

Chairman - Councillor A S Harp

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

Councillors:

F Beatty	R Kenney
B M Cross	A Nixon
M G Dodson	A N Pearce
P W Jones	M Phillips
W J Kemp	

Also in Attendance - Councillors P M M Farrington, J Hood (as a Non-Committee Member), J K Price, P Roycroft and C V Trowbridge.

Officers in attendance:-

Mr J Holmes	-	Development Manager
Mrs S Wright	-	Senior Planning Officer
Mr S Turner	-	Interim Legal Services Manager
Mr A Bailey	-	Scrutiny Officer

PC37 Minutes

Minutes of the previous meetings held on 14 August 2019 were submitted and signed.

PC38 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from A P Edgeller (Substitute P W Jones), A Hobbs, J Hood (Substitute R Kenney) and R M Sutherland (Substitute F Beatty).

PC39 Declarations of Members Interests/Lobbying

Councillor R Kenney indicated that he had been lobbied in respect of Application Number 19/29876/FUL.

PC40 Application No 19/29876/FUL - Proposed erection of a sixty six bedroom, two-storey care home for older people, with associated access, car parking and landscaping - Land Adjacent to The Fillybrooks (A34), Walton, Stone

(Recommendation approve, subject to conditions and the completion of a planning obligation to provide a Travel Plan monitoring fee of £2,600).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter. During his introduction, the Development Manager reported upon the following:-

- The receipt of an additional 17 neighbour representations, during which he summarised those comments that were not already contained within the report
- The need for an additional condition concerning the submission of a Sustainable Drainage Strategy, the wording of which was circulated to Members of the Committee
- A holding direction from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government not to issue a planning decision without their authorisation due to the fact that a request had been received for them to call-in the proposal

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

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

- Referred to the Public Notice in the Staffordshire Newsletter dated 23 January 2019, which stated that the proposed developments did not accord with the provisions of the development plan in force in the area
- Quoted Policy N4 of the Plan for Stafford Borough and page 165 of the Draft Stone Neighbourhood Plan in relation to open space standards
- The proposals fell short of Policy CAF2: Green Infrastructure of the Draft Stone Neighbourhood Plan
- There was no proven surplus of open space
- No assessments or sequential tests had been carried out on the proposal
- The design principles of the proposal were flawed

Mrs J Kemp raised the following points during her support for the proposal:-

- Represented LNT Care Developments
- Provided the Committee with a brief background to the company
- The Council would undertake mitigation measures to offset any loss of open space and sport provision
- Sport England had withdrawn their objection to the proposal
- A needs assessment had revealed an under supply of residential care beds
- The proposal would create 40 to 50 local jobs
- The site included 33 car parking spaces and cycle provision
- There were no objections from the Highways Authority
- There was unrestrictive visiting to the development which would help to ease car parking at peak times

- The design was traditional, energy efficient and could be internally divided

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor J Hood, Walton Ward Member addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- There were two schools and 2 nurseries in the area
- Tilling Drive would inevitably be used for parking for the care home
- The proposals were contrary to Policy N2 of the Plan for Stafford Borough due to inadequate foul sewerage capacity
- Quoted Policy C7 of the Plan for Stafford Borough and that Stone Hockey Club was not a suitable alternative location as it was too far away and dangerous in the dark
- The £200,000 relating to Stone Hockey club was not a material planning consideration
- Disagreed with the reasons for Sport England withdrawing their objections to the proposal
- The Plan for Stafford Borough should meet local needs
- The proposals were contrary to Policy N4 of the Plan for Stafford Borough and if approved, could open the flood gates to similar applications
- The Council had an owner interest in the site and needed the revenue for Westbridge Park
- There were two alternative sites available
- The proposal ignored planning policy

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

- Queried the ethics in considering this proposal when the Council was set to financially gain
- Concern over the loss of open space and the removal of a much needed facility
- Concern that Stone Hockey Club was too far away
- The A34 was a dangerous road to cross especially when the M6 was closed
- Concern that the care home was in the wrong location
- The need for clarification over foul sewerage capacity
- Concern that the proposals were contrary to Policy N4 of the Plan for Stafford Borough Council - The Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure and that the policy did not specify a hierarchy of Green Infrastructure
- Concern that if Policy N4 of the Plan for Stafford Borough Council was ignored, other isolated areas were in danger of development
- The Highways Authority had not objected to the application
- The Stone Neighbourhood Plan did not carry much weight at this stage because the Inspector had recommended the removal of this site from the Plan

- The care home only occupied a third of the area and therefore two thirds remained
- There were alternative sites in Stone for the care home
- Concern over the Design Advisor's comments
- Concern over the large number of objections
- Concern that the proposal did not have to be in this location for the creation of local jobs
- The proposals were in accordance with The Plan for Stafford Borough Spatial Principles 1(SP1), 2(SP2), 3(SP3), 4(SP4) and 7(SP7)
- Those objecting to the proposals were on the basis that the whole site was being lost, but there would be no loss of provision in the area
- Would wish to see additional planting in the area
- There was a need for a good quality and modern development in the area
- Concern over the loss of open space and affect on biodiversity
- Concern that the proposals encouraged more private car use
- Concern over the design, scale, massing and incongruous feature of the proposal
- Concern that this area served potentially 6000 people
- Concern over the lack of open space for the users of the care home
- Clarification of the walkway around the fields
- The operator would not want to build a care home in the wrong place
- The Examiner had removed the site from Green Infrastructure
- The comments by Sports England were convincing
- The former Police station in Stone was an alternative location

In response, the Development Manager clarified the following:-

- The Council was the Local Planning Authority and there was no alternative body to consider the proposal
- There are two conditions in relation to drainage
- There was no hierarchy of Green Infrastructure in the Plan for Stafford Borough Council
- The Examiner had recommended the removal of this site from the Stone Neighbourhood Plan
- This site was one of a number of isolated sites of Green Infrastructure in The Plan for Stafford Borough
- The Examiner did not appear to have re-designated this site as Green Infrastructure in the draft Stone Neighbourhood Plan
- The Committee must deal with the application on its own merits in accordance with planning policies and material planning considerations
- The Committee can decide on what weight to attribute to material planning considerations

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A Nixon and seconded by Councillor R Kenney that Application No 19/29876/FUL be refused on the

grounds that the proposal was contrary to Policy N4 of The Plan for Stafford Borough.

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

It was then moved by Councillor M G Dodson and seconded by Councillor M Phillips that Application No 19/29876/FUL be approved, subject to the completion of a planning obligation to provide a Travel Plan monitoring fee of £2,600 and the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, plus an additional condition concerning the submission of a Sustainable Drainage Strategy.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application no 19/29876/FUL be approved, subject to the completion of a planning obligation to provide a Travel Plan monitoring fee of £2,600 and the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, plus the following additional Condition:-

- 25 No development shall commence unless and until details of a Sustainable Drainage Strategy have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include:-

A clear point of discharge through either:-

- i A proposed soakaway supported by necessary infiltration testing (BRE365) or represented in a micro-drainage model.
- ii An alternative outfall to a diverted sewer with details confirming the ownership, size, condition, available capacity, and permission to connect to this sewer / developer enquiry response from Severn Trent, and supported with calculations for sufficient attenuation.

The above options shall be supported by:-

- i Network calculations for the discharge option and which demonstrate compliance with the technical standards for SuDS (Defra, 2015), including results for 1, 30 and 100 years plus climate change;
- ii SuDS management train to confirm the adequate quality treatment for all sources of runoff (CIRIA SuDS Manual Simple Index Approach).

- iii Maintenance / management arrangement including a maintenance schedule, responsible organisation, and funding arrangements.

The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details, unless alternative details are otherwise first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure the provision of adequate drainage facilities.
(Policy N2 of the Plan for Stafford Borough).

PC41 **Application 19/30837/HOU - Proposed two-storey side extension to provide additional accommodation for extended family - 67 Winsford Crescent, Stafford, Staffordshire, ST17 0PJ**

(Recommendation refuse).

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

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr M Wilson raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Spoke as the applicant for the proposal
- Did not understand the reasons why this proposal was recommended for refusal
- There were other properties in the area with similar extensions
- The proposed extension was for his parents in law
- The extension would be 4.8m wide
- There had been no objections from neighbours or the Highways Authority
- The proposed roof line had been reduced
- Requests for further discussions with a planning officer had been ignored
- The reasons for refusal were vague
- The photos shown for the Committee were taken in the wrong area
- Requested the Committee to visit the site

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

- Clarification over the size and location of the property
- Clarification over the size and location of the proposed extension
- Concern over what would happen to the trees in the area if permission was granted
- Clarification over the position of the proposed extension in relation to the building line

- The Council's Design Supplementary Planning Document was there to help the protection of building lines and prevent the loss of grass verges
- Massing was a concern in this proposal

It was subsequently moved by Councillor B M Cross and seconded by Councillor A N Pearce that Application No 19/30837/HOU be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the of the Head of Development

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application no 19/30837/HOU be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

PC42 Planning Appeals

Considered the report of the Head of Development.

Notification of the following appeals had been received:-

(a) New Appeals

App No	Location	Proposal
19/30278/HOU Delegated Approval Appeal against conditions	18 Oakridge Way Weeping Cross	Proposed rear first floor extension, rear single storey extension and side two storey extension to dwelling
19/30114/HOU Delegated refusal	The Dale Fairoak Bank Fairoak	Two storey front, side and rear extension.
19/30278/HOU Delegated Approval Appeal against conditions	18 Oakridge Way Weeping Cross	Proposed rear first floor extension, rear single storey extension and side two storey extension to dwelling

(b) Appeal Decisions

App No	Location	Proposal
18/29380/FUL Appeal Dismissed	Manor Farm Barns, High Ridge Barn Well Lane High Offley	Proposed conversion of stables and storage areas into single storey dwelling.

CHAIRMAN