Minutes of the Virtual Planning Committee on Wednesday 15 July 2020

Chair - Councillor R M Sutherland

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

Councillors:
F Beatty J Hood
B M Cross W J kemp
M G Dodson A Nixon
A S Harp A N Pearce
D Hobbs M Phillips

Also present:- Councillor C A Baron

Officers in attendance:-

Mr N Lawrence - Deputy Development Manager
Mr S Turner - Legal Services Officer
Mr A Bailey - Scrutiny Officer

PC109 Apologies

An Apology for absence was received from Councillor A P Edgeller (substitute Councillor F Beatty).

PC110 Application No 19/31577/REM - Proposed Reserved Matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to planning permission ref. 18/28423/OUT for Phases 1, 1a, 2 & 3 of the proposed development comprising 214 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure - Land Off Fairway, Littleworth, Stafford

(Recommendation approve, subject to conditions).

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

The Deputy Development Manager reported upon an error contained in the report a number of amendments to Condition No 1.
Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

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

- The site already had outline permission and this was the detailed design stage
- This proposal represented half of the new homes proposed for the whole site
- Affordable housing had been provided as part of the proposal
- The proposal had arisen as a result of a number of pre and post application meetings
- The scheme consisted of attractive houses with only one minor technical deviation from guidance
- There were two housing associations that had expressed an interest in houses on this site
- The proposal would provide jobs and growth

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor C A Baron, Forebridge Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The report was disturbing
- There were some aspects of this development that did not meet planning guidance
- The report did not mention social housing
- There had been no attempt to blend the development in with existing tress as with other developments
- Specific materials for construction had not been considered
- There were breaches of amenity
- There was a need for more emphasis on the biodiversity benefits from the selection of shrubs and plants
- There were questions in relation to equipping the play area
- The impact upon the streetscene was disappointing
- Only the affordable housing seemed to be affected by the proximity of commercial properties
- All the schools in the area had no capacity for the additional pupils that this scheme would create
- The Police Liaison Officer felt the need to offer advice on the security of this development
- There was no provision for health services in this proposal and no consultation with the Clinical Commissioning Group

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

- The Design Advisor had expressed disappointment over the design of the proposals
- All of the affordable units were impacted by commercial development
- The proposal buildings were “Large spanned” and the roads were surrounded by hardstanding and parking areas
• The area was prone to flooding
• This area had a blank canvass to begin with so there should be no need for any technical breaches
• Concern that the proposed flats had no green areas and the affordable houses had reduced sized gardens
• Concern over the lack of frontages to some of the properties
• Concern over the design of the affordable housing as confirmed in the report by the Housing Manager
• There was some good design, but also some poor design
• Queried the water attenuation basin
• Should not approve a ghetto of affordable housing
• Concern that there was no mention of a zero carbon policy or the renewable sourcing of materials
• Concern over the lack of space for amenity
• Queried the concerns of the two registered housing providers which related to the provision of flats
• Confirmation of the location of the proposed pumping station

In response, the Deputy Development Manager confirmed the following:-

• There was already a diversity of design in the area
• The Biodiversity Officer had confirmed that the internal layout of the proposal was acceptable
• A Management Plan for the play area was now been addressed
• The full extent of the affect of the retail centre on the affordable housing was not yet known
• The Supplementary Planning Document on Design was guidance only and in the planning balance the view of the Officers was that the scheme was acceptable, mindful that it was for the Committee to determine
• The design of the scheme was acceptable in terms of layout and form
• The Lead Local Flood authority and Environment Agency had raised no objections to the proposals
• Not all of the affordable housing was located near commercial premises – the nearest housing to the local centre was open market housing
• All had properties had adequate garden space except for two
• There were other registered providers who could express an interest in the affordable housing, which could be adjusted as part of a Section 106 Agreement
• There were in access of 75 trees to be planted on the site
• Referred to the report conclusion and planning balance

It was subsequently moved by Councillor M Phillips and seconded by Councillor J Hood that Application Number 19/31577/REM be referred back in order for Officers to revisit scheme with Applicants covering matters of redesign / layouts, amenity (technical breaches of guidance, applying National Design Guide, affordable housing provision and design,
shared areas (roads/areas to LC1 phase); areas of parking for dwellings; and principles of sustainable development.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning Application Number 19/31577/REM be referred back in order for Officers to revisit scheme with Applicants covering matters of redesign / layouts, amenity (technical breaches of guidance, applying National Design Guide, affordable housing provision and design, shared areas (roads/areas to LC1 phase); areas of parking for dwellings; and principles of sustainable development.

PC111 Planning Appeals

Considered the report of the Head of Development (V1 3/7/20).

Notification of the following appeal decisions had been received:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19/30594/FUL</td>
<td>Greatwood Farmhouse Offleybrook Road Offleybrook</td>
<td>Replacement dwelling with extension of residential curtilage and retention of temporary caravan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/28480/FUL</td>
<td>Darlaston Inn Darlaston Stone</td>
<td>Demolition of existing buildings; erection of a petrol filling station with ancillary retail sales; erection of a drive through restaurant; parking; landscaping and access off the A34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/31349/FUL</td>
<td>Land Rear Of Egremont Newport Road Stafford</td>
<td>Proposed new dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAIRMAN