

Chairman - Councillor A S Harp

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

Councillors:

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

Also present - Councillor F Beatty

Officers in attendance:-

Mr J Homes	-	Development Manager
Mrs E McCook	-	Development Lead
Mr G Pearce	-	Tree Officer
Mr I Curran	-	Legal Services Manager
Mr A Bailey	-	Scrutiny Officer

PC75 Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Councillor C V Trowbridge (Substitute A P Edgeller).

PC76 Declarations of Members Interests/Lobbying

Councillor P W Jones indicated that he would be speaking as a Ward Member in respect of Application Numbers 17/26714/OUT and 17/26939/FUL.

Councillor E G R Jones indicated that he would be speaking as a Ward Member in respect of Application Number 17/26237/OUT.

PC77 Application 17/2465/FUL - Proposed detached dormer bungalow - Land rear of Jesmonde, Sandon Road, Hilderstone, Stone, Staffordshire

(Recommendation approve).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter. The Development Manager reported upon two further representations received in respect of this application.

Councillor F Beatty, Milwich Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- Explained the reasons for her call-in of the application
- In 2011 a bungalow had been allowed on appeal at this site, but this application was a big difference than what was permitted
- This proposal was only just in time before the expiration of the previous permission
- The neighbour was concerned at being overlooked by the proposal
- There were concerns about the design of the property as highlighted by the comments of the Conservation Officer
- Concern over this application in terms of its location in a Conservation Area and Green Belt

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

- Concern that the proposal was for a dormer bungalow
- The Conservation Officer believed that it was unrealistic to object to the proposal
- The amended plans addressed the over looking issues
- Concern that this development was on two floors
- Concern that a Planning Inspector may not have allowed proposals for a dormer bungalow on this site
- Concern over the location of the proposed windows

In response the Development Manager explained there was extant permission for a bungalow on the site and the Committee would have to demonstrate harm to refuse it. The ridge height of the proposal matched those of the surrounding properties.

The Legal Services Manager added that in planning terms there was no difference between a bungalow and a house, but re-iterated the fact that the Committee would have to demonstrate harm to refuse it.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor J K Price and seconded by Councillor C A Baron that the application be refused on the grounds of adverse impact on the Conservation Area and additional harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

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

RESOLVED:- that planning application No 17/26465/FUL be refused on the grounds of adverse impact on the Conservation Area and additional harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

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

PC78 Application 17/26714/OUT - Proposed outline application for residential development - Claremont Garage, Stafford Road, Eccleshall, Stafford

(Recommendation approve).

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

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

- Lived at 14 Marketfields
- Concerned over the ground level and the height of the proposed properties, which were many feet above his property
- The current fences were higher than the roof of the bungalow
- The proposed properties were to be located between three and fifteen feet from the boundary fence
- Privacy would be severely compromised
- Nine properties were preferable than the eleven originally proposed
- Eccleshall already had a worrying drainage problem and this proposal would exacerbate the run-off water

Mr C Edwards raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Spoke as the applicant and owner of the garage
- The garage had been in the family ownership for over 64 years
- It was the last retail petrol station in Eccleshall, but could not compete with supermarket prices
- The garage subsequently had to close as it was not possible to finance an upgrade
- It was now in a poor condition and did not enhance visual amenity
- Currently lived opposite the proposed site
- There was no intention to raise the height of the properties
- The proposal complied with all of the relevant planning policies
- Planning permission was granted in 1999 and renewed in 2002
- Requested the Committee to support the application

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:-

- Had spoken to local residents about this application
- Neighbouring homes would be affected by privacy

- Visibility splay and access arrangements were omitted from this application
- It was important to have houses built in the right place

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

- This was only an outline application and the full application would consider the layout
- It was important to ensure that all the issues related to overlooking were dealt with at the full application stage
- Clarification that the consent for nine dwellings remained in perpetuity

It was subsequently moved by Councillor R M Sutherland and seconded by Councillor A J Perkins 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 17/26714/OUT be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

PC79 **Application 17/26939/FUL - Proposed variation of condition 2 of planning permission 15/23396/FUL. Resubmission of 17/26271/FUL - Bishop Lonsdale School, Shaws Lane, Eccleshall, Stafford**

(Recommendation approve).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter. The Development Manager referred to a further objection received in respect of this application.

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

- There were 17 protected trees on the site
- 10 months was too late to protect the trees
- The space for the construction should have been taken into account during the original application
- Crown reduction was inherently damaging to trees
- Beech trees did not respond well to such works
- In July the Tree Officer had stated that there would be significant damage if the trees were pruned, so what had changed?
- Concerned that some of the conditions had already been breached
- There was a lack of correspondence and accuracy from the developer
- A sub-structure had been added to the site which further reduced the available open space

- Safety was an issue
- The proposal did not improve this part of Eccleshall
- Quoted relevant policies from the National Planning Policy Framework and the Plan for Stafford Borough

Ms J Smith raised the following points during her support for the proposal:-

- Outline permission was permitted during April 2013
- No exact footprint was available at that time
- The proposal was submitted during December 2015 and January 2016, with permission granted in September 2016
- There was not a Tree Preservation Order on the site when the application was first submitted
- The Tree Preservation Orders were granted in February 2016
- This proposal would mean that no trees were removed and an improved planting scheme would be provided
- The pruning work was necessary to correct defects on the trees and important maintenance
- Many trees had grown in excess of 1m in both height and spread
- The works would be carried out to British Standards
- The applicant was working closely with both the consultants and the Council to provide a positive scheme

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:-

- Expressed concern that it was too late for the applicant to discover that 4 trees were in the way of the proposal
- The applicant had not done themselves any favours and was determined to continue with this development
- Believed it was important to protect the land from the developers
- Urged the Committee to reject the application

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

- It was important that the tree works were adhered to
- Clarification over exactly when the Tree Preservation Order was granted
- Concern over the close proximity of the trees to the proposes houses
- The Council's Tree Officer supported the application

It was subsequently moved by Councillor J K Price and seconded by Councillor R M Sutherland 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 17/26939/FUL be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning.

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

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

PC80 **Application 17/26237/OUT - Proposed erection of detached dwelling - Land adjacent 104 Longton Road, Barlaston, Stafford**

(Recommendation approve).

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning regarding this matter. The Development Lead referred to the need for an additional condition.

Mr H Lufton raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- Spoke on behalf of a neighbouring property owner
- The proposal was poorly presented and speculative
- The access arrangements were disputed and impossible to achieve
- The proposed dwelling would overlook neighbouring properties and conflict with Space About Dwellings Guidelines
- The proposal was vague
- Urged the Committee to view the site
- The outline application was unsuitable and it was left to neighbours to provide a visual representation
- Should not have to guess the details of the proposal
- The Highways Authority admitted that the visibility splay could not be achieved, but had not accounted for the additional traffic
- 100 Longton Road would only be 10m away from the proposed development and 102 Longton Road would only be 13m away
- Requested the Committee to reject the new building

Mr R Duncan raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- The proposal was for a detached dwelling
- Barlaston was a key service village
- The principle of development on this site was acceptable
- The proposed windows that were the subject of concern were not principal windows
- There were no breaches of Space About Dwellings Guidelines
- Refusal of this application could not be substantiated at an Appeal
- Access arrangements were discussed on site
- Explained that visibility would be improved by this proposal

- The dwelling would not cause severe harm and its impact was neutral in planning terms
- The Highways Authority had not objected the proposal

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:-

- Had called in the application because of the concerns over the loss of privacy to 100 and 102 Longton Road
- Barlaston was a key service village
- The major areas of concern were Space About Dwellings breaches, the impacts upon neighbours and over crowding
- Further clarification on this proposal was necessary
- Referred to photographs that represented the location of the development
- It was close to neighbouring properties
- It was a busy road and the access arrangements were cluttered
- Visibility splays were unachievable

In response the Development Manager explained that the photograph displayed as part of the Ward Member's presentation was not accurate in terms of scale and location.

The Committee expressed concern that the access arrangements could not be achieved.

In response the Development Lead clarified that the Highways Authority had raised no objections and the proposed access arrangements would be an improvement to the current arrangements and be controlled by conditions.

The Legal Services Manager drew the Committee's attention to Condition 6 related to the proposed access arrangements.

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

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 17/26237/OUT 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:-

12. Notwithstanding the approved drawings the internal layout configuration shown on plan 'Site Plan/Location Plan' are indicative only.

Councillor G O Rowlands left the meeting at this point.

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

PC81 43 Foregate Street, Stafford

Considered the report of the Head of Economic Development and Planning and the Head of Law and Administration (V1 26/09/17) in relation to the display of two signs without the benefit of advertisement consent and listed building consent.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor R M Sutherland, seconded by Councillor J K Price 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 take enforcement action in respect of the two remaining signs and no further action be taken.

CHAIRMAN