

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, 5 MARCH, 2014 AT 3.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M. (Chairman)
Kraujalis, J.T. (Vice-Chairman)

Allen, F.W.C.	Rowley, J.
Anslow, C.	Sutherland, M.
Ball, G.D.	Todd, Mrs. D.
Fisher, P.A.	Todd, R.
Grocott, M.R.	Whitehouse, Mrs. L.M.
Pearson, A.	

102. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Miss M. Freeman and Mrs. P.Z. Stretton.

103. Declarations of Interests of Members and Officers in Contracts and Other Matters and Restriction on Voting by Members

No further declarations were made in addition to those already confirmed by Members in the Register of Members Interests.

104. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillor Mrs. L.M. Whitehouse declared that she had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/13/0297, 463A Littleworth Road, Hednesford – Change of use from shop (A1) to takeaway (A5).

105. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 February, 2014 be approved as a correct record subject to Councillor P.A. Fisher being recorded as having submitted his apologies for the meeting.

106. Members' requests for site visits

The following requests were made:

Application CH/14/0051 – Beau Desert Golf Club – Rugeley Road, Hazel Slade - Installation of a containerised biomass system.

Reason: To assess the environmental impact of the development

107. Application CH/13/0404, Erection of a three car garage with office above, first floor side extension, side balcony and porch to front elevation, 11 Bishops Grange, Rugeley

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.14 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations in support of the application were made by Mr. J. Reynolds, the applicant's agent.

The Development Control Manager advised that the description should not read first floor side extension as this had been replaced by the dormer. Additionally, the drawing on Enclosure 6.4 showing the conservatory was actually the proposed elevation and not the existing elevation.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.

108. Application CH/13/0422, Two storey side extension, 3 Pagets Chase, Cannock

It was reported that this application had been withdrawn from the Planning Committee as the Applicant had agreed to amend design.

109. Application CH/13/0297, Change of use from shop (A1) to hot food takeaway (A5), 463a Littleworth Road, Cannock

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.25 – 6.32 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by an objector, Mr. Gare and by Ms. N. Hassan who was supporting the application (representing the applicant).

The Development Control Manager advised that there was an error in the recommendation as the words "in" and "a" were repeated.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the reasons outlined in the report.

110. Application CH/14/0015, Residential development :- Demolition of

existing dwelling and erection of 3 bedroom detached house with side dormer – 25 Stafford Street, Cannock

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.33 – 6.45 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations in support of the application were made by Mr. J. Reynolds, the applicant's agent.

The Committee raised concern that the property had already been demolished prior to consent being granted.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.

111. Application CH/14/0013, Demolition of existing primary school unit and construction of single storey building with rooms in the roof space incorporating 4 class rooms and amenity facility at ground floor and a further class room and storeroom above, Chase Academy, Lyncroft House, Convent Close, Cannock

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.46 – 6.55 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that the school were unable to attend the meeting to make representations but had emailed their comments in respect of the application and asked that these be read out to the Committee. The comments addressed some of the concerns that the objectors had raised regarding the planting of a hedge and development overlooking their properties.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.

(Councillor G. Ball requested that his name be recorded as having voted against this application).

112. Application CH/14/0020, Retrospective application for part change of use of part of the site to temporary storage building, Gestamp Tallent Limited, Quadrant Point, Wolverhampton Road, Cannock

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.56 – 6.64 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved for a temporary period of 3 years subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.

113. Application CH/13/0132, Residential development – 5 pairs of 2 storey 3 bedroom houses (with rooms in roof space), 3 detached 2 storey 4 bedroom houses and 1 detached 3 bedroom bungalow, Hednesford Court Office, Anglesey Street, Hednesford

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.65 – 6.82 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager explained the background to the application advising that the Committee had previously granted consent subject to a s106 obligation. However, the applicant had commissioned and submitted a viability assessment indicating that the development would be unviable. As such the applicant had indicated they would be willing to contribute £11,031 for a single education place and the compulsory £6,300 for the SAC. Officers considered that, on balance, it would be favourable to support the development with a reduced s106 contribution subject to the implementation period for the proposal being reduced from three years to two years.

Members raised concern regarding the applicant's viability assessment indicating that the development would be unviable and their request for a substantially reduced s106 contribution. Members asked that Officers liaise with the applicant to renegotiate the s106 contribution. It was also suggested that Officers look at the figures contained within the viability assessment.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred to the next meeting to enable officers to liaise with the applicant to seek further information from them to support their request for the reduced s106 contribution and to look at the figures contained within the viability assessment.

The meeting finished at 4.25pm

CHAIRMAN