

**Cannock Chase Council**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of the**  
**Planning Control Committee**

**Held on Wednesday 22 September 2021 at 3:00 pm**  
**in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Cannock**

**Part 1**

**Present:**  
**Councillors**

Startin, P.D. (Chairman)

Allen, F.W.C.	Kruskonjic, P.
Beach, A.	Molineux, G.N. (substitute)
Crabtree, S.K. (substitute)	Smith, C.D.
Fitzgerald, Mrs. A.A.	Sutton, Mrs. H.M.
Hoare, M.W.A.	Thompson, Mrs. S.L.
Jones, Mrs. V.	Wilson, Mrs. L.J.

**41. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A. Muckley (Vice-Chairman), Mrs. S.M. Cartwright and P.A. Fisher.

Councillor G. Molineux was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Fisher and Councillor S. Crabtree was in attendance as substitute for Councillor A. Muckley.

**42. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restriction on Voting by Members**

None declared.

**43. Disclosure of Lobbying of Members**

Nothing declared.

**44. Minutes**

**Resolved:**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 August 2021 be approved as a correct record.

**45. Members requests for Site Visits**

A Member requested that a site visit be held in respect of Application CH/21/0367, Gypsy residential site, Stokes Lane, Cannock, WS12 3HJ – Non-material amendment to Planning Permission No. CH/21/0040 to combine 2 no. proposed utility buildings into 1 building, which was due to be considered at today's meeting. The Development Control

Manager suggested that Members may wish to receive the presentation first and then decide if a site visit was still required.

**46. Application CH/21/0289 – 154 Dartmouth Avenue, Cannock, WS11 1EJ, Two Storey extension to the side to replace existing garage**

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.16 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Planning Technical Assistant advised the Committee that an update had been circulated in advance of the meeting. As the objector and applicant could not attend the meeting, he read the update out, as follows:

“Since the publication of the agenda officers have received further correspondence from the applicant’s agent and from the objector. These in turn state: -

**Letter from the Applicant’s Agent**

Dear Mr Sunter

I have been requested by the Applicant to clarify various aspects regarding the proposed extension.

Very few properties use garages these days in fact new developments do not provide garages. The proposal makes for the removal of the existing garage and replace with useful additional accommodation and kitchen and bathroom facilities and still leaves adequate car parking spaces at the front of the property.

The footprint for the proposal is similar to the existing within the curtilage of the existing property.

The whole scheme has been designed in accordance with the Authorities design and Supplementary Planning Document April 2016.

I would be obliged if the above could be brought to the attention of the Planning Committee.

Yours sincerely

Alan Morton (Agent for the above Application).

**Letter from the Objector**

Dear members of the Committee

My name is Peter Spiers and my wife and I own and live at 152 Dartmouth Ave, Cannock. We have lived at this property for 38 years and have no plans to leave our forever home.

I am 65 and my wife is 72. My wife and I are extremely disappointed that we are not able to attend this planning meeting for personal reasons that have been made available to Mr Sunter in an email dated 16th September.

Our main concerns are contained in my letter dated 20 July 2021 and emailed to Mr Everton at the Council on that date. I don’t want to take up the Committee’s time by

reiterating those details but would appreciate that the 20 July letter be read out if any of the Committee are unsure of its contents.

As mentioned, my wife and I are in our 60's and 70's and I understand that it is well documented that people's need for sunlight is often greater as you get older. I would add further regarding the appearance of the extension that whilst there are a few other properties in the area that look to be a similar size to the proposal for 154 Dartmouth Ave they each have an integral garage therefore do look like residential properties rather than commercial ones.

I thank the Committee for their time reviewing my and my wife's concerns."

Further to this, for the benefit of Members, the Officer then read out the letter dated 20 July received from the objector, as referred to in the update.

Officers then provided a presentation to the Committee outlining the application showing photographs and plans of the proposals.

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein and to the following additional condition:

"That, notwithstanding the details of the approved plan, the wall on the side elevation facing 152 Dartmouth Avenue shall be finished in render of the same colour as that on the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the occupier of 152 Dartmouth Avenue".

**47. Application CH/21/0367, Gypsy residential site, Stokes Lane, Cannock, WS12 3HJ – Non-material amendment to Planning Permission No. CH/21/0040 to combine 2 no. proposed utility buildings into 1 building**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.17 – 6.27 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised the Committee that, as part of the update that had been circulated in advance of the meeting, a copy of the layout granted under planning permission CH/21/0040 was included for members information.

The Development Control Manager provided a presentation to the Committee outlining the application showing photographs and plans of the proposals. He commented that Members should decide whether the presentation had provided the relevant information for Members to determine the application or whether they considered a site visit was required.

Members considered that they could not determine the application based on the information provided and a site visit was necessary in order to decide whether the application to combine the 2 utility buildings into one building was a non-material amendment.

Members also raised concern that the photographs shown by the Officer were out of date as the site looked very different now the larger amenity block had been erected (planning permission CH/21/0040 refers). Further concerns were raised in relation to stables that

had also been erected on the site without the benefit of planning permission. In response to the concerns raised the Development Control Manager advised that he would raise the concern about the stables with the applicant, undertake a visit of the site and advise the applicant of the options available to him. Additionally, he would ask the Enforcement Officer to check that the larger amenity block had been built in accordance with the approved plans and advise Members accordingly.

Members requested that the Officers write to the applicant to ask that he engages greater with both Heath Hayes and Wimblebury Parish Council and Norton Canes Parish Council in the future in order to build better relations.

**Resolved:**

That the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be undertaken to assess whether the application to combine the 2 utility buildings into one building was a non-material amendment.

**48. Public Speaking on Planning Applications, Tree Preservation Orders and Enforcement Cases**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.28 – 6.32 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

**Resolved:**

That Council be recommended to amend the Local Protocol for Planning Decision Making which forms part of the Constitution, so that the time allowed for speakers to address the Planning Control Committee on planning applications, TPO's and enforcement cases be reduced from 10 minutes to 5 minutes.

**49. Discussion Item – Timing of meetings**

The Chairman referred Members to the recent Council meeting where it had been agreed that the start times of Cabinet, Scrutiny Committees, Audit and Governance Committee, and Standards Committee meetings be amended to the later time of 6pm.

He advised that the Head of Governance and Corporate Services would be undertaking a formal consultation process to ascertain whether it was practicable to change the start times of the Planning Control Committee and Licensing and Public Protection Committee. He had therefore included this discussion item on the agenda to seek the Committee's view on this in advance of the consultation.

Members noted that site visits, which were held prior to the meeting, would need to be held in the daylight. It would therefore be difficult, particularly during the winter months, if the meeting moved to 6pm. Members agreed that it was beneficial to hold the meeting soon after the site visits were undertaken so that the details remained fresh in their minds. Several Members commented that consideration should be given to the effect later meeting times would have on Officers. They agreed that there would be an impact on staff who attended the meeting if they were held later. Staff were already being expected to cover the other meetings at 6pm. In addition, as applicants, their agents and objectors may be involved in the Planning Committee a move to a later time may not be suitable for them.

Members agreed that the Planning Control Committee should continue to be held at 3pm.

The Chairman noted the Committee's view on the timing of meetings and advised that this would be fed back to the Head of Governance and Corporate Services prior to the formal consultation process.

The meeting closed at 4:47pm.

---

CHAIRMAN