

**Gnosall Parish Council**  
**Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting**  
**Held on 24th November 2016 at 7.30pm in the Parish Office**

Present: Cllr R Greatrex (in the Chair) Cllr Payne  
Cllr G Gregory (minuting) Cllr K Ingram  
Cllr D Webb Cllr. Wallis

**Public Open Forum** – 11 members of the public present

Councillors were introduced to members of the public and it was agreed that Public Open Forum would be taken immediately preceding the corresponding item, to avoid unnecessary delay and ensure comments were fresh in the mind when decisions were made.

1	<b>To receive apologies and record absences</b> Apologies received from Cllr Abbott & Cllr. Tomkinson and from Jayne Cooper, Clerk to the Council.	
2	<b>To receive and confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2016</b> The minutes of the meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record (Proposed Cllr. Payne, seconded, Cllr. Ingram, agreed by all who had been present.)	
3	<b>To receive any declarations of interest</b> Cllr. Ingram declared an interest in item 5 16/25184/HOU as this is a neighbour.  Cllr. Gregory declared a remote interest in Item 5 16/24803/FUL inasmuch as there had been an email of objection from a member of the public called Mary Cowell and she knew someone of that name but did not know whether it was the same person.	
4	<b>To consider any matters arising from the last meeting</b> Cllr Greatrex gave an update on the application for The Horns, 16/24985/FUL. Cllr. K Williamson had been requested to call this in but had declined to do so because he understood conditions were to be imposed which would limit any noise nuisance at the rear of the property. Committee expressed the hope that any such conditions would be rigorously enforced and, to that end, hoped that members of the public would make them aware of any infringement once in place.  There were no other matters arising.	
5	<b>To consider the following planning applications</b> <i>The meeting was adjourned to allow a member of the public to speak in relation to application 16/25165/FUL.</i>  The resident expressed her concern that the application was unclear as to what exactly was requested but her chief worry was that the conditions imposed upon the original application, for which this variation was requested, had not been complied with and were not being enforced. She therefore felt that any variations would similarly be disregarded and no action taken. She asked what the Parish Council would do about this.	

	<p>She gave examples of non-compliance such as nitrate run-off, rubbish and waste left in surroundings hedges, non removal of polythene (left rolled on hoops instead of removed entirely as per schedule.) She said that Norbury Park Estates shared these concerns and were similarly worried.</p> <p>Her underlying fear was that the applicant really wanted to have permanent structures and these variations were a way of obtaining this. They covered 100 acres and affected several properties but the planning authority deemed only one other property to be affected and thus only one resident had been informed of the application, so she felt a genuine response from the community was not likely to be forthcoming. She had a concern that the increased acreage of polytunnels would exceed the permitted percentage.</p> <p><i>Her comments were noted and the meeting resumed.</i></p> <p>Cllr Greatrex, as Chair, explained that GPC had informed SBC of concerns when these were last brought to its attention some 2-3 years ago. Since then, no concerns had been reported and this was the first Council had heard of them, since the area is not visible from the roadside and Council has no powers to inspect. He confirmed that Norbury Park had not made him aware of their concerns, despite being in regular contact and knowing his position as Chair of this Committee. He said that the rolling down of plastic was acceptable practice, according to planning officers.</p> <p>The difference between the powers of the planning authority, Stafford Borough Council, and the Parish Council, were clarified. It was suggested that the resident officially notify not only the Environment Officer, but also the Borough Planning Department and the Parish Council of the specific breaches mentioned.</p> <p>The exact nature of the requested variations was clarified – ie an increased acreage of polytunnels to 60ha. (variation of condition 2) and a change in erection/removal dates for poly tunnel covers (variation of condition 5 ) to produce:</p> <p>15% tunnels covered by February  90% by March  100% from April – September  90% by October  15% by November.</p> <p>This would extend the season from October-March, as now, to November-February.</p> <p>Councillors discussed this fully and felt unable to comment on variation 2 because there was insufficient information. They needed to know what the total acreage of this site was, the percentage polytunnels represented now and what that figure would be if this variation were approved and the regulations surrounding this. Concern was also expressed about failures to comply with existing regulations and the lack of enforcement.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>They were concerned that any future conditions might similarly fail to be observed and not be enforced, leading to an unwelcome precedent. They requested the resident to supply written details of compliance issues to assist the clerk in writing Council's response. Cllr. Gregory proposed that the Clerk respond explaining that Council could not offer an opinion until this information was forthcoming. Cllr. Ingram seconded and the motion was carried.</p> <p><i>The meeting was again adjourned to allow residents to speak in relation to <b>16/24803/FUL</b>. A resident outlined some main issues but several others added to this or commented. Extensive correspondence on this application had been received and is noted under Item 8. The following information was shared with the meeting:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The history of the building, its construction and ownership , relationship to the Public Right of Way (PROW) and settlement, previous planning history, including previous recommendations from this Parish Council in 1997 to ensure that it should never be a dwelling. (Chair informed the residents that SBC did not include this request so no notice could be taken of it.)</li> <li>• Works undertaken since its sale in 2015 including laying on of electricity, construction of entrance from lane, siting of large caravan, removal of screening shrubs/trees. (Chair explained that provision of power was in the hands of the utilities, not subject to permission)</li> <li>• The involvement of the Enforcement Officer, who had visited the site and explained that siting a caravan required permission. Subsequently a planning application for both the caravan and the conversion of the stables to a dwelling had been made.</li> <li>• Concern was expressed about the possibility of permission being granted and the old stables being demolished and a new property erected in its place.</li> <li>• Concern about the unsuitability of the building for septic tank or soakaway drainage due to topography and for double storey dwelling due to construction (reference to this in a desk-based study was referred to which mentioned possible 2 storey but this was found to be cut and paste and very inaccurate altogether.)</li> <li>• Concern as to the non compliance or otherwise of the application with various policies such as C5 of the PfSB and NPPF 55.</li> <li>• The designation of the site as a Site of Biological Interest and the possible implications of this.</li> </ul> <p><i>The meeting was resumed.</i></p> <p>The Chair explained how the Enforcement Process operates. He explained that the Planning Officer had informed him that Policy C5 was not relevant, since it applied to new builds only, and that Policy E2 (conversion of redundant buildings) and N5 (environmental) would be determinant in this instance. Discussion followed around this. He also explained that the application meets the criteria within the Gnosall NP for</p>	
--	--	--

<p>rural areas (Policy 4.)</p> <p>However, he explained that, at present, insufficient information had been received in relation to Policy N5 and without this, approval would not be given by SBC. The options open to any person not supplying sufficient information were to withdraw and have fees returned, withdraw and resubmit with necessary details or ignore and risk refusal, loss of fees and possible enforcement action.</p> <p>Insofar as the relationship to the settlement was concerned. The Chair outlined the changes to settlement boundaries over recent years is the abolition of Residential Development Boundaries pending the determination of Settlement Boundaries (SB) via Neighbourhood Plans (which had left Gnosall particularly vulnerable for 18 months) and he explained the way in which the SB had been determined for our NP. All residents had been consulted and there had been no suggestion of establishing such a boundary around any location other than Gnosall itself. Therefore Moreton, Outwoods, Knightley etc were all “rural area” and so this application could not be termed outside the settlement boundary because there isn’t one around Outwoods.</p> <p>In relation to fears about demolition, the Chair cited precedent where approved conversions had entailed demolition and action had been taken against them as the authority was very strict about this. New builds in the rural area were being refused due to numbers being exceeded.</p> <p>There was much discussion of Policy E2 and whether it was or was not applicable. The conclusion of the committee was that, no matter what anyone else felt, SBC felt it was the determinant policy and so it would be used.</p> <p>Advice was given about residents writing objections which met planning criteria and referenced relevant policies, which had clearly been signalled in this case. Further advice about speaking at Committee to oppose was also given and residents expressed their thanks for that help.</p> <p>Cllr. Greatrex proposed that the Council write to say that it was unable to make a recommendation due to the insufficiency of information regarding the SBI impact/mitigation and to refer this application back until such information was forthcoming. Cllr. Ingram seconded and all members agreed. It was clarified that the caravan siting was all part of the same application so no comment would be made on that either until such time as it was returned for consideration.</p> <p><i>All members of the public left after this item and thanked the committee for their time and help.</i></p> <p><b>16/25114/HOU</b></p> <p>Members had no objection in principle to the proposal but noted that the proposed garage was too small to accommodate even the smallest car currently available on the market. They could not understand why this</p>	
---	--

	<p>was so, since there was room to build a suitably sized garage.</p> <p>Cllr. Greatrex proposed that the Clerk write to explain that the Committee had no objection to the design in principle but queried why the garage was only 3m internal length when a Fiat 500 was 3626mm and a Mini Cooper 3546mm. This was seconded by Cllr Ingram and agreed by all.</p> <p><b>16/25184/HOU</b></p> <p>This proposal had been refused twice, and once at Appeal. It was resubmitted with changes to dimensions and increased distance from the boundary. The changes were noted and Councillors had no objections.</p>	
6	<p><b>To report on any large scale developments</b></p> <p>Cllr. Greatrex informed the meeting that the Linden Homes developers were making real efforts to support the community by offering support to various causes (eg BKV). Councillors noted this with great pleasure.</p> <p>Cllr. Gregory informed the meeting that she had been told that the application at The Horseshoe had not gone to Appeal and would be confirming this with SBC, then organising removal of protest notices. An future application for that part of the Loop which lies inside the development boundary (the orchard) was possible. Councillors noted that, should this be so, it was likely to be approved since it was inside the Settlement Boundary.</p>	
7	<p><b>To receive planning decisions and information about planning appeals</b></p> <p>16/23800/FUL - Borough Cllr to discover why the delay  16/24213/OUT - Development of houses on Audmore Rd. Case Officer says decision on number of properties awaited, no 3 storey houses permitted.  16/24656/FUL – polytunnels at Knightley Hall Farm, Case Officer letter advising it be considered at Planning Committee 28/11/16.  16/24821/FUL – sports club extension Forrester's Lane. ALLOWED 4/11/16.  16/24956/HOU extension to 51 Fountain Fold. ALLOWED 16/11/16.  16/24833/FUL conservatory, change of use of land and retention of fence at 21 Brookhouse Way – Case Officer was recommending refusal at 3/11/16 on grounds of lack of information. On 21/11/16 Highways offered no objection and SBC Cllr supporting the application.  16/24948/HOU extension, garage, conservatory at 33 Knightley Way – ALLOWED 16/11/16.  16/24971/HOU 2 storey side extension at 26 Hollies Brook Close, ALLOWED 15/11/16.  16/24985/FUL internal &amp; external works The Horns. Awaiting decision, SBC Cllr will not be calling this in, believes there may be conditions attached to external works (tbc)  16/25043/FUL steel framed extension for soft fruit at KH Farm, awaiting decision.  16/24969/OUT 4 bed house to rear of The Ferns Wharf Rd, awaiting decision.</p>	

8	<p><b>To deal with any correspondence and communication relating to planning matters:</b></p> <p>Correspondence had been received in relation to <b>16/24803/FUL</b>: Karen Beddow wished to make the committee aware of the location of the proposal site in relation to other properties, a public ROW and to a SBI listed in the NP. She noted works done since the purchase by the present owner, a referral to the Enforcement Officer relating to these, the nature of the stable building and a previous application in 1997 with subsequent response from GPC. She also referred to the “boundaries” of the current village.</p> <p>Andrew &amp; Wendi Grundy made many of the same points, again querying the definition of “unused/disused” in NPPF 55. Concerns relating to sewage and ground impermeability were repeated and comment made about possible removal of mature trees.</p> <p>David and Tracey Lewis provided a timeline if activity at the site and referred to many of the same points made by other correspondents.</p> <p>Martin and Mary Cowell also made similar points. Janet Evans did likewise, making special mention of the SBI designation and the lack of an environmental report.</p> <p>Stuart Bishop submitted a very detailed letter giving a detailed history of the property and its planning history, along with its construction and topography. He also gave much detail about flooding and site problems, along with mention of past efforts to aid conservation of various species.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted that the planning application for the Library was shortly to be completed and submitted but that this committee had not yet had sight of it. Cllr. Ingram proposed “That before the planning application for the new Library it signed off and submitted, the Planning Committee should have sight of it.” Cllr. Payne proposed the amendment that the following be added “ and that it then be put before the full Parish Council.” The amendment was seconded by Cllr. Webb and duly voted upon. It was approved unanimously and thus became the substantive motion, which was seconded by Cllr. Payne and duly put to the vote and carried unanimously.</p>	Clerk
9	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>15<sup>th</sup> December 2016 at 7.30pm</p>	

The meeting closed at 9.40 pm