

Chairman - Councillor R M Sutherland

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

Councillors:

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

Also present - Councillor A M Loughran

Officers in attendance:-

| | | |
|--------------|---|------------------------------|
| Mr J Holmes | - | Development Manager |
| Mr A Taylor | - | Conservation Officer |
| Ms S Borgars | - | Small Scale Planning Officer |
| Mr I Curran | - | Legal Services Manager |
| Mr A Bailey | - | Scrutiny Officer |

PC16 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C A Baron and M G Dodson.

PC17 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.

Vice Chairman - Councillor A S Harp - In the Chair

PC18

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 Committee viewed the proposal from the Mount Pleasant street scene and from the drive of 22 Mount Pleasant.

The Committee arrived at the site at 10.17am departed at 10.31am and reconvened at the Civic Centre at 11.00am.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

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

- All of the planning guidance and statutory issues had been adhered to
- All of the issues concerning massing, design, positioning and scale had been addressed in the report
- Referred to the sections of the planning officer's report that addressed both Character and appearance and Amenity
- Explained the visual impacts of the proposal

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:-

- Thanked the Committee for undertaking a site visit to this proposal
- Appreciated the situation of both the applicant and the objector
- Requested by the owner of 22 Mount Pleasant to address the Committee about this application
- It was a difficult situation for the neighbours
- The proposal had been revised in order to reduce the massing effect

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

- Concern that this application would cause harm to the neighbour
- The application created a massing effect and terracing effect
- It was difficult to assess the planning reasons to refuse the application
- The proposal should be moved to ridge height
- The garage formed a gap between the two properties which if filled would destroy the outlook
- Confirmation that the properties were built around the same time

- Although did not agree with all of the proposals, on balance the application was acceptable

It was subsequently moved by Councillor J K Price and seconded by Councillor G R Collier that Application No 18/28373/HOU be refused on the grounds of impact on the surrounding amenity, overshadowing of 22 Mount Pleasant, loss of outlook, massing effect and terracing effect.

On being put to the vote and following the Chairman's casting vote, the proposal was declared to be lost.

It was then moved by Councillor E G R Jones and seconded by Councillor C V Trowbridge that Application No 18/28373/HOU be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

On being put to the vote and following the Chairman's casting vote, the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 18/28373/HOU be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

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

Chairman - Councillor R M Sutherland – In the Chair

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

PC19 **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.

The Committee viewed the proposal from the side of the property, the Manor Square street scene, the rear of the property and from the rear garden of 11 Manor Square.

The Committee arrived at the site at 9.42am departed at 10.04am and reconvened at the Civic Centre at 11.00am.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

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

- Reiterated three issues

- The proposal would lead to a lack of privacy and a loss of daylight
- A smaller application for an extension was refused in 2004 on the grounds of massing and dominance
- Side elevations were not normally approved in this Conservation Area

Mr J Knight raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- This proposal mirrored the previously approved application including the outbuilding
- There was planning permission for a two storey extension already in place
- Had participated fully in the pre-application process
- The proposal was supported by the Conservation Officer
- All of the principal windows faced the rear of the property
- Obscure glazing could be used for any other windows

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:-

- This proposal was in a Conservation Area
- Neighbouring properties had worked hard to achieve this status
- The proposed extension would not enhance the Conservation Area
- The extension did not come to the front of the house but would still be visible from the road
- The proposed wrap around extension was not attractive
- Concerned that the supporter would progress with a previous application should this proposal be refused
- 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:-

- The supporter appeared to have threatened the Committee
- The report stated that little weight should be given to the previously approved application
- Previous applications in the area had only been accepted to the rear of the properties
- The previous Conservation Officer appeared to be more strict about the preservation of the Conservation Area
- The wrap-around side extension would affect the Conservation Area
- If approved this could set a precedent
- The existing pitched roof at the rear of the property would rise by 1m if allowed
- Requested the Committee to refuse the application

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

- The re-instatement of original features and removal of unsympathetic structures would make a big difference to the property
- Concern that the proposal would affect the symmetry of the buildings
- The previously approved application was made before the adoption of the Conservation Area
- 9 people consulted were in favour of the proposal
- The proposed landing window that overlooked the adjoining dwelling to the north should be made of obscure glazing and should be non-opening

In response, the Conservation Officer explained that this proposal was more of a “rear-side” extension as opposed to side extension. There was a modest set back, with careful detailing to the rear. The side was subsidiary to the rear and was therefore deemed to have no adverse affect on the Conservation Area.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by Councillor A S Harp that Application No 18/28463/HOU be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development and an additional condition that the landing window overlooking the adjoining dwelling to the north, be non-opening and of an obscure glazing.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application no 18/28463/HOU be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development and the following additional condition:-

6. The proposed side facing first floor landing window shall be obscurely glazed and be non openable before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, and thereafter shall remain obscurely glazed and non openable for the life of the development.

CHAIRMAN