

142. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 May, 2020 be approved as a correct record.

143. Members' Requests for Site Visits

Members discussed a site visit in connection with Application CH/20/029, Land off Colliery Road, Brereton, Rugeley: Erection of a stable and hardstanding that was due to be considered at today's meeting. A number of Members considered a site visit was required. The Principal Solicitor advised that site visits were not currently being undertaken due to the on-going situation with the Coronavirus Covid-19 pandemic and the restrictions in place regarding public gatherings. She advised that the Development Control Manager would be providing a number of photographs along with detailed information in relation to the application as part of his presentation. Members were advised to listen to this presentation, and should they consider they were not able to determine the application based on the information presented to them, they would need to make a decision at that time as to whether they wished a site visit to be undertaken.

144. Application CH/20/026, 21 Stafford Road, Cannock, WS11 4AF: site redevelopment to provide 18 Room House of Multiple Occupancy

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.39 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Borg, an objector, speaking against the application. Further representations were made by Mr. Raxter, the applicant's agent, speaking in favour of the application.

The Development Control Manager provided the following update to the Committee, which had previously been circulated:-

"Since the publication of the agenda the applicant's Heritage Consultant has looked at the additional information submitted by local people in representations and has made the following comments: -

"In response to the further response received from [a local person] dated 19th May 2020, I have already accepted that No. 21 Stafford Road was built around the 1870s and I considered the physical evidence for this in my original letter. The [local person] has now provided more documentary information from the Land Registry suggesting that no. 21 Stafford Road was occupied by William Cotton. If this is correct, then the 1876 auction advertisement indicates that it was built shortly before the 1876 sale. It could quite reasonably be as much as 10-15 years before the auction. I don't consider that whether it was occupied by William Cotton or anyone else makes any material difference to my assessment of the standing building, which is set out in my original Heritage Assessment dated 9th April 2020. That still stands. It is very altered and of "negligible historic and

architectural value".

The further documentary evidence provided by [the local person] confirms that the very large parcel of land identified in the indenture and outlined in green on the map was part of one landholding, which at one time incorporated a barn and stable. We don't know any more the fact that the barn was probably (and logically) located on the "Barn Piece", which is, as my map comparison shows, an extensive plot - refer to my Figure 1.

For the record, once again I will repeat that there is nothing to suggest that the application site is the location of the barn or cowhouse. In fact, this would be a very odd location for such structures. The "Barn Piece" is a vast area by comparison with the current site of 21 Stafford Road. There is neither proof nor compelling evidence that it was the same site."

Notwithstanding the above the applicant has agreed to the provision of an interpretive panel which would outline the historical development of this part of the town. This could be secured by condition.

Officers confirm that the above is accepted and that the recommendation of approval subject to a section 106 and conditions still stands with the exception that a further condition is attached to any permission granted such that an information panel is attached on or near the site that outlines the history of this part of Cannock Town.

The condition would read:

The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a scheme for the provision of an interpretive panel outlining the historical development of this part of Cannock, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the works comprising the approved scheme have been completed.

Reason:

In order to better reveal the historical significance of this part of Cannock Town centre in accordance with the NPPF".

The Development Control Manager added that the County Archaeologist had now responded and had agreed with the Heritage Consultant's statement and there was no reason to attach an Archaeological Appraisal should Members consider the application be approved. Following a discussion with the applicant, it had been agreed that attaching the above additional condition to any approval would be appropriate.

Councillor P.A. Fisher had lost connection at some point during the update and re-joined the meeting at this point in the proceedings. However, as he had not been part of the whole of the discussions in relation to this application he was advised by the Principal Solicitor that he was unable to consider this application and take part in the vote.

After some discussion, Councillor Woodhead moved approval of the application

and this was seconded by Councillor Mrs. A. Layton. Following a vote the result was as follows:

Approval – 3
Against - 4
Abstain - 4

The Principal Solicitor advised that the result of the vote meant that the application had not been approved. A motion to refuse was then put forward and after some discussion withdrawn.

Members discussed the previous planning application (CH/18/247) which had been refused by the Committee along with the reasons why the appeal had been dismissed.

The Principal Solicitor advised that, as there were a number of abstentions and no decision had been reached, Members may wish to defer the application to enable more detailed information to be provided at a future meeting. The Development Control Manager added that the applicant could be asked to provide a plan showing the size and scale of the building in comparison to the previous application that had been refused.

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the application be deferred to enable more detailed information in respect of the proposed room layouts on the first floor to be provided by the Development Control Manager at a future meeting.
- (B) The applicant be asked to provide a plan showing the size and scale of the building in comparison to the previous application (CH/18/247) that was refused by the Planning Control Committee and dismissed on appeal.

145. Application CH/20/029, Land off Colliery Road, Brereton, Rugeley: Erection of a stable and hardstanding

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.40 – 6.58 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager provided the Committee with a number of photographs of the site, outlined the application in detail, and explained the positioning of the stable on the site.

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Philip Brown, the applicant's agent, speaking in favour of the application.

Members were advised that site visits were not currently being undertaken due to the restrictions in place as a result of the Coronavirus Covid-19 pandemic and that officers would look into this further if Members determined that a site visit was required to enable them to determine the application.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred so the Committee could undertake a site visit in order to assess the impact on the Green Belt as Members considered they were not able to determine the application based on the information that had been presented to them.

(Having declared a personal and pecuniary interest Councillor Mrs. S. Thompson left the meeting and was not present for the determination of the following application).

- 146. Application CH/15/0497, Blackfords Working Mens Club, Cannock Road, Cannock: Variation of Section 106 Agreement to Alter the Provision of Affordable Housing from On-Site Provision to a Commuted Sum in respect to Planning Permission CH/15/0497 for Residential Development: Proposed erection of 4 x two storey apartment buildings to form 26 apartments and associated car parking.**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.59 – 6.74 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

To approve the application to vary the Section 106 Agreement so that the requirement for the provision of affordable units on site be amended to the provision of a commuted sum towards off-site provision.

(Councillor Mrs. S. Thompson did not re-join the meeting and was not present for the following report).

- 147. Information Report of the Development Control Manager - Implications of the Written Ministerial Statement on Planning and Construction Working Hours**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.75 – 6.76 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Councillor Woodhead made the following points:-

- (i) The need to review the position at a future date and the Committee be kept informed on the position;
- (ii) To be flexible with hours of operation based on the location of the site;
- (iii) The importance of consultation with local residents;
- (iv) Wider communication of these arrangements to all Members and ensuring Ward Members were advised of any sites within their Wards operating under new hours;
- (v) A complaints mechanism for appeals to be developed; either to the Development Control Manager or the Planning Control Committee;
- (vi) To review operating hours based on the time of year

The Development Control Manager advised that he had noted the points raised by the Member. He would ensure that all Members were notified of the arrangements via email and Ward Members would also be advised of any sites within their areas.

Time limits for the period in which the agreed extension would run for would be agreed at the start of the agreement, as would arrangements for reviewing whether the agreed extension was impacting on amenity. Developers were being advised to continue to observe best practice during the construction process.

RESOLVED:

That the arrangements outlined within the report be noted.

The meeting finished at 16:55pm.

CHAIRMAN