

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE OLD MINING COLLEGE CENTRE, QUEEN STREET, BURNTWOOD ON
MONDAY 15 DECEMBER 2025 COMMENCING AT 6.00 PM**

PRESENT

Councillor S Taylor (in the Chair)

Councillors Bishop, Bullock, Craik, D Ennis, L Ennis, Gittings, Kube, P Taylor, and Willis-Croft

In attendance

Ms Minor, Deputy Clerk

S Lightfoot, Town Clerk

5 members of the public

PUBLIC FORUM

**Planning Application 25/01485/OUTM – Land at Coulter Lane Farm, Coulter Lane
Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except primary means of vehicular
access from Church Road) for the demolition of 59 Church Road (and associated buildings)
and the construction of up to 250 dwellings, associated access, drainage, green and blue
infrastructure, ground remodelling and ancillary infrastructure**

The Chair welcomed members of the public to the meeting.

Mr Hall-Woodcock, representing Burntwood Action Group read out the following statement:

My name is Tim Hall-Woodcock, and I speak tonight on behalf of the Burntwood Action Group and the hundreds of residents who have already objected to this application.

I want to start by being very clear: **We are not anti-development**. We know the UK needs homes. But those homes should not be on the high-quality Green Belt that keeps our town breathing. We believe development must be **Plan-Led**, not speculative.

We are asking you to **OBJECT** because this is the **wrong place**, at the **wrong time**, with **zero infrastructure capacity**.

First: The 'Community Benefit' Myth. The developer claims this scheme brings 'benefits' that outweigh the harm. Let's look at the reality. We explicitly told the developer that a new Community Hub and retail units were neither required nor wanted in this location. They have now removed the Community Hub from the plans—effectively admitting that we were right and it was never viable. The proposed shops are equally unwanted and threaten our existing local businesses. So what is left? They are proposing 250 houses with **zero** tangible benefit to the community to offset the damage they are doing.

Second: The Highway Safety Reality. The developer's traffic model relies on a desktop assumption that our roads are quiet. We have the real-world data. The Action Group has conducted independent monitoring on Church Road which recorded over **2,400 vehicle movements in a single day**. We know that when Church Road/ Rugeley Road and Swan Island gets blocked—which is daily—traffic doesn't just disappear. It rat-runs. It forces cars down **Woodhouses, Farewell Lane, and Coulter Lane**. And now, we are seeing displacement onto **The Abnalls**—a precarious single-track lane that is completely unsafe for heavy traffic. Approving this estate doesn't just jam the main roads; it endangers every walker, cyclist, and horse rider on those rural lanes.

Third: The 'Grey Belt' Myth. Finally, do not let them tell you this is 'Grey Belt' land. This is active farmland. It is a vital wildlife corridor for deer, bats, and owls. It performs a critical Green Belt function by stopping the sprawl of the town. We have commissioned independent technical reviews covering Heritage, Ecology, and Law, which prove this application is fundamentally flawed. We will be submitting those forensic reports directly to Lichfield District Council in the coming weeks.

Forth: The "Affordable" Myth: "The developer claims these homes are a public benefit. But let's be clear: 'Affordable' in planning terms just means 80% of market value.

80% of an expensive, Green Belt home is **still expensive**.

These are not social homes for local families on the waiting list; they are discount products for commuters. We are destroying our heritage to build houses that many Burntwood residents still won't be able to buy.

Tonight, we ask you to stand with us. You don't need our technical reports to know this plan is wrong. You know the reality of the school run gridlock. You know the reality of the doctor waiting lists.

We ask you to submit a robust objection focusing on:

1. **Unsustainable pressure on Infrastructure.**
2. **Severe Highway Safety risks on our rural lanes.**
3. **The loss of the Green Belt character that defines our town.**

Over 95% of residents oppose this. Please, represent them tonight and say NO

The Chair thanked Mr Hall-Woodcock.

37. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE were received from Councillor Hancox and Councillor Swain.

38. GENERAL DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

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.

39. BuRRT UPDATE

In the absence of the Burntwood Response and Repair Team, the Town Clerk attended the meeting and explained that the two staff members report direct to him. He said that he wished to add a bit of narrative as he felt that the report did not truly reflect the work carried out by BuRRT. The Town Clerk explained that the Town Council had established the scheme in the late summer of 2022 which involved an electric vehicle and two staff. The team's activities are a mixture of repairing, checking, and maintaining the Town Council's own infrastructure (defibrillators, bus shelters, grit bins etc) and responding to Councillors' and residents' requests (this may involve carrying out simple repairs, or reporting issues to the appropriate authority). Some of the work is seasonal and a lot of it is routine work. BuRRT has its own designated email address (burrt@burntwood-tc.gov.uk). He also explained that the team discharges the maintenance on behalf of the Town Council with regard to the Old Mining College Centre and the Chase Terrace Community Centre.

The Town Clerk said that he would encourage Councillors to report any issues within their wards direct to BuRRT even though the scheme has limited resources. He felt that the scheme had been a tremendous success.

The Chair asked if we could ensure that all Councillor enquiries are added to the report. Councillor D Ennis explained that even though BuRRT is used for the benefit of the Town Council's infrastructure it also shows members of the public what the team are doing for example extra grit bins which are primarily the responsibility of the County Council. He felt that the team were also integral to the work carried out on the Coulter Lane burial ground wall ensuring that the external contractor completed the work to a high standard.

Councillor P Taylor explained that even though some Councillors (not necessarily on this Committee) felt that the ratio of works carried out was not what was expected, he pointed out the savings made to the Town Council by not employing external contractors.

The Chair confirmed that the next meeting for the BuRRT team to attend (or the Town Clerk) would be 09 February 2026.

RESOLVED That the report of activities be noted.

40. MINUTES

The Chair reminded Members that they were being asked to comment solely on the accuracy of the Minutes.

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

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Planning and Development Committee Meeting held on 17 November 2025 (Minute Nos. 31-36) be approved as a correct record.

41. INFORMATION FROM THE MINUTES

Planning Application 25/01117/FUL – 13 High Street, Chasetown Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 2no two bedroom apartments and associated works

Referring to Minute No. 30 (15 October 2025) and following the Committee's objection (Members felt that there is already inadequate parking provision around the site and this needed to be addressed) the Chair informed Members that Lichfield District Council had refused the application on 28 November 2025 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its height, massing and two storey form, would result in the overdevelopment of this constrained backland plot. The scheme fails to respect the prevailing scale and character of development to the rear of High Street and would appear cramped, visually dominant, and incongruous within its context. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy, Policies B5 and B6 of the Burntwood Neighbourhood Plan, the Sustainable Design SPD and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed development would, due to its siting, height, and proximity, result in an unacceptable loss of outlook from the existing first floor rear window at 13 High Street. The two storey side elevation would create an overbearing and enclosing relationship, harming the amenity of existing and future occupiers of the host property. The proposal

therefore conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy, the Sustainable Design SPD and paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The application site lies within the 15 km zone of influence of the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation. In accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), new residential development within this zone is required to secure mitigation towards the Cannock Chase SAC Partnership. At the point of determination, no completed legal agreement is in place to secure the necessary mitigation contribution. In the absence of secured mitigation, the Local Planning Authority cannot conclude that the development would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Cannock Chase SAC. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies CP13 (Our Natural Resources) and NR7 (Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation) of the Lichfield Local Plan Strategy, the Developer Contributions SPD, the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

42. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------|---|--|
| (a) | 25/01431/FUL | Chasetown | Autosmart International Ltd
Unit 9, Zone 1
Burntwood Business Park
Attwood Road
Burntwood | Section 73
application to
permission of
23/00353/FUL to vary
condition 2 relating
to the siting of tank
SV01 |
|-----|--------------|-----------|---|--|

No objection, however, the Planning Officer to ensure that the variation is still compliant with the storage of chemicals and the associated regulations.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------|---|---------------------------------|
| (b) | 25/01392/FUH | Hunslet | Mr Hunt
47 Hunslet Road
Burntwood | Single storey side
extension |
|-----|--------------|---------|---|---------------------------------|

No objection in principle, however, the Planning Officer needs to be mindful of the Arboricultural Officer's comments when determining this application.

- | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|-----------|---|--|
| (c) | 25/01485/OUTM | Highfield | Bloor Homes Ltd
Land at Coulter Lane Farm
Coulter Lane
Burntwood | Outline planning
application (with all
matters reserved
except primary
means of vehicular
access from Church
Road) for the
demolition of 59
Church Road (and
associated buildings)
and the construction
of up to 250
dwellings, associated
access, drainage,
green and blue
infrastructure,
ground remodelling |
|-----|---------------|-----------|---|--|

and ancillary
infrastructure

STRONG OBJECTION. There have been numerous housing developments without any infrastructure improvements in terms of doctors, dentists, schools, public transport etc and on the basis of this and that the land is designated as Green Belt, (with the exception of agricultural use, the Town Council will not support any development in the Green Belt) any development in this area should be refused.

43. PROPOSED BASE STATION UPGRADE – VODAFONE THREE LIMITED, PROSPECT ROAD, BURNTWOOD – REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT OF 6 NO. ANTENNAS, INSTALLATION OF 1 NO. NEW 600MM DISH AND 1 NO. NEW 300MM DISH WITH OTHER ASSOCIATED ANCILLARY WORKS

The Chair explained that this was for information purposes only and no decision was required by the Committee as the proposed scheme constitutes permitted development and does not require a prior approval/planning application to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

(The Meeting closed at 6.34 pm)

Signed

Date