

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD AT BURNTWOOD LIBRARY, SANKEYS CORNER, BURNTWOOD
ON WEDNESDAY 22 APRIL 2015 COMMENCING AT 7.00 P.M.**

PRESENT

Councillor Drinkwater (in the Chair)
Councillors Mrs Banevicius, Ms Brettell, Brown, Campbell, Constable, Mrs Evans, Mrs Fisher, Isaacs, James, Mosson, Mrs Rigby, Mrs Stokes, Walker MBE, Willis-Croft and Mrs Woodward

In attendance

Ms J Minor, Administrative Assistant
One member of the public
C Jordan, Development Executive (Policy and Implementation), LDC (from 7.45 p.m.)

85. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Bradbury, Humphreys, Norman and Mrs Tranter.

86. GENERAL DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

All District Councillors present wished it to be recorded that their views were a preliminary view and one they may change when they hear all the evidence at the District Council's Planning Committee.

87. MINUTES

The Chairman informed all Members present that having spoken to the Planning Officer at LDC, it was hopeful that the McDonald's application would go to LDC's Planning Committee in June 2015. The Chairman explained that the Highways Department and McDonald's Agents were the ones holding it up.

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 02 April 2015 (Minute Nos. 80 - 84) be approved.

88. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED That the following comments be submitted to the Local Planning Authority:

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------|---|--|
| (a) | 15/00227/FUL | Highfield | Mr D Barker
25 Lichfield Road
Burntwood | Erection of a 2
bedroom detached
bungalow and a
detached double
garage and associated
works |
|-----|--------------|-----------|---|--|

OBJECTION on the following grounds:

- It is considered that the proposal represents an unacceptable form of backland development that is not in keeping with the form and character of the surrounding area.
- Access/egress issues (very narrow access).
- It is considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.

(b)	15/00236/FUL	Chase Terrace	Acorn Group Limited Birch Autos 96 Cannock Road Chase Terrace	Erection of valeting and MOT testing building and expansion of car park including erection of lighting columns
-----	--------------	---------------	--	--

No objection in principle to the proposal, however, should the Local Planning Authority be minded to grant permission then the following condition MUST be included:

- That adequate parking provision is provided within the 'expansion of the car park' to accommodate employees as this is a business.

In addition the Local Planning Authority to ensure that the lighting columns are in keeping with the District Council's criteria.

(c)	15/00301/COU	Central	Mr R Archer Springhill Medical Centre 154 Cannock Road Burntwood	Conversion and first floor rear extension to form 5 no. apartments and associated works
-----	--------------	---------	---	---

OBJECTION on the following grounds:

- It is considered that not enough car parking provision has been provided.
- It is considered that not enough bin stores have been provided.
- It is considered that the proposed extension is very close to the boundary fence which would have an adverse impact on neighbouring property.
- Access/egress - it is considered that the proposed development is situated on a hazardous junction.

(d)	15/00315/FUL	Central	Mr M Miah Anan Restaurant 3 Bridge Cross Road Burntwood	Variation of condition no. 6 of application 14/00521/COU relating to opening times
-----	--------------	---------	--	--

No objection.

(e)	15/00318/FUL	Highfield	Mr P Davies Upfield Cottages 3 Upfields Coulter Lane Burntwood	Loft conversion with dormer window to form bedroom
-----	--------------	-----------	--	--

No objection in principle provided the development complies with Green Belt criteria in particular loft conversions with dormer windows and the potential for overlooking.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|------------|---|---|
| (f) | 15/00378/FUL | All Saints | Mr R Summerfield
4 Acorn View
Burntwood | Single storey rear
extension to form
conservatory |
|-----|--------------|------------|---|---|

OBJECTION on the following grounds:

- It is considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.
- Space about dwellings.

89. ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

89.1 Dog Fouling (Minute No. 84.1 refers)

Councillor Drinkwater informed Members that LDC's Environmental Health Officers have had some impact in the area in dealing with dog fouling.

RESOLVED That the information be received and noted.

(COUNCILLOR MRS BANEVICIUS LEFT THE MEETING AT 7.25 P.M., COUNCILLOR MRS RIGBY LEFT THE MEETING AT 7.25 P.M., COUNCILLOR MRS STOKES LEFT THE MEETING AT 7.25 P.M. AND COUNCILLOR MRS WOODWARD LEFT THE MEETING AT 7.25 P.M.)

90. LICHFIELD DISTRICT COUNCIL (LDC): THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

The Chairman welcomed Craig Jordan, Development Executive (Policy and Implementation), LDC to the meeting. Mr Jordan gave an overview of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - explaining that CIL is a planning charge, introduced by the Planning Act 2008 as a tool for Local Authorities to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of areas. It came into force on 06 April 2010 through the CIL Regulations 2010 with the most recent amendments in February 2014. Mr Jordan said that CIL would be more rigid than S106.

Mr Jordan explained that the Draft Charging Schedule consultation is the second stage for introducing CIL in the District. The proposed CIL charges/rates, in the Draft Charging Schedule are informed by evidence within the January 2015 Peter Brett Associates Viability report. This follows on from the consultation undertaken by LDC in March 2014 on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (taking into account representations received by LDC).

Mr Jordan stated that it is to be noted that the main purpose of this stage of consultation is to consult specifically on the Draft Charging Schedule which proposes the scale of charges that will be applied to development across the District.

Councillor Campbell asked what the relationship between CIL and S106 was in terms of charging. Mr Jordan confirmed that you cannot charge S106 and CIL to the same development.

Councillor Drinkwater mentioned the new housing development off Milestone Way and the 350 approximate houses but no infrastructure. Mr Jordan explained that as CIL is not in place then we are still reliant on S106.

Councillor Isaacs reiterated Councillor Drinkwater's comments regarding the new housing development. Mr Jordan stated that in theory it should come under CIL as it was anticipated that Autumn 2015 would see CIL come into force.

Councillor Mrs Evans stated that she would like to see a mechanism for review to be included in the process and suggested a review point of two years. Mr Jordan explained that subject to consultation/feedback, there would be a constant review (would not be put on the shelf for 10/20 years).

Councillor Walker MBE asked when CIL was going to 'kick in'. Mr Jordan explained that LDC were still reliant on S106 until after the consultation/examination and it was anticipated that Autumn 2015 would see CIL 'move into action'.

Councillor Isaacs questioned the zero charge for the blue boarding site on Milestone Way. Mr Jordan stated that this was to encourage development/marketability of the site.

Mr Jordan explained that the Parish Council would get 15% of CIL from eligible developments within the Town, however, if a Neighbourhood Plan was formally in place the CIL would increase to 25%.

Councillor Campbell raised the matter of flats/apartments. Mr Jordan confirmed that flats and social housing are exempt from the charges.

The Chairman thanked Mr Jordan for his presentation and attendance.

It was **AGREED** by all Members present that the following be forwarded to Lichfield District Council:

1. The recommended CIL rates to support development and economic growth in the District are a suitable balance between the need to fund infrastructure whilst ensuring that overall development remains financially viable?

No. Burntwood Town Council would want to have a better understanding of the rationale behind the decision to set the rate.

2. The recommended CIL rates are consistent with the evidence?

No. See above.

3. The supporting evidence demonstrates that the proposed CIL rates will not threaten delivery of the Local Plan as a whole.

N/A. Too early to tell.

4. The range of evidence used is appropriate?

N/A

5. The interpretation of evidence is appropriate?

N/A

6. If you have any other comments or related issues to raise in relation to this consultation, please include these. Please be as precise and concise as possible.

The increase in the differential between the rates set for most of the Burntwood ward and the rest of the District troubles Burntwood Town Council. The Town Council believes that this will impact on the yield from CIL for Burntwood, especially when the Neighbourhood Plan is eventually adopted.

Burntwood Town Council would also like to see a mechanism for review to be included in the process, and suggest a review point of two years so enough evidence can be collected about the impact of the CIL charging rates.

7. Please indicate if you wish to attend the examination with a 'right to be heard' regarding your representation.

Yes.

8. That an email be sent to all Members of the Town Council (enclosing the questions and answers forwarded to LDC) asking if further comments/observations be forwarded to BTC by Wednesday 29 April 2015 at the latest (closing date for consultation comments 01 May 2015).

(The Meeting closed at 8.25 p.m.)

Signed

Date