

Chair – Councillor B M Cross

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

Councillors:

F Beatty	P W Jones
A T A Godfrey	W J Kemp
A D Hobbs	B McKeown
J Hood	M Phillips
E G R Jones	C V Trowbridge

Also in attendance:- Councillors I D Fordham and M J Winnington

Officers in attendance:-

Mr J Holmes	- Development Manager
Mrs S Wright	- Development Lead
Mr S Turner	- Legal Services Manager
Mr J Dean	- Democratic Services Officer

PC5 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A G Cooper (substituted by Councillor F Beatty), A P Edgeller (substituted by Councillor C V Trowbridge) and G P K Pardesi (substituted by Councillor A T A Godfrey).

PC6 Declarations of Interests/Lobbying

All Members indicated that they had received email correspondence relating to Application No 20/32679/FUL;

Councillor C V Trowbridge indicated that she would be speaking as Ward Member in respect of Application No 20/32128/FUL;

Councillor J Hood declared a personal interest pertaining to Application No 20/32679/FUL.

PC7 Application No 20/33264/FUL, Aston Hall, Aston Hill, Aston by Doxey

(Recommendation approval, subject to conditions).

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

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor M J Winnington, Seighford and Church Eaton Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- Confirmed reasons for calling the application in;
- Wanted best possible outcome for local people;
- Had no problems with the application and proposed movements;
- Applicant had not agreed with request to amend the management plan;
- Proposed flying days reduced to 60 days;
- Sought clarification on how many flights allowed per day

In response to Councillor Winnington's question, the Development Manager confirmed that 60 flying days were proposed, with no limit on the number of flights allowed on said days. Mr Holmes referred Members to condition 4 on page 30 of the agenda.

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

- Location of Millennium Green and local rambling paths;
- Potential disturbance to livestock and nearby livery stables;
- Monitoring of number of flights from the site;
- Comments of the Councils Environmental Health Officer

It was subsequently moved by Councillor F Beatty and seconded by Councillor E G R Jones that application number 20/33264/FUL 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 have fallen.

Following further debate, it was again moved by Councillor F Beatty and seconded by Councillor E G R Jones that application number 20/33264/FUL 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 20/33264/FUL be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

PC8 **Application No 20/32128/FUL, Rowley House Nursing Home, 26 Rowley Avenue, Stafford**

(Recommendation approval, subject to conditions).

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

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Speaking in objection to the proposals, Mr K Howe raised the following:-

- Lived at No 1 Sandown Croft;
- Was representing local residents;
- Proposal would dominate the area, would be a huge 2 storey building;
- Suggested parking arrangements were unworkable;
- Dedicated ambulance parking space would be removed;
- Walls would be in full view of neighbours impacting on privacy;
- Application should be refused;
- Ask Committee to undertake site visit

The Development Lead responded to the speakers queries regarding parking provision at the location.

Mrs C Pearce raised the following points during her support for the proposal:-

- Is the Manager of the care home in question;
- Business benefitted the local community and economy;
- Site opened in the 1950's and had a good relationship with neighbours;
- Were looking to provide a dedicated dementia unit;
- Offered a safe place to stay in specifically designed units;
- Provision would match local need;
- Most staff lived locally and did not drive to the site;
- Ample parking was available;
- Gardens surround the home;
- Were trying to provide vital beds to address the local shortfall

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor C V Trowbridge, Rowley Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues whilst presenting a selection of photographs:-

- Thanked Chairman for the opportunity to speak;
- Was representing residents of Rowley Avenue;
- Building had changed significantly since 1982 and now filled the site;
- Proposal would tower over existing houses;
- Car park turning space would be removed;
- Bin store would be relocated;
- Exiting cars would have to reverse out onto the main road;
- Lack of provision of ambulance space was not acceptable;
- Queried lack of SPD guidance relating to care homes;
- Pleaded to Committee to reject the proposal, quoting from Planning Policy SP1, C3 and the NPPF
- Proposal would be harmful to the local area

The Committee discussed the application and raised the issue of car parking at the site.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A T A Godfrey and seconded by Councillor W J Kemp that application number 20/32128/FUL be deferred, pending a site visit by Members of the Committee.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application number 20/32128/FUL be deferred, pending a site visit by Members of the Committee to assess the site, visualise the proposed extension and assess car parking and any impact on neighbouring properties.

PC9 Application No 20/32679/FUL, 6 Mill Farm Barns, Mill Street, Stone

(Recommendation approval, subject to conditions).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter. At the conclusion of her presentation, the Development Lead suggested a further condition be added to the proposal to retain the metal grate in question.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Speaking in objection to the proposals, Mr R Large raised the following:-

- Had lived locally for over 6 years, was speaking on behalf of residents;
- Was grateful to see the application had been 'called in';
- Proposal was more than just about the fence;
- Redhill was in a Zone 1 flooding area, substantial amounts of water flowed from Redhill during periods of poor weather;
- Ground level behind the fence was raised;
- Excess water overflowed into agricultural land to the West;
- Had been 3 occasions of flooding since the fence was installed in April 2019;
- Nearby houses had suffered damage as a result of flooding;
- Proposal to install a metal grate would not suffice;

Mr K Riley raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Was speaking on behalf of the applicant;
- Thanked Officers for their work on the application;
- Noted lack of objections on highways grounds;
- Design had been amended as requested to mitigate risks of flooding;
- Grate allowed water to flow from the site;
- Was willing to construct additional associated grating;

- Fence was damaged in January 2021;
- Hoped a long term solution could be found;
- Proposal was similar to existing fence;
- Was trying to live in harmony with neighbours

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor I D Fordham, St Michaels and Stonefield Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- Unauthorised fence caused flooding in the area;
- Was a danger to pedestrian safety;
- West side of the road was 600m in length, 50m hedged;
- 1.8m closed board fence was obtrusive;
- Quoted from Case Officer and Conservation Officer;
- Land in question was not in domestic curtilage;
- Views would be blocked across nearby valley;
- Extending the fence was not required for security reasons;
- Fencing redirected a torrent of flood water into nearby properties;
- A new earth bank channelled flood water;
- Quoted from NPPF, noted associated Highways comments;
- Sought refusal as approval would cause additional flooding and damage in the local area;
- Raised concerns of pedestrian safety;
- Proposal did not confirm to Policy;
- Suggested fence be removed and replaced with railings;
- Proposed Members undertook a site visit

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

- Comments of the Council's Conservation Officer;
- Local flooding concerns;
- Size of the fence in question;
- Concerns for local landscape including ancient hedgerow

It was subsequently moved by Councillor B McKeown and seconded by Councillor A T A Godfrey that application number 20/32679/FUL be deferred to allow discussions to take place with the landowner regarding the design of the fence.

On continuation of the debate an amendment was moved by Councillor F Beatty, seconded by Councillor M Phillips, that the application be refused.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application number 20/32679/FUL be refused on the grounds of concerns to the safety to pedestrians, it represented a hard boundary to a conservation area,

offered no justification for its height, blocked views and was damaging to the street scene.

PC10 Application No 15/23264/FUL, Land between Boat Yard and Chandlers Way, Newcastle Road, Stone

(Recommendation approval, subject to a Section 106 agreement and conditions).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter. At the conclusion of his presentation, the Development Manager noted there were no changes to National Policy in respect of this application, but reminded Members of the emerging Stone Neighbourhood Plan.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor W J Kemp and seconded by Councillor A T A Godfrey that application number 15/23264/FUL be approved, subject to a Section 106 agreement and the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

Members commented on highways issues in the locality.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application number 15/23264/FUL be approved, subject to a Section 106 agreement and the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

PC11 Planning Appeals

Considered the report of the Head of Development.

Notification of the following new appeals had been received:-

Application Reference	Location	Proposal
20/33438/FUL Delegated Decision	Green Gable Summerhill Milwich	Retention of a single-storey implement store building
20/32836/FUL Delegated Decision	Land Rear Of Egremont Newport Road Stafford	Proposed new dwelling
20/32341/FUL Delegated Decision	Norbury Manor Barns Norbury Stafford	Conversion of Dutch Barn to provide garaging and domestic storage/home office

Notification of the following appeal decisions had been received:-

Application Reference	Location	Proposal
20/32821/HOU and 20/32822/LBC Appeal Dismissed	9 Church Street Eccleshall Stafford	Rear extension and minor internal works. In conjunction with 20/32822/LBC
20/33053/HOU Appeal Dismissed	1 Blackberry Way Woodseaves Stafford	Two storey side extension to form new play room and extended dining area to the ground floor, together with an additional bedroom and extended bedroom and additional shower room to the first floor.

CHAIR