

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD AT BURNTWOOD LIBRARY, SANKEYS CORNER, BURNTWOOD
ON WEDNESDAY 10 DECEMBER 2014 COMMENCING AT 7.00 P.M.**

PRESENT

Councillor Drinkwater (in the Chair)
Councillors Bradbury, Brown, Campbell, Mrs Evans, Isaacs, Norman, Mrs Stokes, Walker MBE,
Willis-Croft and Mrs Woodward

In attendance

Ms J Minor, Administrative Assistant
3 members of the public

49. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Mrs Banevicius, Ms Brettell, Heath, Humphreys, Mosson, Mrs Rigby, Taylor,
Mrs Tranter.

50. 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.

51. MINUTES

Councillor Drinkwater, as Chairman, referred Members to page 36 para 2 of the Minutes and stated that S106 sums for education had now been reduced from £1,478,579 to £714,746 giving a total S106 sum of £2,499,361 instead of £3,263,194 and that the 72 primary places had been deleted and the 47 secondary places had been reduced to 43.

Councillor Mrs Woodward believed that there was a fall in number for primary school places and that there was capacity however there would be a need for primary school places if the development went ahead. Councillor Mrs Woodward stated that this was not the full picture and that a new school was being built in Lichfield and asked where the resources were coming from.

Councillor Isaacs referred Members to page 35 para 5 and stated that when the developers had spoken to officers from LDC and SCC that no education monies had been put in. Councillor Isaacs stated that the developers were looking for the maximum profit on the site and said that for many years BTC through the LDC Local Plan, National Frameworks and now the Burntwood Neighbourhood Plan had pushed for infrastructure first instead of housing and yet now 351 houses were proposed with no infrastructure. Councillor Isaacs said that 40% social housing on the site was needed.

Councillor Campbell asked if the formula used by SCC had changed.

Councillor Mrs Evans said that she was afraid that Burntwood would lose the number of school places and would receive none of the S106 monies and that we needed to keep

an eye on where the monies were going. We needed to retain as much money as possible in Burntwood.

The Chairman confirmed that the formula applied by SCC was applied to each house, size of house and size of development.

RESOLVED THAT

- (a) The Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 13 November 2014 (Minute Nos. 44 - 48) be approved and adopted.
- (b) A letter be sent to the Chief Executive of both LDC and SCC making it clear that all monies received from the development must be spent in Burntwood.

52. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|------------|---|---|
| (a) | 14/00675/ADV | All Saints | Partner Construction Limited
Former The Greyhound
Boney Hay Road
Burntwood | Retention of a free standing non illuminated sign |
|-----|--------------|------------|---|---|

COMMENT: Members felt that even though the signage was not a permanent structure, it was very intrusive in the streetscene and to neighbours and that the Local Planning Authority should ensure that the size of the proposed sign is reduced considerably and is not sited in front of neighbouring properties.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------------|---|--|
| (b) | 14/00792/FUL | Chase Terrace | Mr and Mrs Hewitt
22 New Street
Chase Terrace | First floor side extension to form family room and bedroom with en-suite |
|-----|--------------|---------------|---|--|

COMMENT: That the Local Planning Authority to satisfy itself that there is no potential for overlooking and over intensification.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------------|--|---|
| (c) | 14/00794/FUL | Chase Terrace | Mr E Smith
56 Water Street
Burntwood | First floor rear extension to form en-suite |
|-----|--------------|---------------|--|---|

No objection.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|--|--|---|
| (d) | 14/01025/COU | | Mr A Waheed
Walsall Burial Park
Burntwood Way
Burntwood | Change of use from cemetery building to mausoleum |
|-----|--------------|--|--|---|

STRONG OBJECTION on the following grounds:

- Inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
- Inadequate parking provision – Members felt that the provision of ‘overspill’ parking within the site as suggested by Staffordshire County Council is still inadequate. Members were informed that on several occasions cars had been seen to be parked on grass verges in Burntwood Way. Members felt that adequate parking needed to be

provided to meet the need and a condition imposed to limit the number of cars on the site at any one time.

- Highway issues – access/egress.
- No environmental impact assessment (noise/air pollution) has been provided.
- No traffic assessment has been provided.
- No proper screening for the whole site (visual impact, privacy) has been provided.
- No transport plan provided.
- If this proposal was for more than the burial of ashes then the Town Council would have grave concerns.

(e) 14/01026/FUL Highfield Mr S Morton
24 Westwoods Hollow
Burntwood Installation of porch
and new canopy to
front

No objection.

(f) 14/01067/FUL Chase Mr and Mrs C Barker
Terrace 25 Princess Street
Burntwood Increase width of the
existing detached
garage and replace flat
roof with pitched roof

COMMENT: Members were concerned that this proposal (increase width of the existing detached garage) would grow into a granny annex which would be totally inappropriate in the back garden. Should the Local Planning Authority be mindful to grant permission then a condition to say that no residential building or business can be operated from the garage should be imposed.

(g) 14/01073/COU Chase Bradshaw Brothers Butchers
Terrace Bleak House Farm
Ironstone Road
Burntwood Change of use of land
to caravan storage

OBJECTION on the following grounds:

- Highway issues – access/egress as access is via the existing access track off Ironstone Road which is already a very busy road/traffic island (one track road which is far from adequate).
- Over intensive use of the site (problematic multiple use once all the caravans are on the site).
- Inappropriate use in the Green Belt.

(h) 14/01125/ADV Chase Burntwood Town Council
Terrace Grass Verge Junction of
Stables Way/Ironstone Road
Burntwood Erection of a brick
plinth incorporating a
non-illuminated
welcome sign

No objection. This application is part of the Burntwood Town Strategy, part of the Burntwood Business Crew plan and is important to the community.

(ALL MEMBERS PRESENT DECLARED AN INTEREST IN THE APPLICATION AS THE TOWN COUNCIL IS THE APPLICANT).

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------|--|--|
| (i) | 14/01130/FUL | Chasetown | Mr and Mrs T Jones
5 Maple Close
Burntwood | Single storey rear extension to form bedroom and kitchen with bay window and canopy to front |
|-----|--------------|-----------|--|--|

COMMENT: Members were concerned relating to massing, space about dwellings, potential overlooking and the Local Planning Authority to satisfy itself that the allowed percentage over the original footprint has not been exceeded.

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|-----------|---|--|
| (j) | 14/00612/FULM
(Amendment) | Chasetown | Barratt Homes
Taylor Wimpsey
London & Cambridge Properties
Land East of Burntwood Bypass
Milestone Way
Burntwood | Erection of 351 residential dwellings, together with associated works including the provision of access, infrastructure, public open space and car parking |
|-----|------------------------------|-----------|---|--|

COMMENT: Members felt that BTC's original comments needed to be reiterated as only some had been addressed:

Whilst Members agreed in principle to the development a number of concerns were raised:

- Footbridge over to Chasewater - Members felt that there was already a footbridge from Church Street Car Park (owned by LDC) to Chasewater and what was needed was separate car parking this side of Chasewater. Members felt that parking for Chasewater would be outside of peoples' properties and this was an ideal opportunity to get some parking solutions.
- Right of Ways - Members felt that the right of ways through the development needed to be sorted out prior to the commencement of development rather than in the future.
- Bats - Members were informed that there were a lot of bats located at St Annes Church and Chasetown Community Church.
- Members had concerns relating to over intensive use and space about dwellings and felt that this could be overcome by reducing the number of residential dwellings from 374 to 250.
- Members felt that the 'Larks Rise' Estate is a good example of how a development should look i.e. plenty of open space, sympathetically designed, adequate driveway provided for parking off road, affordable housing, attractive housing design, built in road calming measures.
- Adequate bin stores must be provided.

Members felt that this application should be dealt with by the Planning Committee at Lichfield District Council as this is a major development for Burntwood. Members felt that the community fund/S106 monies resulting from this development MUST be spent in Burntwood to improve infrastructure. Members felt that a breakdown of housing type

was needed namely number of social housing, affordable housing, part buy/part rent and that if the Local Planning Authority are minded to grant permission then the plan approved must be strictly adhered to.

53. CANNOCK CHASE LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - GREEN BELT REVIEW

Councillor Mrs Woodward stated that Burntwood is known as a complete Town and the green areas/spaces around the Town must be preserved.

Councillor Norman referred Members to page 1 para 1.7 and stated that the sentence "Simple – no Green Belt purpose is considered more important than any other in the NPPF so no weighting has been applied in the method" was difficult to LDC and that the documentation received particularly the plans were difficult to understand.

Councillor Drinkwater informed Members that the Church Commission owned the parcel of land at Chase Terrace and in order to meet the deadline of 19 December for consultation responses the following response be submitted:

RESOLVED THAT

- (a)** Cannock Chase Council be reminded of the interpretation of the Green Belt namely to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another and that BTC would not agree to any Green Belt sprawl/joining up with Norton Canes and Heath Hayes or anything close to the boundary of Chase Terrace.
- (b)** A separate meeting with Planning Officers from Cannock Chase Council to discuss the review in more detail be arranged.

54. ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

54.1 Aldi Access (Minute No. 48.2 - 13 November 2014 refers)

Councillor Drinkwater updated Members on the new access to Aldi. He confirmed that the new access had been completed but not opened. Councillor Drinkwater stated that the electrical works needed to be buried further underground, a splitter island with no right turn needed to be installed and the widening of the road needed to be completed before the new access could be opened.

RESOLVED That the information be received and noted.

(The Meeting closed at 8.16 p.m.)

Signed

Date