

Chairman - Councillor B M Cross

Present (for all or part of the meeting):-

Councillors:

A G Cooper

F Beatty

A T A Godfrey

A D Hobbs

J Hood

E G R Jones

W J Kemp

R Kenney

M Phillips

C V Trowbridge

Also in attendance - Councillors B Mckeown and J K Price

Officers in attendance:-

Mr R Wood

Mr E Handley

Mrs J McGoldrick

Mr A Bailey

-

-

-

-

Development Lead

Senior Planning Officer

Principal Solicitor

Scrutiny Officer

PC37 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A P Edgeller (Substitute C V Trowbridge) P W Jones (Substitute F Beatty), G P K Pardesi (Substitute A T A Godfrey) and B McKeown (Substitute R Kenney).

PC38 Declaration of Interests/Lobbying

Councillor A G Cooper declared a personal interest in respect of Application Number 20/33371/FUL as he lives in Great Haywood.

PC39 Application 20/33371/FUL - Proposed residential development of 117 dwellings - Land Off Little Tixall Lane, Lichfield Road, Great Haywood, Stafford

(Recommendation approve, subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter.

The Senior Planning Officer reported upon an amendment to the plot numbers in the proposal.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr A Dunn raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- Represented Colwich Parish Council
- Great Haywood was a key service village
- This proposal was for 117 new dwellings
- There was no proposed improvement to the infrastructure
- The infrastructure was acceptable at the time for 77 dwellings
- This new application proposed an increase of dwellings from 77 to 117 to which Colwich Parish Council objected to
- The area would have a disproportionate amount of houses with a lack of disabled access
- The drainage and foul systems were outdated with the Trent Lane and Uplands areas being particularly affected
- Both Severn Trent and Staffordshire County Council were currently investigating the issue of flooding
- Manhole covers were being lifted due to the amount of heavy water
- The Local lead Planning Authority had consistently objected to these proposals
- Requested the Committee to reject the proposals

Mr A Seabridge raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- The proposals had been developed following extensive consultation
- The proposals were consistent with all policies
- This was an allocated site
- Surveys had highlighted a shortage of new homes
- This proposal would create an additional 40 new homes, some of which would be affordable housing
- The site already had approval for 77 dwellings
- The proposed density per hectare was below national guidance
- The highway access was already in place
- The report provided mitigation measures for open space, ecology and drainage
- Staffordshire County Council Highways had approved the scheme
- Requested the Committee to approve the proposals

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor B McKeown, Haywood and Hixon Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- Explained that these proposals amounted to development by stealth
- The site had a long history dating back 8 years
- Originally a proposal for 157 dwellings had been rejected and then 77 approved

- A variation of a condition in 2019 resulted in the closure of Little Tixall Lane
- This proposal was an increase of 52%
- There was a spacious arrangement with 77 dwellings, but not so for 117
- The proposal would dominate areas of hard standing land
- The arguments that “Its already there” should not justify a 53% increase
- The proposals needed to be better and not bigger
- The local amenity provision was non existent
- The proposals were inconsistent with the Council’s Climate Change objectives as most occupants of the new dwellings would be forced to drive
- Requested the Committee to reject the proposals

The Committee discussed the application and raised a number of issues, including:-

- There was a sizable difference between the approved and proposed schemes
- Concern the ecological corridor had been significantly squashed
- In terms of the provision of open space, concern that the proposals were contrary to C7 of the Plan for Stafford Borough
- Clarification over the revisions included in Policy C7(a) of the Plan for Stafford Borough and off-site contributions
- Clarification that the Council’s sports and leisure officer had raised no objections
- Concerns over the Design Advisor’s comments
- Concerns over the reduced space allowed for gardens and parking
- Concern that all properties would need to exit the site using the A51
- Claimed that although the open space was provision for 77 house was acceptable, it was not for an additional 40
- Concern over the removal of trees from the street scene
- Concern over the development’s carbon footprint
- Concern over the lack of social facilities and play provision
- Clarification that the proposals should be acceptable as they were within guidelines
- Rainwater in the area was sufficient to lift manhole covers
- Clarification that Severn Trent Water had raised no objections
- Clarification that the Government’s National Model Design Code dated 9 August 2021 advised that applications should be rejected if they failed in design
- Clarification of Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework
- Clarification that the Design Advisor had not objected to the problems, but raised concerns that were mitigated through Conditions
- Concern that the proposals created a virtual gated and isolated community with the only recreational facilities located off site

It was subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by Councillor J Hood, that Planning Application Number 20/33371/FUL be deferred for the following reasons:-

- Integration and linkage to wider village and Marlborough Close
- Distances between windows and garden sizes in relation to guidelines within the Supplementary Planning Document on design
- Improved structural planting within the site in respect of street scene and the appearance of car parking areas, and to wider views of the development
- Consideration of the National Model Design Code
- Confirmation of density figures and greater input from the Design Advisor on the redesign

On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 20/33371/FUL be deferred for the following reasons:-

1. Integration and linkage to wider village and Marlborough Close.
2. Distances between windows and garden sizes in relation to guidelines within the Supplementary Planning Document on design.
3. Improved structural planting within the site in respect of street scene and the appearance of car parking areas, and to wider views of the development.
4. Consideration of the National Model Design Code.
5. Confirmation of density figures and greater input from the Design Advisor on the redesign.

CHAIR