



**Minutes of the Special Planning Committee
(Additional Meeting) held at the Civic
Centre, Riverside, Stafford, on Wednesday
19 July 2017**

Chairman - Councillor A S Harp

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 in present:-

Councillors L B Bakker-Collier, B M Cross and R M Smith

Officers in attendance:-

Mrs E McCook	-	Development Lead
Mrs S Lawson	-	Senior Planning Officer
Mr R Simpson	-	Regulatory Services Group Manager
Mrs J McGoldrick	-	Principal Solicitor
Mr A Bailey	-	Scrutiny Officer

PC38 Declarations of Members Interests/Lobbying

Councillor E G R Jones indicated that he would be speaking as a Ward Member in respect of Application Number 16/24484/COU.

Councillor P W Jones indicated that he would be speaking as a Ward Member in respect of Application Number 17/26271/FUL.

Councillor J K Price indicated that he would be speaking as an adjacent Ward Member in respect of Application Number 17/26366/ADV.

Councillor R M Sutherland indicated that he would be speaking as a Ward Member in respect of Application Number 17/26366/ADV.

Councillor G R Collier indicated that he had been lobbied in respect of Application Number 16/24484/COU.

Councillor E G R Jones left the meeting at this point and attended as a Ward Member.

PC39 Application No 16/24484/COU - Proposed use of farm buildings for light industrial purposes; car parking and access alterations; retention of gates - Former Blurton Poultry Farm Buildings, Barlaston Road, Blurton

(Recommendation approve).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter. The Development Lead reported upon the receipt of 10 additional representations in objection to the proposal.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr D Webster raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- Chief Executive of the neighbouring Douglas Macmillan Hospice
- Disappointed at the light industrial use of the land
- The proposals were unsatisfactory
- There would be significant impact on the Douglas Macmillan Hospice
- There would be an inevitable escalation of noise
- The Douglas Macmillan Hospice offered bereavement counselling and end of life care
- The hospice could not contend with rising noise and disruption levels
- The Douglas Macmillan Hospice was a place of tranquillity that had been located there for 40 years
- The proposal was unimaginative and lacking in vision
- The Douglas Macmillan Hospice Board had not been adequately involved in the proposals

Ms L Bailey raised the following points during her support for the proposal:-

- Represented the applicant
- The proposal was for a heating and lighting company
- Did not manufacture heating, ventilation and air conditioning
- There would be no trade counter
- Had outgrown their current home
- Concerns regarding the storage of gas were unwarranted
- Had great empathy over the impact of the proposal on the Douglas Macmillan Hospice
- Had taken advice of noise consultants
- Silencers would be used on vehicles
- The site would be non-reversing
- An acoustic fence would be erected
- The current buildings were dilapidated and in a state of disrepair

- Fires and vandalism on the existing site had caused significant damage
- Steps were being taken to remove the vandalism damage
- Security on the site was being increased
- The site would receive only one heavy goods vehicle every other day
- There were no proposals to extend the site

Councillor E G R Jones, Barlaston Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The whole site covered 5 acres that was close to the City of Stoke on Trent boundary
- It was beneficial to bring the site back in to productive use in order to reduce anti-social behaviour and vandalism
- The building was to be used for light industrial
- There would be no heavy machinery
- It would not be significantly noisy and there would be no great manpower
- The applicants were fully aware of the needs of the Douglas Macmillan Hospice
- The Douglas Macmillan Hospice was very important in providing vital end of life care
- The proposed conditions would ensure that the Hospice received adequate protection
- There would not be significant traffic issues
- Recommended the Committee to support the application subject to the proposed Conditions

In response, the Regulatory Services Group Manager outlined the noise mitigation measures for the proposal, including meeting with the both the consultant and applicant in order to develop a number of conditions that would reduce the impact upon noise sensitive receptors.

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

- Fully empathised with the concerns of the Dougal Macmillan Hospice
- The mitigation measures in place would reduce the impact on the Hospice
- Clarification of the protection measures in place and enforcement process should they not be adhered to

It was then moved by Councillor R M Sutherland and seconded by Councillor J K Price that the application be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 16/24484/COU be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

Councillor E G R Jones re-joined his seat at the table.

PC40 **Application No 17/26114/LBC - Proposed retention of ten circular openings - The Cottage, Norbury Park House, Norbury Road, Norbury**

(Recommendation refuse).

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

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr G Maxfield raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- The impact upon the proposal was not significant
- Described the historical function of the building following the granting of planning permission in December 2014 for a long term experiment launched by the Birmingham Institute of Forest Research to allow trees to be studied in their natural environment
- Permission had been granted for a change of use including new openings
- The principal listed building is the farmhouse
- There was significant evidence of other historic barns in mid Staffordshire that had circular pitching eyes
- The circular openings assisted in the functioning of a working farm and were therefore part of the intrinsic character of such buildings
- The proposal brought significant benefits to the local area

Councillor R M Smith, Gnosall and Woodseaves Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- Permission had already been granted for new openings on this building
- There had been no objections to the windows
- Either round or square windows was very subjective
- One barn in the area already had a round window
- The building was only deemed to be listed and was last used as a cow shed
- Existing parts of the barn had been crudely constructed
- Reference to comparable barns in Mid Staffordshire was disingenuous when there were neighbouring barns in Norbury Parish that had round windows
- Referred to Supplementary Planning Guidance related to windows

- A square window would give the effect of a more Georgian period building
- Enforcement of a square window was not a proportionate response

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

- The presence of the Conservation officer at the meeting would have been helpful
- The application of Policy N9 of the Plan for Stafford Borough related to the Historic Environment was purely subjective
- Confirmation that there were originally no windows in the barn
- Square windows were originally approved for the barn
- Confirmation that the building was Grade 2 listed
- The Committee needed to determine whether the round window was harmful

It was then moved by Councillor G R Collier and seconded by Councillor G O Rowlands that the application be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

On being put to the vote and then following the Chairman's casting vote, the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 17/26114/LBC be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

Councillor C A Baron joined the meeting at this point.

Councillor P W Jones left the meeting at this point and attended as a Ward Member.

PC41 **Application No 17/26271/FUL - Proposed variation of condition 2 of planning permission 15/23396/FUL removal of trees - Bishops Lonsdale School, Shaws Lane, Eccleshall**

(Recommendation approve).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter. The Development Lead reported upon additional representation received in respect of the proposal.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Miss K Lynch raised the following points during her objection to the proposal:-

- The removal of any protected trees should have previously been considered

- Condition No 13 of the original application had still not been discharged
- There was no garage proposed on this plot
- Agued that the trees were of good arboricultural value
- The appeal decision related to different trees
- This proposal has been put forward 9 months after the commencement of the development
- A Tree Preservation Order had been served and therefore their removal would be detrimental
- The trees were in good health
- This was a poor approach by the applicant
- Local residents should not have to suffer the removal of the trees
- Removal of the trees was contrary to planning policy

Mr E Ashton raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Represented Taylor Wimpey
- There was a need to implement the approved scheme
- Appreciated the concerns of residents
- It was necessary to remove the trees because of the damage to the footpath
- The Cherry Tree and the Pine Tree were of low quality
- The tree roots would be damaged by the development
- The proposal had been developed in full consultation with the Council's Arboricultural Officer
- The retention of the trees was not possible in the present form
- The Tree Preservation Order was issued after the approval of the scheme
- Requested the Committee to approve the recommendation

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

- Explained how the applicant had let residents down and removed other trees on the site
- The Council's Public Appeals Committee had requested the Tree Preservation Order on the site
- At this late stage it appeared that 4 trees were in the way
- Expressed concern that Conditions were being amended and deleted
- The trees were necessary to screen the development
- Urged the Committee to refuse the application

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

- Whether the Tree Preservation Order was placed after the application was determined
- This was a subjective opinion from two different Arboricultural Officers
- The trees were the subject of a Tree Preservation Order and should be protected

The Principal Solicitor advised that the trees were part of a larger group and their removal was not deemed significant if removed to the wider amenity of the tree group.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A J Perkins and seconded by Councillor J K Price that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal would result in the loss of landscape and natural assets that should be protected, conserved and maintained and as such would be contrary to policy N4 i(i), k(i) and N8 of the adopted Plan for Stafford Borough 2011 – 2031.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application 17/26721/FUL be refused on the grounds that the proposal would result in the loss of landscape and natural assets that should be protected, conserved and maintained and as such would be contrary to policy N4 i(i), k(i) and N8 of the adopted Plan for Stafford Borough 2011 – 2031.

Councillor P W Jones re-joined his seat at the table.

PC42 **Application No 17/26338/HOU - Proposed dropped kerb to create vehicle access for off road parking - 80 Old Road, Stone, Stafford, ST15 8HS**

(Recommendation approve).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter. The Senior Planning Officer reported upon an additional letter of representation in objection to the proposal.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr C Fallows raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- Objected to the proposal
- There had been no consultation
- The road was very busy and chaotic
- There were safety issues with this proposal
- Disagreed with the report

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

- Spoke on behalf of the applicant
- The Council had provided pre-application advice
- Planning permission was not required at that time
- An approved contractor was then identified
- Fully complied with the planning permission
- The area was very congested
- If vehicles was left on the road outside of the property, larger vehicles would not be able to pass
- Visibility was good when leaving the drive
- There were 6 other dropped curbs within 300 yards of the property

Councillor L B Bakker-Collier, St Michael's and Stonefield Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The road was very busy
- The property was part of a terraced block
- None of the other properties in the block had a dropped curb
- This proposal was in the wrong area
- The dropped curb was put in without permission
- The existing privet hedge had been dug out
- It was not helping parking in the area as people did not want to block the entrance
- The traffic had to be single file in the road
- Many pedestrians use the footpath
- Referred to the objections received
- Requested the Committee to visit the site

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

- There were no grounds for refusal as the Highways authority did not object to the proposal
- The privet hedge was not protected
- Queried the visibility splay from the drive
- It was a good use of the front garden of the property

It was then moved by Councillor G R Collier and seconded by Councillor I E Davies that the application be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 17/26338/HOU be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

Councillor J K Price left the meeting at this point and attended as an adjacent Ward Member.

Councillor R M Sutherland left the meeting at this point and attended as a Ward Member.

PC43 **Application No 17/26366/ADV - Proposed signage/advertisements - W R Davies - Nissan, Valley Drive, Stafford, ST16 1NZ**

(Recommendation approve).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter. The Development Lead reported upon the need for an additional condition relating to the hours of lighting.

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

- Supported the application on the basis of the proposed additional condition that restricted the hours of lighting

Councillor J K Price, Holmcroft Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issue:-

- Also supported the application on the basis of the proposed additional condition that restricted the hours of lighting

It was then moved by Councillor E G R Jones and seconded by Councillor M G Dodson that the application be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning, plus an additional condition related to the hours of lighting.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 17/26366/ADV be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning and the following additional Condition:-

8. The advertisement hereby approved shall only be illuminated during the hours of 07:00 - 19:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 - 17:00 Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays.

CHAIRMAN