

Chairman - Councillor B M Cross

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

Councillors:

A G Cooper

W J Kemp

A D Hobbs

R Kenney

J Hood

G P K Pardesi

E G R Jones

C V Trowbridge

P W Jones

Also in attendance:- Councillor A R G Brown.

Officers in attendance:-

Mr R Wood - Development Lead

Mrs S Wright - Development Lead

Miss L Collingridge - Contracts Solicitor

Mr A Bailey - Scrutiny Officer

PC12 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A P Edgeller (Substitute Councillor C V Trowbridge), B Mckeown (Substitute Councillor R Kenney) and M Phillips.

PC13 Declaration of Interests/Lobbying

The Chairman, Councillor B M Cross, indicated that he had been lobbied in respect of Application Number 20/33493/COU.

All of the Committee indicated that they had been lobbied in respect of Application Number 19/31487/COU.

Councillor C V Trowbridge declared that she would be speaking as the Local Ward Member in respect of Application Number 20/33493/COU and would not be participating in the discussion and voting thereon.

Councillor C V Trowbridge left her place at the table at this point and took her seat in the public gallery.

PC14 Application 20/33493/COU - Proposed relocation of existing barber shop business facilitated by a change of use of land from residential garden to A1 hair dressing to include erection of log cabin and fence fronting Newport Road. Existing barber shop building to revert back to uses incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house White Lodge - Land Adjacent to Nick Hughes Barbering, White Lodge, 2 Deanshill Close, Stafford ST16 1BW

(Recommendation approve, subject to conditions).

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

The Development Lead reported upon additional representation received from the Tree Officer and Highways Authority.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Ms K Wild raised the following points during her objection to the proposal:-

- Explained how the Arboricultural Officer had not considered all of the ground conditions when making their report
- The photographic evidence demonstrated that the concrete incursion into the root protection areas was 25 times more than what was included in the survey
- The red Cedar Trees were no longer there
- Queried why there was provided incorrect evidence of the excavations
- There was considerable evidence that demonstrated that much of the development was not permissible under Permitted development Rights
- The design was inappropriate for the area
- The log cabin was in a poor location and the stilts increased its height above the level of the road and dominated the streetscene
- The log cabin had a detrimental affect on the existing character of the area
- Requested the Committee to reject the application or visit the site

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

- The Call-In for the proposal was questionable
- The Committee should only consider factual and material planning considerations
- The Tree Officer and the Highways Authority were satisfied with the proposals
- The scheme was carefully designed to be energy efficient
- The fence secured the property away from the busy road
- The proposal reflected a business relocation due to illness

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

- Provided a history of the site from 1989
- Explained that there were not enough parking spaces for the 40 employees
- The proposal was called in during 2015 due to the fact that the Barbershop should have been located within the town centre
- During 2020, two trees had been removed
- Queried why the updated Tree Officers report was not included within the Agenda
- The damage to the trees was only inspected above ground level and not below
- Queried whether the log cabin had Permitted Development Rights
- The log cabin was 20m² including the porch and the veranda and there were insufficient parking spaces
- The log cabin was already being used as a bar

In response, the Development Lead clarified the following:-

- There was no requirement in the application for additional car parking at the accountant's premises
- Condition No 2 clarified the Business Use
- Only one business could be operated from the site
- Permitted Development Rights did not apply
- Referred to the comments of the Highways Authority in relation to visibility splay
- The Tree Officer was aware of the the concrete when providing clarification from the photographs submitted by Councillor Trowbridge

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

- Condition No 2 appeared to be restrictive to the applicant
- The shrubs had grown significantly since the Spring and the development was now less obtrusive and well screened

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A D Hobbs and seconded by Councillor R Kenney, that Planning Application Number 20/33493/COU be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

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

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 20/33493/COU be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

Councillor C V Trowbridge retook her place at the table at this point

PC15 Application 19/31487/COU - Proposed change of use of concrete runway for storage of vehicles and associated perimeter fencing and landscape improvements - Land at former airfield, Hixon, Stafford, Staffordshire

(Recommendation approve, subject to conditions).

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

The Development Lead referred to the updated comments on the proposal received from Environmental Health.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr B Weatherley raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Explained would outline the Needs, Impacts and Benefits of the proposal
- In terms of Need for the proposal – there was established use originating from 2014 and again in 2017
- The site was used for storage and auctions, but with increased demand came the need for additional space
- More space would lead to the need for less transportation, which was better for the environment
- The site was close to the designated Hixon Airfield Industrial Estate and was brownfield
- In terms of Impact – there would be perimeter fencing erected and landscaping improvements
- These improvements would enhance the character and appearance of the area
- The highways would be improved as well as drainage
- There were no objections from statutory consultees
- In terms of Benefits – the proposal would bring economic growth to the area
- Businesses could expand due to the additional space and increased spend on larger commercial vehicles
- There would be employee spend in the area, reduced vehicle emissions, additional landscaping and biodiversity
- In conclusion, the proposal was logical, reasonable, was supported by extensive documentation, provided sustainable economic development and was within the planning policy framework
- Requested the committee to approve the application

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor A R G Brown, Haywood and Hixon Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- Clarification that the site was brownfield
- The proposal would have a major impact on local residents
- Visibility would be impacted
- There would be a decrease in biodiversity
- Welcomed the Tree plan
- The location was outside of the designated Hixon Airfield Industrial Estate
- Requested the Committee to visit the site

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

- Clarification of the proposed landscaping scheme
- All of the Committee had been lobbied over this proposal
- The photographs referred to showed damaged lorries on the site and a site visit was justified in order to confirm this
- Clarification over the nearest properties
- Confirmation that loss of view was not a material planning consideration
- The footpaths in the area were difficult to navigate due to the stored vehicles
- Clarification of the Public Rights of Way Officer's comments
- Concern that there were no comments from the Environmental Health Officer
- The photographs did not show a true representation of the site
- A site visit was necessary in order to consider the visual impact on both the character and appearance on the area and to reflect upon the landscaping of the previous scheme

It was subsequently moved by Councillor W J Kemp and seconded by Councillor J Hood, that Planning Application Number 19/31487/COU be deferred pending a site visit, to assess the visual impact of the proposal from on the site and its surroundings on the character and appearance of the area and the landscaping of the previous scheme.

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

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 19/31487/COU be deferred pending a site visit.

CHAIR