

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 16 JULY 2019

PRESENT

- Councillor Davies
- Councillor Hawley
- Councillor McLoughlin
- Councillor Perkin
- Councillor Redfern
- Councillor Rogers
- Councillor Swift

16. APOLOGIES

- Councillor Adams
- Councillor Garvey
- Councillor Jones
- Councillor Rushton
- Councillor Salt
- Councillor Smith

17. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- a) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Dispensations: None.
- b) Other Interests: Councillor Redfern, if residents from Victoria Row were in attendance.

The Chief Officer declared an interest in application SMD/2019/0364, a neighbour, and left the room before discussion took place.

18. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 18 June 2019 were signed as an accurate record.

19. BIDDULPH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

A verbal update on the meeting of 3 July 2019 Neighbourhood Plan Working Group was received. The Working Group were in the throes of reviewing the documents ready for Regulation 14 consultation. A letter had been written to SMDC from Urban Vision, to note their concerns about the Local Plan process.

The Neighbourhood Plan is due to begin consultation on 12 September so it is possible that the consultations would be running at the same time. The consultant had made it clear that the two documents would be in conflict; if there is no resolution, this would be determined by the examiner. Mr Larner (SMDC Executive Director) had not formally responded to the consultant's letter but had shared it with officers.

Councillor McLoughlin noted that the Local Plan had not been updated and contained out-of-date documents, some from 2006. He noted that the general public did not understand the difference between the Local and Neighbourhood Plans; it would need careful explanation during consultation.

The Chief Officer cautioned that if both consultations were held at the same time, the public would need to be carefully informed of the differences. Feedback received for the Local Plan by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group would be logged and redirected.

Councillor Hawley wondered if an article in the Chronicle could explain the differences between the two Plans.

Councillor Rogers noted that a lot of Councillors haven't a clue what's gone on over the past three years. Councillor Hawley noted that the Neighbourhood Plan meetings had been open to everyone.

20. UPLANDS MILL UPDATE

In his absence, a handout from Councillor Garvey was distributed and read from by the Chief Officer.

Councillor McLoughlin noted that the bins were overflowing again, the balancing pond gate was open, and the fence was not keeping young children out of the pond. The life-ring holder was empty and located in an area that flooded. The area had been poorly designed. Specific concerns should be fed back through Councillor Garvey.

Councillor Davies noted that work was progressing. The concerns about the pond area were planning issues and would have been agreed at the SMDC Planning Committee.

Councillor McLoughlin noted that Councillor Garvey had done a fantastic job; this had been dragging on for years.

The Chief Officer would email the paper to members.

21. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Councillor Hawley summarised each application before discussion of the detail.

The Chief Officer left the room before discussion took place on the following application.

SMD/2019/0364	14 Conway Road	Single storey flat roof extension with single storey side extension ** The Chief Officer will not be present during these discussions. **
<p>Councillor Hawley outlined the application and read the objections from one of the neighbours: one metre from the boundary, balcony would overlook neighbours garden and rear living area, building would block light to rear windows, would not be able to carry out work without access to neighbour's property.</p> <p>Councillor McLoughlin thought the juliet balcony inappropriate, it would give access to a future roof terrace.</p> <p>Councillor Davies noted that access could be allowed via a party wall agreement, this was not a planning concern.</p> <p>Councillor Rogers recommended refusal, as there were neighbour concerns.</p> <p>Councillor Hawley agreed, adding that the extension would block light to the neighbouring property.</p> <p>Councillor Adams thought the extension was inappropriate</p> <p>Councillor Hawley proposed that, given the neighbour concerns, the application is recommended for refusal.</p> <p>Councillor Davies queried if the concerns were valid planning concerns.</p> <p>Councillor Hawley proposed recommend approval, subject to a party wall agreement.</p>		

Councillor Perkins noted that the plans submitted did not show the relationship between the two buildings, so it was impossible to see if it had infringed planning laws on privacy and obstruction of light.

Councillor Hawley proposed to recommend approval subject to valid neighbour planning objections. The Town Council also had concerns about the light in the neighbour's lounge window and intrusion from the balcony on the rear extension.

The Chief Officer returned to the meeting.

SMD/2019/0367	Green Acres Tower Hill Road	Variation/removal of condition 1 (agricultural occupancy) relating to application 1361
---------------	--------------------------------	--

It was noted that Councillor Yates had some concerns about covenants in relation to this property; Councillors viewed a picture of the properties.

Councillor Hawley noted that a covenant doesn't prevent planning permission and planning permission cannot override a covenant.

Councillor Rogers considered the use of the property; the applicant is running his office there.

Councillor McLoughlin noted that the two houses now look like one property. We are not here to deal with breaches of covenant.

Councillor Hawley stated it is up to the neighbours to sort out car parking problems.

Councillor Hawley said that the use of number 12 is not relevant to the planning application, that would be enforcement, and proposed **no adverse comments subject to neighbour valid planning concerns.**

Councillor Redfern noted that the covenant could be removed.

SMD/2019/0374	10 Smokies Way	Rear 2 storey side and rear single storey extensions
---------------	----------------	---

There was consideration of the maps.

Councillor Hawley proposed no adverse comments neighbours have also extended. Agreed.		
SMD/2019/0383	11 Blackbird Way	Rear and side single storey extension forming new kitchen, utility and shower room.
Councillor Hawley proposed approval, subject to neighbour valid planning concerns. Agreed.		
SMD/2019/0384	99 Station Road	Proposed 2 storey side extension, rear single storey extension and single storey front porch
Councillor Hawley proposed approval, subject to neighbour valid planning concerns. Agreed.		
SMD/2019/0399	Brook Works Brook Street	Outline planning application for residential development comprising of the erection of 4 new build dwellings
<p>Councillor Rogers is happy with this application, if the applicant builds on the existing site.</p> <p>Councillor Davies noted this was outline permission only.</p> <p>Councillor McLoughlin could not oppose development of a brownfield site.</p> <p>Councillor Rogers thought it was an eyesore.</p> <p>Councillor Hawley proposed no adverse comments; agreed.</p>		

22. DECISIONS AND NOTICES RECEIVED FROM THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

		SMDC Decision	Town Council Decision
SMD/2019/0022	Knowle Style Farm	Approved	Subject to no contravention of the greenbelt
SMD/2019/0041	Towerhill Road	Refused The application site is located within the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. NPPF	Approved subject to no contravention of the Green Belt

		<p>paragraph 145 states that Local Planning Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt, unless they fall into one of a number of categories including, inter alia, the provision of appropriate for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, and the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Given the scale of the existing facilities on site and the significant size of the proposed extension it is not considered that the proposal is an “appropriate” facility for outdoor sport and recreation and that it would result in a disproportionate addition. The proposal is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is contrary to policies SS1, SS1a, SS6c, and R1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 26th March 2014), and the National Planning Policy Framework section 12 'Protecting Green Belt land.' The proposed extension does not have a secondary/subservient appearance to the host building, it would be attached</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>awkwardly to the rear (north-eastern) side and overlap the existing side wall resulting in a large, 5.17m high, wide gable fronting on to open fields. Extensions should harmonise with the parent building, respecting the dominance of the original building and being subservient to it. The application is therefore contrary to policies SS1, SS1a, SS6c, DC1, DC3 and R1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 26th March 2014), the Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide (adopted SPD 21st February 2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework including sections 12 'Achieving well-designed places'. Notwithstanding the fact that the applicant has provided land levels details, the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt with no very special circumstances to justify the scheme.</p>	
SMD/2019/0085	Hurst Bank Farm	Approved	Acceptable, providing Green Belt was not contravened. It would also be necessary to provide clarity about whether this is one or two-bed.

SMD/2019/0225	24 Wedgwood Lane	<p>Staffordshire Moorlands District Council in pursuance of powers under the above mentioned Act hereby REFUSE to permit the development described above in accordance with plans: 18-063-AS(0)01; 18-063-AS(0)05; 18-063-AS(0)06; 18-063-AS(0)07; 18-063-AS(0)09; 18-063-AS(0)11 for the following reason(s):</p> <p>1. The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, height, massing and visual appearance would fail to have a subordinate and relationship with the existing dwelling, and would result in significant harm to the existing character and appearance of the existing dwelling, contrary to Policies SS1 and DC1 of the Core Strategy, the 'Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD, and Paragraph 127 of the NPPF; thereby resulting in an unsustainable form of development, contrary to Policy SS1a of the Core Strategy and paragraph 11 of the NPPF The LPA has provided the applicant's agent with clear planning solutions which would address the above reason for refusal, which amounts to submitted a new application for minor development which consists</p>	No Adverse Comments
---------------	------------------------	--	------------------------

		of the 'conversion' or 'replacement' of the dwelling. It is therefore anticipated that subject to all material considerations, the above reason for refusal will be addressed in due course	
SMD/2019/0260		Approved	No Adverse Comments
SMD/2019/0265		Approved	No Adverse Comments
SMD/2019/0266		Approved	Returned to planners noting the concerns about the structured intensity of the neighbour concerns

The decisions were received.

Councillor Hawley outlined arrangements for applications received for August. If one or two were received, they would be circulated to members for comments. If a significant amount were received, a meeting would be convened in August.

The meeting closed at 6.25pm.

Signature

Date