## $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Gnosall Parish Council} \\ \textbf{Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting} \\ \textbf{Held on Thursday 2}^{nd} \ \textbf{November 2017 at 7.30pm in the Parish Office} \end{array}$

**Present:** Cllr R Greatrex (in the Chair), Cllr G Gregory, Cllr T Innamorati, Cllr J Tomkinson, Cllr C Emsley, Jayne Cooper

Public Open Forum: one member of the public present

1	To receive apologies and record absences	
	Apologies were received from Cllr Booth, Cllr Webb and Cllr Abbott	
2	To receive and confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2017.	
	The minutes of the meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.	
3	To receive any declarations of interest	
	There were no declarations of interest.	
4	To consider any matters arising from the last meeting	
	a) Response to SBC's consultation on the Planning Application Criteria	
	As requested, Cllrs had reviewed the consultation document in detail and made the following comments that the Clerk would submit to Stafford Borough Council:	Clerk
	<ul> <li>The document is well resourced and well referenced although some of the references as to where to find guidance lack detail</li> <li>The beginning is helpful (Do I need to make a planning application?) however a flow chart in the most simple form would be even more helpful to those who have no knowledge of the planning system</li> <li>The criteria seems to be aimed more at the developer rather than the individual householder</li> <li>Perhaps a more simple guide for domestic applications would be better for the average person</li> <li>Householders may find it difficult</li> <li>Developers will cope with the jargon</li> <li>Page 24 says Heritage assess – presuming this should say Heritage assets</li> <li>Page 25 section 13 polytunnels and wind turbines – there is very little detail her just references to best practice and guidance. Our experience shows that these are sensitive proposals re landscape issues</li> <li>Details in the Annex would perhaps be better at the beginning and be more simple</li> <li>Response to SBC's Assessment of Services and Facilities in</li> </ul>	
	Parishes  An assessment of services and facilities in Gnosall parish had commenced and would be complete ready for submission by the deadline of 13 <sup>th</sup> December.	

	c) 17/27235/FUL: Variation of condition one on planning permission 13/19275/COU at Knightley Hall Farm, Gnosall Road – this application had been withdrawn from the planning system and a new application (not a variation) had since been received.	
5	To consider the following planning applications	
	The meeting was adjourned to allow the member of the public to speak about application 17/27235/FUL	
	Concern was raised that on the original application, the caravans should have been contained and screened and this had never been carried out. On another site owned by the same company, the caravans are set out in a more appropriate way. These comments were noted. Council were also informed that plastic from polytunnels should have been removed by 1 <sup>st</sup> November and it had not been. Council informed the parishioner that this sort of issue has to be reported to the Planning Department's Enforcement Team.	
	The meeting resumed.	
	17/27235/FUL extension of an existing caravan site for occupation by seasonal workers at Knightley Hall Farm, Gnosall	
	The Case Officer had been asked to confirm the numbers of caravans already on this site and this information was not yet available. It was agreed until this information is confirmed a decision on this application would be deferred. If the information is received before the Council meeting on 13 <sup>th</sup> , a decision would be made at the Council meeting and the points raised by the member of public would be included in the response. In addition, a notice in the Staffordshire Newsletter (dated 1 <sup>st</sup> November) reported that the proposals affect a Right of Way whereas the Right of Way runs alongside the site and is not affected.	Clerk
	<b>17/27246/HOU:</b> house extension (orangery) at Moreton Park House, Walnut Tree Lane, Moreton	
	There was no objection although it was noted that as the proposed new fire escape leads to the roof it would be sensible to have hand rails to ensure health and safety matters are adhered to. There are no hand rails included in the proposals. The Clerk to respond accordingly.	Clerk
6	To report on any large scale developments	
	The Clerk had been notified that the Burial Ground is being used as a recreation site to exercise dogs allegedly by residents of the Bellway Site on Lowfield Lane. Letters would be sent to residents about this as well as the planned clearance works on Hen & Chicken Lane that is scheduled to start on 7 <sup>th</sup> November. An article would also be prepared for the next edition of GPN.	Clerk
7	To receive planning decisions and information about planning	
	appeals  Details of decisions on recent applications were reported.	

8	To deal with any correspondence and communication relating to planning matters	
	17/27192.FUL – 11 Deer Park, this application, which the planning committee considered at its meeting on 12 <sup>th</sup> October, had since been amended in that site plans had been amended to scale. This was noted and no further comments were necessary.	
	Cllrs reported that they had been approached by several parishioners about the sale of goods on land off Station Road. It was noted that the Borough Council's licensing and planning departments were aware of the situation.	
9	Date of Next Meeting	
	23 <sup>rd</sup> November 2017 at 7.30pm	

Meeting closed at 8.20pm