

Gnosall Parish Council
DRAFT Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting
Held on Thursday 22nd February 2018 at 7.30pm in the Parish Office

Present: Cllr R Greatrex (in the Chair), Cllr G Gregory, Cllr Booth, Cllr J Tomkinson, Cllr D Webb, Cllr C Emsley, Cllr Abbott.

Public Open Forum: none present

1	<p>To receive apologies and record absences</p> <p>Received from Cllr Innamorati and Jayne Cooper</p>	
2	<p>To receive and confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 1st February 2018.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.</p>	
3	<p>To receive any declarations of interest</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
4	<p>To consider any matters arising from the last meeting</p> <p>18/27829/FUL It was noted that the enquiry to the Land Registry regarding the ownership of the area of land currently used as a turning space had resulted in further confusion. The Land Registry said it did not belong to the applicant but the applicant's agent said this was an error on the part of the Registry and that it did. The Case Officer is checking this. He had also expected a response from Highways regarding the safety of the proposed new access onto Doley Brook Lane by 14.02.18 but no response had yet been received. Councillors were informed that Borough Councillors declined to call in the application.</p> <p>The Clerk had informed Councillors about ongoing information regarding land off Stafford Road (Bradshaw's). It appears that EA representatives have been in greater attendance, although they said no regulations had been broken in regard to the presence of additional soil on the flood plain. SBC has issued an enforcement notice and the owner has 28 days to respond, which takes us to the end of February.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>
5	<p>To consider the following planning applications:</p> <p>18/27890/COU conversion of ground floor retail floor space to dwelling at 17 High Street, Gnosall. Councillors had considered this at the last meeting and offered no objection. Since then, an amended proposal had been received, which identified a right of access to the property from the entrance to the Grosvenor Centre. Cllr Greatrex had looked through the files and established that a legal document permitting the said access, sufficient for a 7.5t truck, had been drawn up in 1997.</p> <p>Councillors had no objection to the right of access and accepted that it was a sound legal agreement. However, they noted that the pathway indicated might prove restrictive to any proposals to refurbish/rebuild the Grosvenor Centre. For example, the indicated pathway might preclude certain types of rebuild or rebuilding could restrict light to the converted</p>	

	<p>verandah in the property.</p> <p>It was decided to ask the Clerk to inform SBC that GPC acknowledge the right of access indicated as a long-standing legal agreement between SBC, GPC and Annabel Clapham. However, since the GPC is currently drawing up plans to enhance/redevelop the Grosvenor Centre (which is a valued community asset), the said right of access delineated in red might require change in future. GPC will enter into discussion with the applicant in order to resolve this potential problem. No objections are offered.</p> <p>18/27984/FUL Detached house and ancillary garage with studio accommodation in roof space and formation of new vehicular access on land adjacent to 74 Audmore Road.</p> <p>Councillors noted that this was the fourth time this proposal had been before them and they had previously offered no objections. However, due to an increase in traffic along Ranton Lane since the last application, due to increased building in the village, it was felt that the proposed new access onto the lane was now inadequate and dangerous. Committee felt that it would be much better placed onto Audmore Road, either adjacent to the existing entrance or sharing it.</p> <p>18/27946/HOU Conversion of garage to single storey accommodation incorporating new pitched roof and side extension at 29 Shelmore Way, Gnosall. There were no objections.</p> <p>18/28008/HOU Proposed two storey side and single storey rear extension at 22 Norbury Close. There were no objections.</p> <p>18/39005/FUL Erection of Stables (correct number 18/28005/FUL) at Knightley Grange, Grange Road, Knightley There were no objections.</p> <p>18/27925/FUL Retention of two wooden stables (retrospective) on land off Radmore Lane, Gnosall. There were no objections to this but it was noted that the applicant drew attention to a potential conflict with PROW Norbury 1, indicating that the PROW actually followed a slightly different pathway and illustrating this with a map. The response from the Rights of Way Consultation Group draws attention to the absence of the necessary Section 257 of the Town & Country Planning Act request for a diversion of this PROW. GPC felt strongly that due process should be followed.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>
6	<p>To consider meeting with other Key Service Villages regarding the review of Stafford Borough Council's Local Plan and the possible effect to Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p>It was noted that a response had been received from SBC indicating that revised policies, boundaries or development figures would require the NP to yield. Thus the concern which had led to the proposal to call a meeting still existed. However, it was felt that it would be desirable to meet first with representatives of Forward Planning and Borough Councillors, in order to ascertain their proposed methodology around this issue. If they were to reassure the parish council that full and detailed consultation with Parishes would take place before such material changes appeared in the proposed revised PfSB, then it might be appropriate to inform other parishes by letter. Should that assurance not be forthcoming, a meeting</p>	

	might still be felt to be the most appropriate means of communication. It was resolved to ask the Clerk to set up such a meeting with representatives as noted above and the Planning Committee.	Clerk
7	To report on any large scale developments Nothing to report.	
8	To receive planning decisions and information about planning appeals Details of recent decision were reported (attached).	
9	To deal with any correspondence and communication relating to planning matters There had been no correspondence or communication save that referred to above regarding the Land Registry and search of the legal file.	
9	Date of Next Meeting 15 th March 2018 at 7.30pm . Cllrs Gregory and Abbott presented apologies for this meeting and Cllr Booth said it was possible that she would be unable to attend.	

Meeting closed at 8.35pm

Planning Committee - Update on Planning Applications as at 22.2.18

Application Number	Date GPC Committee considered	Details	GPC Decision	SBC Decision	Notes
17/27461/FUL	14.12.17	Detached dwelling and separate double garage at Nirvana, Stafford Road	Councillors objected to initial application but not amended application.	Awaiting decision	Revised application received Feb 2018 that councillors had no objection to
18/27890/COU	1.2.18	18/27890/COU conversion of ground floor retail floor space to dwelling at 17 High Street, Gnosall	No objection	Awaiting decision	Planning application amended to include access via Grosvenor Centre car park for parking to the rear of the property.
18/27829/FUL	1.2.18	18/27829/FUL Change of use from incidental use to garden extension too detached garage at Rose Cottage, Doley Brook Lane, Gnosall	no objection to the extension, but concerns about using the additional land that could affect others such as deliveries, refuse vehicles and public traffic and unsure about land ownership.	Awaiting decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPC search with Land Registry confirmed applicant does not own land although applicant says he does. This being checked by Case office • Case officer also says “<i>with regards to the safety of the proposed new access on to Doley Brook Lane I have sent a consult to the Highway Authority but I am still waiting to hear back at this time. I should have a response from them by 14.02.18</i>”. • Borough Councillors would not call in this application.