

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, 11 JULY, 2012 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. | Pearson, A. |
| Davies, D.N. | Rowley, J. |
| Fisher, P. | Sutherland, M. |
| Freeman, Miss M. | Todd, B. |
| Morgan, C.W.J. | Whitehouse, Mrs. L.M. |

168. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J. Bernard, Mrs. P.Z. Stretton and Mrs. D.M. Todd.

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

| <u>Member</u> | <u>Nature of Interest</u> | <u>Type</u> |
|---------------|---|--------------------------|
| Davies, D.N. | Application CH/12/0167, Change of use of residential dwelling to residential dwelling and cattery business, Birchwood, Kingsley Wood Road, Rugeley – Member is the Applicant | Personal and Prejudicial |
| Fisher, P.A. | Application CH/12/0167, Change of use of residential dwelling to residential dwelling and cattery business, Birchwood, Kingsley Wood Road, Rugeley – Member is a personal friend of the Applicant | Personal and Prejudicial |
| Rowley, J. | Application CH/12/180, Residential Development – demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two 4 bedroom houses, 26 West Butts Road, Rugeley – Member is a friend of the objector speaking | Personal and Prejudicial |

in connection with the application

| | | |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|
| Sutherland, M. | Application CH/12/180, Residential Development – demolition of existing dwellings and erection of two 4 bedroom houses, 26 West Butts Road, Rugeley – Member is a friend of the objector speaking in connection with the application | Personal and Prejudicial |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|

170. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillors F.W.C. Allen, D.N. Davies, P.A. Fisher and Mrs. L. Whitehouse declared they had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/12/180, Residential development – demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two 4 bedroom houses, 26 West Butts Road, Rugeley.

Councillor F.W.C. Allen declared he had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/12/176, erection of a two storey supported living development, comprising of six 1 bedroom flats and one 2 bedroom resource flat; with associated landscaping, parking and access, former garage court, Woodside Place, Cannock.

171. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 20 June, 2012 be approved as a correct record.

172. Members' requests for site visits

No site visits were requested.

173. Application CH/12/0180, Residential Development – demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two 4 bedroom houses, 26 West Butts Road, Rugeley

Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest Councillors J. Rowley and M. Sutherland left the meeting during consideration of this application

Following a site visit by Members of the Committee consideration was given to the Report of the Planning Services Manager (Enclosure 6.1 – 6.10 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Manager provided the Committee with an update on the application and a copy was circulated to Members at the meeting. He explained that since the report had been written the following additional representations had been received:

1. Email on behalf of Aidan Burley, MP, which states:
“I have been approached by two residents on West Butts Road who are objectors to this application. I would like to represent that the concerns put

to me are as follows:

- Overdevelopment
- Adverse visual impact, by reason of the scale and siting of proposed dwellings
- Detrimental impact of additional development within the boundary of the Cannock Chase AONB
- Adverse effect on road safety and infrastructure of extra traffic on West Butts Road to serve an additional dwelling

This application has much in common with application CH/11/0333, which the Committee was minded to refuse. To the extent that these applications are similar, in my view, that is the correct precedent to follow.”

Officer response:

1. Impact on AONB – the proposed development would retain the majority of the front hedge and whilst it would include the loss of some, non-protected trees on the site it retains the trees to the front (adjacent to number 24) and offers opportunity for new tree planting to the front. On balance this is considered acceptable.
2. The gaps between the proposed and existing dwellings are as follows:
 - a. Between number 24 and plot 1 – 1.2m
 - b. Between plot 1 and plot 2 – 1.4m
 - c. Between plot 2 and number 28 – 2.1m

Within West Butts Road the closest two properties are numbers 33 and 35 – 2.7m. However, within the wider context of the site, including East Butts Road there are numerous properties between 1.6m and 2m apart.

3. The heights of the proposed dwellings are greater than the surrounding bungalows. The street scene is however a mix of bungalows adjacent to two storey houses and the proposal continues this mix and is therefore considered acceptable.
4. The character of the area is made up of individually designed, detached dwellings set in generous gardens. In this instance the building to plot ratio is greater and gaps between proposed and existing dwellings is smaller than those nearby. However, plot widths are comparable to many existing dwelling plots in West Butts Road and East Butts Road. Also, properties opposite on West Butts Road and to the rear in East Butts Road are 2 storey. Officers remain of the view that the proposed dwellings are individually designed, detached houses, which conform to the wider character of the area.
5. Impact upon neighbouring trees. At the time of writing the Committee Report, no comments had been received from the Council’s Trees, Landscape and Countryside department. Whilst there has not been a formal tree survey there are no trees on neighbouring land within close proximity to the proposed dwellings and therefore it is maintained that it is

highly unlikely that the proposed development would have an adverse impact upon any neighbouring vegetation. The letter makes reference to trees within the gardens of numbers 4 and 8 however these do not abut the application site.

Comments from Environmental Services – Landscaping:

- Proposed development out of context with the surrounding street scene and the overdevelopment is detrimental to the affluent feel that the area currently benefits from;
- Access to rear of properties would be difficult
- Lack of tree information

He confirmed that the impact of construction works can be a material consideration but Officers considered that the construction of two dwellings would not cause too much disruption. However, if Members had any concern a condition could be added should permission be granted.

Prior to determination of the application representations were made by an objector, County Councillor G. Martin and the applicant.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the following reason:

The proposed development, by virtue of the size and siting of the dwellings constitutes overdevelopment of the site which results in the development having an adverse visual impact on the streetscene. The loss of the existing bungalow and replacement with 2 storey dwellings has a detrimental impact on the wider character of the area, contrary to Local Plan Policy B8 - Design principles for new built development.

174. Application CH/12/0169, Two storey side extension and new vehicle access, 139 Green Lane, Rugeley

Following a site visit by Members of the Committee consideration was given to the Report of the Planning Services Manager (Enclosure 6.11 – 6.19 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Manager provided the Committee with an update on the application and a copy was circulated to Members at the meeting. He explained that following the submission of amended plans the neighbour was still objecting to the application for the following reasons:

- Impact of proposed extension – loss of light, overbearing impact and impact on character of the area;
- Requirement for parking resulting in the loss of soft landscaping;
- Lack of access to rear.

He confirmed that County Highways had no objection to the amended plans. He

also explained that drainage can be a material consideration but Officers considered that as the application seeks an extension to an existing building which already has drainage, it was not considered a material consideration with regard to this application.

Prior to determination of the application representations were made by an objector.

RESOLVED:

(A) That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein with the proviso that only one parking space be allowed.

(B) That the following additional condition be added:

Notwithstanding the submitted site and block plans, no development shall commence until a scheme for the front garden area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted scheme shall incorporate:-

- i) Only one parking space;
- ii) A pedestrian path from the back of the pavement to the proposed front door, &
- iii) A fence and hedgerow along the boundary between the application site and No.14.

The approved works shall be complete prior to the extension being brought into use and retained for the life of the development.

Reason

In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Local Plan Policy B8.

175. Application CH/12/0176, Erection of a two storey supported living development comprising of six 1 bedroom flats and one 2 bedroom resource flat; with associated landscaping, parking and access, Former garage court, Woodside Place, Cannock

Following a site visit by Members of the Committee consideration was given to the Report of the Planning Services Manager (Enclosure 6.20 – 6.27 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Manager provided the Committee with an update on the application and a copy was circulated to Members at the meeting. He explained that an additional petition against the proposal signed by 32 people had been received. An email from the applicant's agent had been received stating that the access cannot be provided off St Aidan's Road because of:

- Inadequate road width
- No footpath leading to site
- St Aidan's Road being on a bend
- St Aidan's Road not being to adoptable standards

- Lack of adequate street lighting
- Insufficient width for service and emergency vehicles

He explained that confirmation had been received on behalf of the applicants regarding the proposed parking (8 spaces – 7 spaces and one spare), as follows:

- 3 spaces for a maximum of 4 members of staff
- 2 spaces for tenants
- 1 space for visiting friends and family
- 1 space for visiting professionals

A letter had been received from Aidan Burley, MP, on behalf of a resident. This reiterated the concerns raised by the resident and requested that they are notified of the Planning Committee process.

A further letter from a neighbour had been received objecting to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Overbearing impact
- Loss of privacy
- Overdevelopment of site
- Impact of traffic on St Aidan's Road, Woodside Close and surrounding area
- Article in Express and Star on Thursday suggesting that the proposal would go ahead regardless of objections

He explained that Officers were unable to comment on the Express and Star report and all other matters raised had been addressed in the report.

Prior to determination of the application representations were received from two objectors and the Applicant's representative.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the following reason:

The proposed development, by virtue of its size, mass and proximity to neighbouring properties, particularly the two-storey element, would have an overbearing impact upon the neighbouring dwellings, contrary to Local Plan Policy B8: Design Principles for New Built Development and H5: Infill Development.

Councillor J. Kraujalis requested that his name be recorded as having voted against this decision.

176. Application CH/12/0167, Change of use of residential dwelling to residential dwelling and cattery business; with outdoor boarding cattery in existing outbuilding with associated office, Birchwood, Kingsley Wood Road, Rugeley

Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest Councillor P.A. Fisher left the meeting during determination of the application.

Consideration was given to the Report of the Planning Services Manager (Enclosure 6.28 – 6.39 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to the determination of the application representations were made by an objector and the Applicant.

Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest the Applicant (Councillor D.N. Davies) then left the meeting whilst the Committee determined the application.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the following reason:

The additional traffic generated by the proposed use in a quiet residential locality would have an adverse impact on the environmental quality of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty contrary to Policy C8 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan 1997 and NC3 of the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 1996 - 2011.

CHAIRMAN

The meeting closed at 5.20 pm.