

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE MEETING ROOM, BURNTWOOD LIBRARY, BRIDGE CROSS ROAD,
BURNTWOOD ON TUESDAY 23 NOVEMBER 2021 COMMENCING AT 6.02 PM**

PRESENT

Councillor Birch [in the Chair]

Councillors Bullock, D Ennis, Flanagan, Gittings, M Place, R Place and Willis-Croft

In attendance

Ms Minor, Deputy Clerk

Councillor Evans

Two members of the public [who left the meeting at 6.16pm]

PUBLIC FORUM

No questions were raised by members of the public.

21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Brown [dispensation] and Taylor.

22. GENERAL DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

Labour Party Members of the Committee declared a non-prejudicial interest in planning application 21/01893/PNH - 33 Water Street as the applicant is known to them.

The 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.

23. MINUTES

It was proposed by Councillor D Ennis and seconded by Councillor Flanagan and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Planning and Development Committee Meeting held on 13 October 2021 [Minute Nos. 16-20] be approved as a correct record.

24. INFORMATION FROM THE MINUTES

Councillor Birch referred to planning application 21/00914/FULM - residential development comprising 87 dwellings [100% affordable dwellings], including formation of vehicular access, associated landscaping and site remediation [Blue Hoarding Site] and explained that the planning application had been refused by

Lichfield District Council's Planning Committee on 01 November 2021. The proposal conflicted with the overarching aims of the LDC's Local Plan and the Burntwood Neighbourhood Plan which allocates the site for mixed town centre retail and leisure uses in response to an identified need to serve existing and future residents of the town and to redevelop and regenerate Burntwood Town Centre to create a key focal point for the area. Whilst the scheme would provide for affordable housing, there was insufficient evidence to suggest that this need cannot be met within the sustainable locations through allocated sites, new development coming forward and existing permissions. The proposals therefore conflict with the LDC's adopted Development Plan. There were a number of technical objections to the scheme in relation to the design and layout of the scheme, highway safety, ecology, impact on the Cannock Chase SAC and drainage, which had not been addressed and also justify sustainable reasons for refusal.

25. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

- | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| (a) | 21/01734/FUH | Highfield | C Lee
157 Woodhouses Road
Burntwood | Erection of two storey extensions to side and rear |
| | No objection. | | | |
| (b) | 21/01719/CLE | Summerfield & All Saints | Mrs T Lowbridge
80 Boney Hay Road
Burntwood | Annexe in existing residential property |
| | No objection. | | | |
| (c) | 21/01755/FUH | Highfield | Mr and Mrs N Graham
8 The Hollies
Coulter Lane
Burntwood | Conversion of existing garage into additional bedroom and bathroom |
| | No objection. | | | |
| (d) | 21/01814/FUH | Boney Hay & Central | Mr and Mrs Clarke
12 Eastwood Avenue
Burntwood | Erection of a single storey wrap around extension following demolition of existing garage and conservatory |
| | No objection. | | | |
| (e) | 21/01635/FUH | Summerfield & All Saints | Ms D Cowles
12 Brantwood Avenue
Burntwood | Retention of single garage |
| | No objection. | | | |

(f)	21/01509/FUL	Summerfield & All Saints	C Davis S Lester Packing Materials Ltd Unit 15 Mount Road Burntwood	Erection of portal framed building to cover existing unloading/loading area to the north elevation of the existing premises
	No objection.			
(g)	21/01603/FUH	Summerfield & All Saints	Mr D Canavan 87 Nailers Drive Burntwood	Erection of a single storey rear extension and new bay window to front elevation Amendment: the applicant has amended the fence location and the size of the extension
	No objection providing the Planning Officer is satisfied that the street scene will not be unduly impacted by the new fencing location.			
(h)	21/01890/FUH	Summerfield & All Saints	Mr B Wingfield 2 Woodland Way Burntwood	Conversion of existing garage to form kitchen and bedroom together with erection of a single storey garage extension
	No objection.			
(i)	21/01893/PNH	Chase Terrace	Mr M Galvin 33 Water Street Burntwood	Prior Notification: single storey rear extension projecting 3.50m from the rear wall of the original dwelling and reaching a maximum height of 2.90m and eaves height of 2.70m
	No objection.			
(j)	21/01801/CLE	Highfield	Lord D Evetts Edial Farm Cottage Edial Farm Mews Lichfield Road Burntwood	Certificate of Lawfulness [Existing]: conversion of existing barn to form 1 no. five bedroom dwelling house

Comment: Members felt that it was not clear from the limited information provided what the Town Council was meant to be commenting on. The overview states it is a Certificate of Lawfulness for an existing conversion of a barn to a five bedroom house. It is not possible for the Town Council to give a formal response without further

explanation or sight of plans.

(k)	21/01863/FUL	Chasetown	Miss R Kendrew McDonald's Milestone Way Burntwood	Installation of 2 no. rapid electric vehicle charging stations within car park, converting 3 no. existing parking spaces to 2 no. two electric vehicle charging bays, with associated equipment
-----	--------------	-----------	--	---

No objection.

(l)	21/01925/FUH	Chasetown	Mr and Mrs Standen 22 Queen Street Burntwood	Erection of two no. storey rear extension [inc. basement]
-----	--------------	-----------	--	---

No objection.

(m)	21/01887/FUH	Highfield	Mrs Bradbury Green Lane Farm Green Lane Burntwood	Retention of two storey extension to rear
-----	--------------	-----------	--	---

Burntwood Town Council wish to make a **STRONG OBJECTION** to this application for a significant extension to the building which lies within the Green Belt.

This is a very large extension amounting to a 43.86% increase in the size of the dwelling and not the 40% increase quoted in the figures from the applicant. Burntwood Town Council consider this to be an unacceptably large development contrary to the NPPF which states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate if it results in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Burntwood Town Council consider that an increase in size of 43.86% is a disproportionate addition and amounts to overdevelopment in the Green Belt contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. There is no account taken of sustainable development in the erection of the building in its design or construction and no mitigation for the environmental impact of such a sizeable development in the Green Belt. It should be considered therefore as being contrary to the Sustainable Design Supplementary Planning Document.

It should also be noted that the extension comprises a sitting room, lounge, bathroom, kitchen, 2x bedrooms and 2x bathrooms. There is also only one integral door from the utility room of the original dwelling to the lounge of the extension to interconnect the property with the extension which has its own entrances and staircase. The extension can be functionally used as a two bedroomed self-contained dwelling in its own right. This clearly shows that the additional building is not in fact an extension but a separate dwelling intended to be used as such. This additional dwelling has been built in the Green Belt without any permission and without due regard to protect the Green Belt or reference to planning policy or building regulations.

Burntwood Town Council are concerned about the fire safety and building regulations compliance aspects of the building as there is no way to ascertain if it has been built to the correct standards required for building regulations or fire safety in terms of the materials used or quality of the construction and electrical installations.

There is concern regarding the ecological impact and the impact as a result of the proximity of the building to the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation.

This application begs the question of why there was no application for planning permission prior to the completion of the building if the applicants believed it was acceptable development and thus would be granted permission prior to construction. The Planning Officers and Planning Committee at Lichfield District Council should ask themselves the question of whether this would have been granted permission within the Green Belt had the application have been prospective rather than retrospective. Should permission be granted then all future permissible development rights should be removed and a condition should be put in place to ensure the extension remains ancillary to the original dwelling and cannot be separated and sold as a separate dwelling.

[The Meeting closed at 6:33 pm]

Signed

Date