

Chair - Councillor E G R Jones

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

Councillors:

F Beatty

A G Cooper

P W Jones

A Nixon

G P K Pardesi

C V Trowbridge

Also present:- Councillor L Nixon

Officers in attendance:-

Mr R Wood

-

Development Lead

Mr E Handley

-

Senior Planning Officer

Miss L Collingridge

-

Solicitor

Mr A Bailey

-

Scrutiny Officer

PC22 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A P Edgeller, J Hood and B McKeown.

PC23 Declarations of Interest/Lobbying

Councillor C V Trowbridge declared that she had briefly spoken to someone in relation to Application Number 21/34682/FUL, but would still be participating in the discussion and voting thereon.

PC24 Application No 21/34682/FUL - Proposed infrastructure works comprising of the main Primary Spine Road and Secondary Loop Road, drainage, the principal areas of public open space, including associated engineering works, pursuant to the S73 planning permission (reference 20/32034/FUL) - Land West of Stafford, Martin Drive, Castlefields, Stafford

(Recommendation Approve, subject to conditions).

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

The Committee viewed the proposal from the access track to and from Hill Farm.

The Committee arrived at the site at 9.50 am, departed at 10.10 am and reconvened at the Civic Centre at 10.45 am.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr M Collier raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- Owned a property at the end of the track on the site
- Had suffered from disturbance at the property from builders
- Had Little direct contact from Taylor Wimpey
- Had suffered from an assault due to the lack of signage around the area
- The private road had previously been blocked by the builders
- The developers were not properly exercising their obligations
- Concerned over the timescales that dust and noise would be created

Mr J Bonehill raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- The application addressed various demands
- The proposal included a primary spine road, bunds and provision for over 1000 homes
- The site formed a major portion in the West of Stafford Strategic Development Location in The Plan for Stafford Borough
- Outline consent had been sought in 2017 and amended in 2020
- Had worked closely with officers on this proposal
- There were no technical objections to the proposal
- All construction and environmental conditions would be adhered to
- Would take on board the concerns of the objector
- Encouraged the Committee to approve the application

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor C V Trowbridge, Rowley Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- A lot of the work for this proposal had been achieved in 2017
- Expressed concern that Mr and Mrs Collier had not been treated with the respect that they deserved from the developers
- Explained the frequent liaison with Taylor Wimpey during Phase 1 of the development and there were very few issues
- Requested that the developer fully co-operated with the neighbour and ensure that the bunds were correctly formed and that dust was restricted
- There was also a need to keep mud off the roads with wheel wash facilities
- Sought assurances that the conditions would keep the mud off the roads

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

- Confirmation that Condition No 20 was robust enough to prevent mud from sticking to the road surface
- The importance of maintaining a proper dialogue with the neighbours and relaying this message to staff on site
- Clarification that the impermeable areas of the site were due to future development
- Clarification of the access to the site
- Confirmation that the applicant had submitted a further noise survey, there were no objections from the Environmental Health Officer and conditions were in place to control the dust
- Clarification that proposals for green areas and planting would be covered by subsequent reserved matters applications
- Confirmation that the blocking of the private road was a civil matter
- Clarification of the phasing of the bunds and the fact that landscaping would be undertaken once the bunds had been delivered

It was then subsequently moved by Councillor C V Trowbridge and seconded by Councillor F Beatty that Planning Application Number 21/34682/FUL be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

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

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 21/34682/FUL be approved, subject to the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

PC25 Application No 21/34683/FUL - Proposed Variation of conditions 49 (plans) and 50 (levels) of permission 20/32034/FUL (PLOTS 1-442) - Land West of Redgrave Drive, Stafford

(Recommendation Approve, subject to conditions and the applicant entering into a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement).

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

The Committee viewed the proposal from the Martin Drive and Daws Court.

The Committee arrived at the site at 10.12 am, departed at 10.25 am and reconvened at the Civic Centre at 10.45 am.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr J Bonehill raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- This proposal sought retrospective permission
- During construction, there emerged the need for minor variations in levels
- Broadly, the site would now be more shallow

- The revised arrangements were detailed in the report
- The proposed changes were marginal and did not affect overall space
- Drew attention to the Design Advisor's comments in the report
- Requested the Committee to approve the proposal

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor C V Trowbridge, Rowley Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- Expressed concern that this was a retrospective application that was needed once the houses had been built and was therefore difficult to refuse
- The applicant should not have needed to make a retrospective application working so closely with the Local Planning Authority
- Queried which part of the site would be 3.6m higher

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

- Clarification that 3.6 m included the infill of a ditch, the majority of infill of the site is a maximum of 2.8m above the original ground level
- Clarification that the Design Advisor's comments could be controlled through Condition No 56
- An explanation that the decisions of the Planning Committee should be respected and a developer should not proceed without the appropriate permission
- Clarification that the floor levels had changed from a previous design and the applicant rarely sought retrospective permission
- The need for the applicant to complete a walkway at the rear of the houses

It was then subsequently moved by Councillor F Beatty and seconded by Councillor C V Trowbridge that Planning Application Number 21/34683/FUL be approved, subject to the applicant entering into a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement and the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

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

RESOLVED:- that Planning Application Number 21/34683/FUL be approved, subject to the applicant entering into a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement and the Conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

CHAIR