

Councillor A S Harp (Chairman)

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

Councillors:

C A Baron	P W Jones
G R Collier	A J Perkins
I E Davies	J K Price
M G Dodson	G O Rowlands
R J Draper	R M Sutherland
E G R Jones	C V Trowbridge

Also present:-

Councillors P M M Farrington, F A Finlay, J Hood, M E Jennings and R M Smith

Officers in attendance:-

Mr J Holmes	-	Development Manager
Miss M Smith	-	Business Improvement Manager
Mrs E Simcox-Parry	-	Solicitor
Mr J Dean	-	Democratic Services Officer

**PC30 Minutes**

Minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2017 were submitted and signed.

**PC31 Declarations of Members Interests/Lobbying**

Councillor J K Price declared a prejudicial interest in respect of Application No 17/26170/FUL

Councillor R M Sutherland indicated that he would be speaking as Ward Member in respect of Application No 17/25878/COU

Councillor P W Jones indicated that he would be speaking as Ward Member in respect of Application No 17/26170/FUL

Councillor R J Draper indicated that although within his Ward, he would be acting as a Member of the Committee in respect of Application No 17/26409/COU

All Members reported that they had been lobbied in respect of Application No 17/26207/FUL

PC32 **Application No 17/25878/COU - High Onn Farm, High Onn, Church Eaton**

(Recommend approval, subject to conditions).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr J Price raised the following points during his objections to the proposal:-

- Referred to letter submitted on 18/04/17
- Lived directly opposite the Farm in question
- Was concerned for welfare of his family
- Had been in direct contact with the Options Group
- Understood facility was intended to be staffed on a 1-1 basis
- Noted concerns regarding lack of parking spaces
- Thanked Members for listening to views

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

- Thanked Members for opportunity to speak
- Noted change of use of property and very small extension
- Confirmed building could already be used as a care home – principal was already established
- Stated a maximum of 6 young people in residence
- Occupants would be young people, not young offenders
- Referred to similar facility 3 miles away operating without issues
- Location suited needs of children
- Options Group was a National provider of such facilities
- Noted requirement of Ofsted satisfaction
- Would be a home for children, not in commercial use
- Proposal was in accordance with development plans
- Requested Committee endorse the recommendation of approval

Councillor R M Sutherland, Seighford and Church Eaton Ward Member, at the invitation of the Chairman addressed the meeting and raised the following issues:-

- Thanked the Chairman for opportunity to address Members
- Was a 'difficult' application with much support and also many concerns
- Had called in the application on behalf of Church Eaton Parish Council – went on to detail their main concerns
- Location was in a very scenic, rural area with narrow roads

- Children would be bused to school in Shifnal
- Were no facilities for use in evenings/holidays by young people in Church Eaton
- Were few bus connections into Stafford (currently under review by SCC)
- Social needs of proposed residents were unclear
- Concerned regarding low number of proposed parking spaces

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

- Access to the site/traffic management details
- Change of use from C3 to C2 (the Development Manager clarified, referring Members to paragraph 3 of part 1 of the report, as set out on page 6 of the agenda, the Business Improvement Manager continued by reading out in full the associated 5 pages statement as published on the Council's website on 21/04/17).

It was subsequently moved by Councillor J K Price and seconded by Councillor R J Draper that the application be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 17/25878/COU be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

**PC33 Application No 17/26109/FUL - Land Behind 1 Oak Avenue, Walton on the Hill, Stafford**

(Recommend approval, subject to conditions).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter.

Prior to his presentation, the Development Manager reported receipt of 5 additional neighbour responses objecting to the proposals which were duly summarised.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr M Williams raised the following points during his objections to the proposal:-

- Was an application for a new building on an inappropriate plot
- Proposal was shoe-horned into a triangular shaped piece of land
- Was 'garden grabbing' and overcrowding at its worst
- Quoted from NPPF

- Would be severe overlooking by front windows
- Impact would be worsened by amended plans
- Principal window objecting to was not mentioned in the report
- Revised plans affect local views/amenity
- Was informed planning report was written before end of consultation period
- Report neglected some neighbours objections and contained several errors
- Committee didn't have the facts to make a fair decision
- Asked for refusal or deferment

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

- Property was owned by applicants parents
- Plot of land was large enough to take another home
- Quoted from new homes white paper
- Housing market was 'broken'
- Proposal was acceptable subject to considerations
- Amendments were supported by planning Officers
- Parking provision had been increased
- Was acceptable in size and design
- Would not harm local amenity
- Planning Policy would not be compromised
- Why would wish to prevent new people from joining local community?

Councillor F A Finlay, Milford Ward Member, at the invitation of the Chairman addressed the meeting and raised the following issues:-

- Application did not fulfil any housing need
- Council currently exceeding demand for housing
- Proposal was squeezed into a back garden
- Principal of the development should not be supported
- Oak Avenue was a largely untouched 1960's development
- To interfere with the character of the area would be detrimental to the history of the area
- Frontage of the plot would be materially changed
- Committee needed to carefully consider the needs of the area

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

- SAD guidelines
- Scale of the application

It was subsequently moved by Councillor J K Price and seconded by Councillor G R Collier that the application be deferred, pending a site visit by Members of the Committee.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 17/26109/FUL be deferred, pending a site visit by Members of the Committee.

PC34 **Application No 17/26170/FUL - Eccleshall Fire Station, Newport Road, Eccleshall**

*Having declared a prejudicial interest, Councillor J K Price left the room during consideration of this application, taking no part in the debate and voting thereon.*

(Recommend approval, subject to conditions).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter.

Prior to her presentation, the Business Improvement Manager reported receipt of an additional neighbour letter objecting to the application.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mrs C Bratton raised the following points during her objections to the proposal:-

- Tower was no longer fit for purpose
- New tower would be in the same location
- Quoted from design statement
- Tubular steel would not blend in to the area
- Quoted from previous nearby application
- Present tower was not in use – queried need for a replacement
- Would be very intrusive to character of the area and the street scene
- Doesn't matter that the tower matches other in applicants portfolio

Councillor P W Jones, Eccleshall Ward Member, at the invitation of the Chairman addressed the meeting and raised the following issues:-

- Thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to speak in objection to the application on behalf of Eccleshall Parish Council
- Site was surrounded on all sides by residential housing
- Agreed Firefighters should have the best training facilities - not currently in use at Eccleshall Fire Station
- Tower would be in a prominent town centre location, be visually intrusive impacting on the character of the area and the street scene
- Asked Committee to refuse the application on behalf of the people of Eccleshall

It was subsequently moved by Councillor R M Sutherland and seconded by Councillor G R Collier that the application be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 17/26170/FUL be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

*Councillor J K Price re-joined the meeting at this point.*

**PC35 Application No 17/26207/FUL - Westbridge Park, Stafford Street, Stone**

(Recommend approval, subject to conditions).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter.

Prior to his presentation, the Development Manager reported receipt of a further letter objecting to the proposal, detailed the response of Stone Town Council to the amended plans and suggested an amendment to condition 17 (insertion of the word 'construction' after the word 'All').

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

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

- Thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address Members
- Application formed key part of Leisure strategy
- Detailed the proposal in question
- Was a strategic concept to replace the existing limited facilities
- Sport England modelling confirmed support for higher use and daytime community access, particularly to swimming
- Was located at a gateway to the town and had good access/transport links
- Swim England supported the proposals
- Design was suitable for a community pool
- Majority of consultation responses had been positive
- Proposal would compliment other leisure facilities
- Was a significant investment in Stone
- Would form a key, modern facility for years to come
- Was a key part of the Council's Health and Wellbeing Strategy

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

- Referred to letter sent from Stone Town Council to SBC
- Proposal would have a harmful impact on Stone
- Residents are in favour of improved leisure facilities
- Was poorly thought out piece meal plan with no sports hall provided
- Building was not sympathetic to its surroundings
- Weak consultation carried out not reflecting needs of public
- Building was smaller than that at Alleyne's
- Referred to Canal and River Trust statement and noted associated conservation area, including retention of nearby woodland
- Quoted comments of Borough Conservation Officer
- Was important that Stone Town Council played a role in the process
- Detailed conversation held with Planning Officers regarding STC letter of 1 June clearly setting out their intentions – was not published as part of the report
- Planning protocol had not been followed
- A verbal summary of updates was not acceptable
- Asked for deferment until full consideration of STC report undertaken and proper planning procedures adhered to

The Development Manager responded accordingly to the comments raised regarding furnishing Members with all relevant information regarding an application, again reiterating the normal accepted practice of verbally updating Members of any additional information received since publication of the meeting agenda.

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

- Current facilities were dilapidated
- Proposal was of huge benefit to Stone

It was subsequently moved by Councillor J K Price and seconded by Councillor C V Trowbridge that the application be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report with the proposed amendment to condition 17.

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

**RESOLVED:-** that planning application No 17/26207/FUL be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning with the amendment to condition 17.

PC36 **Application No 17/26409/COU - 9 Melbourne Crescent, Stafford**

(Recommend approval, subject to conditions).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter.

Prior to her presentation, the Business Improvement Manager summarised an additional neighbour letter objecting to the proposal, and suggested inclusion of an additional condition pertaining to permitted development rights.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Ms C Crane raised the following points during her objections to the proposal:-

- Resident of 1 Tasman Drive
- Proposed scale was out of keeping with the area
- Garage would be 5' wider than other local examples
- Suggested fence would be out of character to the area
- Reduced width of grass verge would reduce visibility
- Provision of new access would impact on parking in a quiet street
- Openness of the area would be reduced
- Development would lead to loss of green space and a mature tree
- Requested refusal or deferment for site visit to allow Members to judge the detrimental effect
- 6 out of 8 residents have raised objections to the plans

Councillor M E Jennings, Littleworth Ward Member, at the invitation of the Chairman addressed the meeting and raised the following issues:-

- Called application in due to considerable impact on the openness of the area
- Identified examples of low fencing in the location
- (Displayed Image 5)
- Street was a small open cul-de-sac
- Was very significant that 6 out of 8 residents had objected
- Believed that Councillors had a responsibility to the health and well being of local residents
- Aerial view of the site was small and difficult to understand
- If in any doubt Members should visit the site
- Appearance would not be similar to No 11 Melbourne Crescent, displayed Image 4 and noted differences
- Garage was not of similar size to existing, was bigger in all dimensions
- (Displayed Images 2 and 3)
- Description of the fence panels was confusing
- Would like to see the application refused

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

- Provision of extra condition re height of fence
- Height of the garage in question
- Removal of green area

It was subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by Councillor M G Dodson that the application be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report, plus an additional condition relating to the height of the fence in question.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 17/26409/COU be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning, and the following extra condition:-

The fence shown adjacent to the new driveway without height annotation on the 1:100 Proposed Boundary fence and garage 9 Melbourne Crescent (amended plan received 22 June 2017) shall not exceed 0.6 metres in height.

**PC37 48 Tithe Barn Road, Stafford**

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning (V1 03/07/17).

It was subsequently moved by Councillor R M Sutherland and seconded by Councillor A J Perkins that the recommendation as set out in the report be approved.

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

RESOLVED:- that it is not expedient to take enforcement action and no further action be taken.

CHAIRMAN