

Chairman - Councillor B M Cross

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

Councillors:

A G Cooper  
A P Edgeller  
A D Hobbs  
J Hood  
P W Jones

W J Kemp  
B McKeown  
G P K Pardesi  
M Phillips  
C V Trowbridge

Also in attendance - Councillors M G Dodson A N Peace,  
J M Pert and J k Price

Officers in attendance:-

Mr J Holmes - Development Manager  
Mr R Wood - Development Lead  
Mr I Curran - Head of Law and Administration  
Mr A Bailey - Scrutiny Officer

**PC45 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meetings held on 17 March and 29 September 2021 were submitted and signed.

**PC46 Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor E G R Jones (Substitute Councillor C V Trowbridge).

**PC47 Declaration of Interests/Lobbying**

Councillor A G Cooper declared a personal interest in respect of Application Number 20/33371/FUL as he lives in Great Haywood.

Councillor A G Cooper also indicated that he had been lobbied in respect of Application Number 20/33371/FUL.

Councillor M Phillips indicated that she had been lobbied in respect of Application Number 20/33371/FUL.

*At this point, the Chairman indicated that only Councillors A G Cooper, B M Cross, A D Hobbs, J Hood, W J Kemp, M Phillips and C V Trowbridge could participate and vote in the following application as they were the only Members present when the proposal was previously considered at the Planning Committee held on 1 September 2021.*

*Councillors A P Edgeller, P W Jones, B Mckeown and G P K Pardesi did not take part in the debate or voting on the application thereafter.*

**PC48 Application 20/33371/FUL - Proposed residential development of 117 dwellings - Land Off Little Tixall Lane, Lichfield Road, Great Haywood, Stafford**

(Recommendation approve, subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement).

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

The Development Lead reported upon the receipt of two additional neighbour representations and a letter from the applicant.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

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

- Represented Colwich Parish Council
- Great Haywood was a key service village
- This proposal was for 117 new dwellings
- Great Haywood was a Key Service Village
- The original application for 157 houses was rejected
- This application represented a 52% increase from the agreed 77 dwellings
- The 1200 houses in Great Haywood exceeded the provision Borough Wide for Key Service Villages
- The proposal still caused concern around the linkages and integration to the wider area
- Great Haywood had received a Royal Horticultural Society Gold Award
- The concerns of the Staffordshire Police Design Advisor had been ignored
- This proposal increased the need for travel yet there was a lack of amenities
- The proposal increased the size of the ecological corridor
- The proposals would do little to improve the street scene
- The proposals would place a further strain on amenities, travel and the street scene

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

- The proposal had been deferred for five matters that had now all been resolved
- There was a clear recommendation to approve the proposals
- The site was within the Colwich Neighbourhood Plan
- The proposals had been modified to increase garden sizes and parking spaces
- 149 new trees would be planted across the site
- 23 dwellings per hectare was in accordance with paragraph 125 of the National Planning Policy Framework
- Requested the Committee to endorse the recommendation

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor B McKeown, Haywood and Hixon Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The applicant had not gone far enough in addressing the reasons for deferring the proposal
- There had been no improvement in the connectivity of the site or the street scene
- There was a lack of safe routes for pedestrians
- The houses were of a standard design
- Although the default position was there was an extant permission on the site, this proposal should be considered on its merits
- Referred to two previous applications that had been turned down on Appeal due to the lack of pedestrian links
- The site should never have had permission in the first place
- A refusal would send a clear message to developers
- Additional development was not needed in this area
- The integrity of the area was compromised
- Requested the Committee to refuse the application

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

- Clarification that the principles of the development were acceptable
- Confirmation that the numbers of new houses provided in key service villages could be exceeded
- Concern that the site did appear to be over developed
- Clarification over the density of the site
- Everything possible had been done to improve the proposal
- 30 houses were now of a better standard following the previous referral back
- Concern that pedestrian safety, connection to the surrounding area and density of housing had not been addressed
- Clarification that density levels were within the parameters set by the National Planning Policy Framework and The Plan for Stafford Borough
- Clarification of the building works undertaken so far

- Confirmation that the Reserved Matters for this development had already been approved
- Disappointment that no new additional trees were proposed to be planted
- Clarification of the Boundary Treatment Plan
- The need for an additional condition relating to the boundary with the adjacent green space
- Concern over the size of the attenuation pond
- The need for an additional condition relating to the fence around the attenuation pond
- Clarification that the attenuation pond could withstand a 1 in 100 year storm event
- Confirmation that there would be a local equipped play area on the site
- Clarification of the Travel Plan
- Concern over isolation and pedestrian safety
- Clarification that the applicant was not willing to make any further amendments to the application
- Concern over infrastructure and insufficient land for open space
- Quoted Policy N1 of the Plan for Stafford Borough in relation to design

It was subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by the Chairman, Councillor B M Cross, that Planning Application Number 20/33371/FUL be approved, subject to a Section 106 Agreement, the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development together with additional conditions relating to the boundary with the adjacent green open space and the fencing around the attenuation pond.

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

The Committee then continued with the debate based around the potential planning reasons for refusing the application.

In the absence of an alternative proposal, it was moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by the Chairman, Councillor B M Cross, that Planning Application Number 20/33371/FUL be approved, subject to a Section 106 Agreement, the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development together with additional conditions relating to the boundary with the adjacent green open space and the fencing around the attenuation pond.

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

It was then subsequently moved by Councillor M Phillips and seconded by Councillor A G Cooper that Planning Application Number 20/33371/FUL be deferred for consideration at a future meeting due to concerns over compliance with policy N1 and other aspects of the development, for

members to consider the policy in greater detail and to determine their reasoning for any decision.

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 20/33371/FUL be deferred for consideration at a future meeting due to concerns over policy N1 design and other aspects of the development, for members to consider the policy in greater detail and to determine their reasoning for any decision.

*The Chairman declared a short comfort break at this point and the recording was paused and re-started when the meeting re-commenced.*

*Councillors A P Edgeller, P W Jones, B Mckeown and G P K Pardesi re-took their places at the table at this point.*

**PC49 Application 20/32899/FUL - Proposed excavations and formation of embankments to create slurry lagoon - Land North of Old House Farm, Kempsage Lane, Garmelow, Eccleshall, ST21 6HL**

(Recommendation approve).

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

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr J Court raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- The impacts of climate change would increase year on year
- Quoted the Government's response to the climate change emergency
- This proposal would increase flooding in the local area
- The grid reference provided for the proposal was incorrect
- The Lead Local Flood Authority had declared that the area was a medium to high flood risk
- Each inaccuracy in the report was misleading
- The proposal risked extensive additional flooding
- Moving the lagoon to the north of the site would cause additional flooding problems
- Flooding could not run uphill and could back-up and lead to further flooding on Well Lane as a result
- A directive had been overlooked and disregarded
- Concerned that flooding would be increased both within and around the site
- Urged the Committee to reject the proposal

Mr D Collier raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Reminded the Committee of what had already been approved
- The slurry lagoon was an essential component of the development

- The applicants had received many accolades
- The proposal was ideal in terms of environmental and agricultural purposes
- There was easy access to fields
- There was a good spoil structure
- The slurry lagoon was located well away from the source protection zone
- The lagoon details would be regulated by the Environment Agency
- The site had been independently assessed as in Flood Zone 2
- The prevailing wind was a south westerly
- The Environmental Health Officer was content with the proposals
- There was good policy support for the proposals
- There was no reason for the Committee to refuse the application

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

- Supported the principle of a rural economy
- Grateful to see investment in local business
- This application had previously been referred back due to significant evidence of surface water flooding
- The proposed slurry lagoon would cause significant pollution in the area
- The ground level on the site would need to be raised by 1.5m to accommodate the slurry lagoon
- The Environment Agency were concerned with rivers and seas, but the Lead Local Flood Authority for this proposal was Staffordshire County Council
- The field drain was found to need to be relocated to 80m away
- Recommended further investigation of this proposal
- Quoted the flood report
- If the slurry lagoon was raised by 1,5m, where would the water drain away to?
- There was a long standing drain 0.7m away
- The applicant's independent rural consultant indicated that all three components of the proposal could become flooded and polluted
- Urged the Committee to refuse the proposal as the site flooded

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

- Clarification that as the land undulated, the applicant had proposed to fill the hollows and dips
- There was a need for a topographical survey of the whole site with cross sections in order to fully understand the land levels of the area

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A P Edgeller and seconded by Councillor P W Jones, that Planning Application Number 20/32899/FUL be deferred in order for a Topographical Survey to be undertaken on the site.

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

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 20/32899/FUL be deferred in order for a Topographical Survey to be undertaken on the site.

**PC50 Application 20/33570/HOU - Proposed two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, front porch, internal alterations and dropped kerb - 2 Green Park, Fulford, Stoke on Trent ST11 9RT**

(Recommendation approve).

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

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mrs J Barnard raised the following points during her objection to the proposal:-

- Objected to the proposal on the grounds that it breached the 70% increase in floor space
- The large mature Ash Tree that was protected by a Tree Preservation Order, would be disturbed
- There would be harm to the character and appearance of the local area
- Green Park was within a Conservation Area
- There were 7 buildings with historic interest in the area
- This proposal would be highly visible in the area
- The Parish Council and 9 neighbours had expressed strong objections to the proposal
- Fulford was a previous winner of a Best Kept Village Competition
- Highlighted the various planning policies broken by the proposal

Mr N Johnson raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Represented the applicant
- The property was a two storey detached dwelling
- The property dated back to the late 20<sup>th</sup> Century and had the smallest footprint on the road
- There were no listed buildings in the road
- The proposal was for a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension
- The proposal provided critical floor space for an elderly family member together with a study to facilitate working from home
- Requested the Committee to approve the proposal

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor M G Dodson, Fulford Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The property was between 40 and 50 years old and could not be considered as modern
- Queried that the building could have special or architectural merit
- The Conservation Officer had twice rejected the proposals
- Referred to the history of the Conservation Area
- The proposed extensions exceeded the 70% figure stipulated in Policy C5 of The Plan for Stafford Borough
- The proposal should be proportionate to the property
- This would be the only house with a dwelling on the boundary
- The photos of the proposals represented gross over massing and an uncharacteristic development
- There were only two supporters of the application
- The root zone of the tree was much larger than reported
- The only access to the proposal was over the tree root zone
- The building was on a slope with the footings 1 m deeper
- There was a risk of subsidence

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

- Clarification that a proposed car port had been removed from the scheme
- Confirmation that there were no objections by the Tree Officer
- Clarification of the comments made by the Conservation Officer
- An explanation as to why the proposal was in contradiction to Policy C5 of The Plan for Stafford Borough
- Confirmation that the Council reviewed the Conservation area 5 years ago and made no changes
- Concerns that the proposals represented over intensification of the site
- Confirmation that all of the houses in the area were of a mixed two storey design
- Confirmation that if the property was not in the Conservation Area the Permitted Development Rights would be no different
- Clarification that the Third Party Wall Act would be the relevant legislation concerning neighbour access
- Confirmation that there was no precedent set by this proposal under Policy C5 of The Plan for Stafford Borough

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A P Edgeller and seconded by Councillor J Hood, that Planning Application Number 20/33570/HOU be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

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

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 20/33570/HOU be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.



**PC51 Application 21/34119/FUL - Proposed erection of a solar carport in the car park - Stafford Institute Billiards and Snooker Club, 10 Victoria Road, Stafford ST16 2AF**

(Recommendation refuse).

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

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor A N Pearce, Doxey and Castletown Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The proposal was not outlandish
- The cars were already parked on the site
- The proposal would not make a huge difference to the street scene
- Quoted paragraphs 12.15 and 12.17 of The Plan for Stafford Borough
- There were five representations all supportive of the proposals
- There were no objections from the Highways Authority or the War Memorials Trust
- There were no proposals for a solid building
- The solar panels would be on the roof of the car port at a 10° angle and would not face Victoria Park

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

- Clarification that the applicant did not own the adjoining buildings and therefore could not re-site the solar panels on the roof
- Clarification that the solar panels would not receive sufficient light if located on top of the adjacent building
- The proposed solar panels would not affect the view from Victoria Park
- Clarification of Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to harm
- The need to condition boundary planting, materials and illumination

It was subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by Councillor J Hood, that Planning Application Number 21/34119/FUL be approved, subject to conditions to secure boundary planting, external finish, and luminance levels, to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

**RESOLVED:-** that Planning Application Number 21/34119/FUL be approved, subject to conditions to secure boundary planting, external finish, and luminance levels, to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

*At this point, given the lateness of the hour, the Chairman announced that consideration of the following application would be deferred until the Special Planning Committee that was due to be held on 29 October 2021.*

**PC52 Application 20/33051/FUL - Proposed conversion of two barns with glazed link to form one dwelling including new septic tank and ground source heating systems, with new access and parking off B5206 - Bank Farm, Back Lane, Croxton, Stafford ST21 6PE**

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 20/33051/FUL be deferred for consideration at the Special Planning Committee that was due to be held on 29 October 2021.

**PC53 Planning Appeals**

Considered the report of the Head of Development (V1 15/10/2021).

Notification of the following new appeals had been received:-

<b>App No</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>21/33855/FUL</b>  <b>Delegated Refusal</b>	Adjacent to Stallington Grange Farm	Demolition of existing redundant outbuildings and erection of new dwelling.
<b>20/32391/FUL</b>  <b>Committee Refusal</b>	203 Prospect Road	Change of use from grass land to residential to form domestic garden area. Side and rear two storey extension, single storey kitchen extension, new boundary fence with gates and driveway
<b>20/32679/FUL</b>  <b>Committee Refusal</b>	6 Mill Farm Barns	Retrospective application for the retention of existing fence and the erection of fence adjacent to Redhill Road

CHAIR