



Chair - Councillor E G R Jones

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

Councillors:

A G Cooper

J Hood

R A James

P W Jones

B McKeown

A Nixon

G P K Pardesi

C V Trowbridge

Also present:- Councillors P M M Farrington, R M Smith and  
M J Winnington

Officers in attendance:-

Mr J Holmes	-	Development Manager
Mr E Handley	-	Senior Planning Officer
Mrs S Moss	-	Planning and Conservation Officer
Ms R Hurst	-	Principal Solicitor
Mr A Bailey	-	Scrutiny Officer

**PC52 Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors F Beatty (Substitute R A James), A P Edgeller and A D Hobbs.

**PC53 Declarations of Interest/Lobbying**

Councillor G P K Pardesi declared that she had been lobbied in respect of Application Number 21/35062/FUL.

Councillor J Hood declared that she had been lobbied in respect of Application Number 21/35049/FUL.

**PC54 Application No 21/35062/FUL - Proposed Change of Use of Land for a Private Romany Gypsy Site for one family, siting of no more than two mobile homes and four touring caravans and the construction of a Dayroom - Sandybank Land at Radmore Lane, Gnosall, Stafford, ST20 0EG**

(Recommendation Approve, subject to conditions).

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

The Development Manager reported upon various amendments caused by the formatting of the report and the need to delete Condition No 5.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr R Greatrex raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- Represented objectors on behalf of Gnosall Parish Council
- The proposal was outside of the designated settlement boundary
- The site was located in open countryside
- There was an access issue to the site with poor visibility
- The need for this proposal had not been demonstrated
- The family was already housed in Telford
- Expressed concern that the local primary school could get over subscribed
- Expressed concern that consultations had in the past been ignored
- Other types of applications on this land would be refused
- Permission was refused in 2012 and the previous reasons for refusal were still relevant
- The current proposal included a 3m high acoustic fence and there were concerns in respect of the proposed soakaway
- There was no overriding need for this proposal
- Requested the Committee to refuse the proposal

Ms K Newman raised the following points during her support for the proposal:-

- A local resident who welcomed the proposal
- This was the perfect opportunity to provide a Romani family with a home and to keep a homeless child safe
- The approval rating for this proposal was high following the consultation
- The family's current property was very overcrowded
- The concerns over this proposal were unfounded
- There was no evidence of a negative effect of this proposal
- The Parish Council should help all of its residents including a Romani family
- Relations would improve if this proposal was approved

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

- An identical application to this was refused some time ago for many reasons
- Nothing has changed since then and this was a larger settlement
- It was probably true that the current pitch was not satisfactory
- This was green land and any housing development on it would be refused

- Should not need to help Telford and Wrekin Council
- There was a high level of weight that the Council had a 5 year supply of housing land
- There were sufficient sites available in the emerging new Local Plan
- The New Local Plan Preferred Options Report did not include this site
- There was no identified need for this site in the Local Plan

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor P M M Farrington, Gnosall and Woodseaves Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The issue surrounding this proposal was related to the 5 year supply of housing land
- The proposal did not make sense as more accommodation could have been provided
- The report suggested that there potentially a supply of 25 additional pitches to be developed during the next 5 years
- The report demonstrated proof that the housing need had been met
- Requested the Committee to refuse the application

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

- Confirmation that the Preferred Options Report of the New Local Plan had no weight as it was still under consultation and would not be approved for at least two more years
- Policy C6 of The Plan for Stafford Borough was specific for the determination of Gypsy and Traveller pitches to satisfy local need, which was not in existence when the previous application was refused
- A recent Public Enquiry had agreed that the Local Planning Authority did not currently have a demonstrable 5 year supply of housing land
- The reasons as to why a previous proposal was rejected in 2012 should be disregarded as Policy C6 of the Plan for Stafford Borough should carry weight
- The current Local Plan for Stafford Borough period was from 2020 to 2040 and it must meet housing needs
- An explanation of the proposed sewage treatment works
- Confirmation that there was a farmhouse nearby with utilities
- Confirmation of the importance of Policy C6 of the Plan for Stafford Borough
- A commercial caravan site would not be allowed on this site
- Belief that the current consultation on the Preferred Options Report of the New Local Plan should be a material consideration
- Confirmation that the current site was overcrowded and that two units were required
- Confirmation that there was a similar site to this proposal at Sandon Road/ Salt Road

- 392 representations of objections showed the strength of feeling against this proposal
- 392 representations did not necessarily mean 392 separate people

It was then subsequently moved by Councillor A Nixon and seconded by Councillor J Hood that Planning Application Number 21/35062/FUL be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Head of Development, including the deletion of Condition No 5.

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

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 21/35062/FUL be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, including the deletion of Condition No 5.

*The Committee took a short comfort break at this point. The recording was paused and re-started again upon the resumption of the meeting.*

**PC55 Application No 21/35049/FUL - Proposed Variation of condition 2 (plans) of 19/31557/FUL - Land at St Johns Church, Granville Terrace, Stone**

(Recommendation Approve, subject to conditions).

At this point, the Chairman read out the following statement from Councillor R Kenney, St Michael's and Stonefield Ward Member:-

"Can I please give my apologies as I am unable to attend in person this evening as I have a prior engagement that has been organised for several months.

The call in is on behalf of neighbours who are intending to speak this evening. I will not be making anymore representations other than those in my call in and advising that I have called in the item on behalf of the neighbours."

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported upon the receipt of addition neighbour representation and the need for an additional Condition No 6.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr K Handy raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- Lived next door to the church
- Requested the committee to either reject the proposal or defer the application for a site visit
- Quoted paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework

- Queried whether the public at large would benefit from ventilation of the property
- There was no evidence to support the proposal
- The developer should not have renovated the property
- Had previously 125 years of privacy from the property
- Argued that the windows were peripheral
- A site visit to the property would make the situation clearer to see

Mr A Howells raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Clarified the situation in respect of the windows
- Explained the appeal decision
- All of the works had been undertaken in accordance with the Local Planning Authority
- There were 4 plots currently unoccupied
- The only fault found during the appeal was the failure to advertise the discharge of a condition
- There was no fault found by the Conservation Officer
- All of the restoration works had been undertaken with methodology
- The distance between neighbouring properties was within guidelines
- Clarified the opaque glazing
- The proposal had been passed by an inspector on appeal

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

- Clarification that the Conditions granted at the Appeal were extant
- An explanation of the need for the addition Condition No 6
- Clarification as to why the stained glass windows could not be reinstalled
- Clarification of the colouring and apertures of the windows
- Clarification of the red edge of the site plan
- Clarification as to guidance in relation to the loss of privacy and confirmation that the rooms concerned were not habitable
- Queried as why all of the glass in the windows could not be opaque and confirmation that this was a balance of amenity versus privacy
- The building was in a poor state of disrepair and has now been preserved as a Heritage Asset
- The need for a Unilateral Undertaking to be incorporated as part of the recommendation

It was then moved by Councillor A G Cooper and seconded by Councillor R A James that Planning Application Number 21/35049/FUL be approved subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, a Unilateral Undertaking and an additional Conditional No 6 and a further additional Condition concerning obscure glazing to the upper windows on the first floor.

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

It was then subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by Councillor J Hood that Planning Application Number 21/35049/FUL be approved subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, including a Unilateral Undertaking and an additional Condition No 6.

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

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 21/35049/FUL be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, including a Unilateral Undertaking and the following additional Condition No 6:-

6. Notwithstanding any description/details within the application documents, and before unit 5 is first brought into use, the following windows within unit 5 shall be installed in accordance with the following and thereafter retained as such:
  - First floor, southeast-facing, window serving bedroom 5 (frame 10) shall be obscure glazed and non-opening to a height of 1.7m above floor level.
  - First floor, southwest-facing, window serving the ensuite bathroom to bedroom 5 (frame 14) shall be obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m above floor level and hung from the right-hand side (external).
  - First floor, southwest-facing window serving the landing (frame 14) shall be obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m above floor level and hung from the right-hand side (external).
  - First floor, southwest-facing window serving the landing (frame 13) shall be obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m above floor level, the left-hand casement shall be non-opening, and the right-hand casement shall be hung from the right-hand side (external).

**PC56 Application 21/35101/LBC - Proposed retention of unauthorised works to the church and erection of a two-storey rear extension (following demolition of existing single-storey extension) to convert the building into five residential units - Land at St Johns Church, Granville Terrace, Stone**

(Recommendation Approve, subject to conditions).

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported upon the need for an additional Condition No 12.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mrs E Handy raised the following points during her objection to the proposal:-

- Requested the Committee to defer consideration of the proposal for a site visit
- The changes made to the property were a criminal offence and errors had been made
- The illegal works had undermined the privacy and security
- There had been very substantial harm caused to the property
- The new windows were an abomination
- There were no public benefits to the proposal
- Did not believe that the Committee could make an informed decision without a site visit
- Believed that the report was floored

Mr A Howells raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- The windows at the property had been replaced at the behest of the Conservation Officer
- Any work that had been undertaken illegally at the property was done so at the behest of the Local Planning Authority
- The only illegality was the failure to advertise the discharge of a condition
- There was no facility for public amenity with the listed building consent
- There was no breach of planning permission and had not done anything wrong

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

- Confirmation that the previous Conservation Officer's notes were available on the file
- Clarification that the previous Conservation officer had been dealing with the Conditions imposed by the Inspector

It was then subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by Councillor J Hood that Planning Application Number 21/35101/LBC be approved subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, including an additional Condition No 12.

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

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 21/35101/LBC be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development, including the following additional Condition No 12:-

12. Notwithstanding condition 6 of this consent, and before unit 5 is first brought into use, the following windows within unit 5 shall be installed in accordance with the following and thereafter retained as such:
  - First floor, southeast-facing, window serving bedroom 5 (frame 10) shall be obscure glazed and non-opening to a height of 1.7m above floor level.
  - First floor, southwest-facing, window serving the en-suite bathroom to bedroom 5 (frame 14) shall be obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m above floor level and hung from the right-hand side (external)
  - First floor, southwest-facing window serving the landing (frame 14) shall be obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m above floor level and hung from the right-hand side (external).
  - First floor, southwest-facing window serving the landing (frame 13) shall be obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m above floor level, the left-hand casement shall be non-opening, and the right-hand casement shall be hung from the right-hand side (external).

**PC57 Application No 21/35171/LBC - Proposed Retention of unauthorised works to include the repositioning of roof lights approved by listed building consent APP/Y3425/Y/16/3164144 and internal works to include the removal of a staircase, removal of internal walls within units 1 and 2 and other minor alterations - Land at St Johns Church, Granville Terrace, Stone**

(Recommendation Approve, subject to conditions).

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

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr A Howells raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Explained the reasons that lay behind the unauthorised works
- The application that had been brought forward at the behest of the Conservation Officer had been refused
- The situation was out of his control



- There were restrictions imposed from the Judicial Review
- This proposal had practical implications

It was then subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by Councillor B McKeown that Planning Application Number 21/35171/LBC be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

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

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 21/35171/LBC be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

**PC58 Planning Appeals**

Considered the report of the Head of Development.

Notification of the following appeal had been received:-

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>22/35819/FUL</b>  <b>Delegated Refusal</b>	Blacklake Farm 85 Hilderstone Road Meir Heath	Removal of condition 2 (pd rights) on 19/30024/FUL

**PC59 WKS3/00255/EN21 - PARK HOUSE, PARK LANE, BROCTON, STAFFORD**

Considered the joint report of the Head of Development and Head of Law and Administration regarding the erection of a carport to the front elevation of the property without the benefit of planning permission.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor R A James and seconded by Councillor A Nixon that the recommendation as set out in the joint report be approved.

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

RESOLVED:- that appropriate action be authorised to include all steps including the instigation of court proceedings and any work required to secure the removal of the car port.

CHAIR