

Considered the report of the Head of Development (V1 11/02/19).

Notification of the following appeals had been received:-

(a) Appeal Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/28352/FUL Appeal Dismissed</td>
<td>Land Adjacent Nesbitt Close Morton Road Stafford</td>
<td>Proposed erection of four maisonettes and one bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/26885/HOU Appeal Dismissed</td>
<td>92 St Georges Parkway Stafford ST16 3WF</td>
<td>Retrospective permission for a metal storage container, timber fence to the south west frontage and proposed gate and fence along rear north west boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC111 ADV/00252/EN18 – 19 High Street, Stone, Staffordshire, ST15 8AJ

Considered the joint report of the Head of Development and the Head of Law and Administration (V1 11/02/19) considering the addition of a large illuminated sign on a shop front within a conservation area.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor G R Collier and seconded by Councillor D B Price that the report be approved.

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

RESOLVED: that appropriate action be authorised to include all steps including the instigation of court proceedings and any work required to secure the removal of the illuminated sign and barber’s pole on the front elevation of the building.
Draft Planning Application Validation Criteria

Considered the report of the Head of Development (V1 11/02/19) seeking approval to consult on the draft Planning Application Validation Criteria, as set out in the booklet as circulated with the meeting agenda.

RESOLVED:- that the Draft Planning Application Criteria be subject to an 8 week consultation period.

CHAIRMAN