



**Minutes of the Planning Committee held at  
the Civic Centre, Riverside, Stafford, on  
Wednesday 23 August 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	G O Rowlands
M G Dodson	R M Sutherland
R J Draper	C V Trowbridge
E G R Jones	

Officers in attendance:-

Mr J Homes	-	Development Manager
Mrs S Wright	-	Senior Planning Officer
Mr S Turner	-	Solicitor
Mr J Dean	-	Democratic Services Officer

**PC55 Minutes**

Minutes of the meetings held on 12 June 2017 (x2), 19 July 2017, 2 August 2017 and 14 August 2017 (x2) were submitted and signed.

**PC56 Apologies**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor J K Price.

**PC57 Declarations of Members Interests/Lobbying**

Councillor A J Perkins indicated that he would be speaking as a Ward Member in respect of Application Number 17/26391/FUL.

**PC58 Application 17/25712/FUL - Proposed rural workers dwelling - Land Adjacent to Oaklands, Lapley Road, Church Eaton, Stafford, Staffordshire, ST19 5QL**

(Recommendation refuse).

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

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

- Hoped that Members had studied the application
- There was a conflict of opinion with the Independent Assessment
- Was critical of the interpretation of “Critical Need”
- Challenged the Business Sustainability conclusion
- Referred to a previous legal case
- Referred to Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework
- Noted the points related to essential need
- This was a unique site
- Detailed the owners of the site
- Noted and would comply with the requirement for an on-site residency to look after the horses (third party)
- The site would have fulltime security
- Would welcome a site visit
- There were no registered objectors
- Hoped the Committee would permit the application

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

- Clarification of the difference of opinion between the supporter and the Local Planning Authority
- Exploration of the fact that the business case for the proposal would be constrained if there was no permanent residency on site
- Highlighted that it could be sensible to defer the application until the accounts had been provided
- Could not see why the business would fail
- The nearest property was some distance away
- There was genuine intention for the business to succeed and be sustainable
- If approved, the accommodation could be tied in with the farm business
- Should defer the application pending the production of the accounts
- Clarification of the Court of Appeal decision in Redhill Aerodrome (October 2014)
- The accounts for the business had been requested, but not submitted
- The numbers of cattle and horses on the farm had decreased, which demonstrated that the business had declined
- Clarification that the applicant could be invited to supply additional information including accounts over a three year period and a business case
- Concern about building upon rented land
- Confirmation of the application site

In response the Development Manager highlighted the fact that an essential need for the proposed dwelling had not been justified, and as no accounts or long term business case had been provided by the applicant it

had not been demonstrated that the proposal is sustainable. He confirmed the timescales that this could take should the application be deferred and clarified the application site.

It was then moved by Councillor M G Dodson and seconded by Councillor E G R Jones that the application be deferred pending the submission of accounts and business case to support the proposed rural workers dwelling.

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

It was then moved by Councillor A J Perkins 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 following the Chairman's casting vote, the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 17/25712/FUL be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

*Councillor A J Perkins left the meeting at this point and attended as a Ward Member.*

PC59 **Application 17/26391/FUL - Proposed Erection of craft/retail units - Land Adjacent Unit 2, Oakedge Park, Lichfield Road, Shugborough, Stafford, Staffordshire**

(Recommendation refuse).

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

Councillor A J Perkins, Haywood and Hixon Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- This was a very small development in a very successful enterprise
- There were already six businesses in the development
- A 3 metre high wall already existed
- Only the roof would be visible from the A51
- It was therefore not intrusive or harmful to the Greenbelt
- The Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Office had not objected to the proposal
- Some improvements could be made to the design of the units, which could be secured by conditions
- Five additional car parking spaces could be provided
- There were no neighbour objections

- The proposal was supported by the Parish Council
- The proposal would support the rural economy
- Requested the Committee to permit the application

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

- The proposal was outside of any defined settlement boundary
- The existing buildings were converted barns
- Queried why the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Office supported the application

It was then moved by Councillor E G R Jones and seconded by Councillor R M Sutherland that the application be refused for the reason 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 17/26391/FUL be refused for the reason as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

*Councillor A J Perkins re-joined his seat at the table.*

## PC60 **Planning Appeals**

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning (V1 14/08/17).

Notification of the following appeals had been received:-

### (a) New Appeals

<b>App No</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
17/25822/HOU <b>Delegated refusal</b>	Mill House, Lichfield Road	First floor extension and conversion of garage to living accommodation

### (b) Appeal Decisions

<b>App No</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
16/25399/COU <b>Appeal Dismissed</b>	Knights BMW	Change of use of adjoining field to staff parking area
16/24832/FUL <b>Appeal Dismissed</b>	Long Lane Head Farm	Conversion derelict barn

<b>App No</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
16/23671/FUL and 16/23672/LBC  <b>Appeal Allowed Costs Refused</b>	Land at St Johns Church	Conversion of church and erection of 2 story extension
16/25056/LDCP  <b>Appeal Dismissed</b>	The Gables, Yarlet Lane	LDCP - Proposed storage unit
15/23238/LDC  <b>Appeal Dismissed</b>	Ivy Cottage Mobile Home Park	Use of land for purposes ancillary to residential caravan site for the storage of residents' caravans
WKS3/00135/EN15  <b>Appeal Allowed</b>	Greenfields Stafford Road	Large Shed erected without planning permission

**PC61 Junction of Timberfield Road and Blackberry Lane, Stafford**

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning and the Head of Law and Administration (V1 14/08/17) in relation to the erection of a vehicular gate without the benefit of planning permission.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor C A Baron, seconded by Councillor R M Sutherland that the report be approved.

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

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

**PC62 1 and 2 Ingestre Road, Forebridge, Stafford, ST17 4DJ**

Considered the joint report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning and the Head of Law and Administration (V1 14/08/17) in relation to the introduction of a flat fronted window on the street scene which deviated from the approved application 15/22776/FUL which illustrated the retention of a bay window to the frontage of the premises of 1 and 2 Ingestre Road, Forebridge, Stafford, ST17 4DJ.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by Councillor C A Baron 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 considered expedient to take enforcement action and it is therefore recommended that no further action be taken.

PC63 **Ongoing Enforcement Cases**

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning (V1 14/08/17) setting out the ongoing authorised enforcement cases.

The Committee discussed the on-going enforcement case at 3 Hunters Ride with the Development Manager.

RESOLVED:- that the report be noted.

CHAIRMAN