

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**

WEDNESDAY 13 SEPTEMBER, 2017 AT 3:00 P.M.

IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M. (Chairman)
Pearson, A.R. (Vice-Chairman)

Allen, F.W.C.	Smith, D. (substituting for D.J. Snape)
Dean, A.	Snape, P.A.
Dudson, A.	Sutherland, M.
Grice, Mrs. D.	Witton, P. (substituting for J.T. Kraujalis)
Hoare, M.W.A.	
Lea, C.I.	

37. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Miss J. Cooper, M.R. Grocott, J.T. Kraujalis, D.J. Snape and Mrs. D.M. Todd.

Notification had been received that Councillor D. Smith would be substituting for Councillor D.J. Snape and Councillor P. Witton would be substituting for Councillor J.T. Kraujalis.

38. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restriction on Voting by Members

No declarations of interests were made.

39. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Nothing declared.

40. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 August, 2017 be approved as a correct record subject to Councillor A. Dudson being included on the list of apologies.

41. Members' Requests for Site Visits

Councillor A. Pearson requested that a site visit be undertaken in respect of

Application CH/17/348, Fallow Park, Rugeley Road, Hednesford WS12 0QZ, Residential development, Erection of 3 no. houses in order to assess whether there was any possible overdevelopment of the site.

RESOLVED:

That a site visit be undertaken in respect of Application CH/17/348, Fallow Park, Rugeley Road, Hednesford, WS12 0QZ, Residential development, Erection of 3 no. houses.

Reason: To assess possible overdevelopment of the site.

42. Application CH/17/206, 53 Gorse Lane, Cannock, WS11 1EY, two storey side extension

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.14 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to the determination of the application a representation was made by Sam Shirley, speaking on behalf of his parents who were objecting to the application.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.

43. Update Report in respect to issues raised by Augean Cannock regarding the adjacent residential development at Chenet Chase, Cannock – pursuant to Planning consents CH/13/0323 and CH/16/0124

Consideration was given to the update report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.15 to 6.16 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that he had been asked to provide the update report to Members at the previous meeting. The Managing Director had sent a letter to Members in respect of this matter and this update was identical to the letter. He also referred to an email that had been sent to all Members of the Committee which advised that the application reference number quoted in the update report (CH/15/0080) was wrong and related to another site off Walkmill Lane. The correct reference numbers are CH/13/2323 for the outline application and CH/16/0124 for the reserved matters application.

The Officer confirmed that the Managing Director was involved in a multi-agency review of waste sites across Staffordshire to assess the impact of a significant fire at each site. This review was currently being undertaken and this site was included in the review.

Members had concern that the development was adjacent to the hazardous waste treatment site and raised a number of issues, including:-

- Although the statutory consultees had not objected to the original application Members commented that further consideration should be given to whether it

was safe for the development to be so close to the chemical waste treatment site especially as the application was approved prior to the fire at Grenfell Tower;

- whether the developer should cease work until the outcome of review was known;
- there was concern that the acoustic barrier was to be made of close boarded timber fencing and it was considered that it should be made of a non-flammable material;
- although noise mitigation had been considered when agreeing a condition for an acoustic fence to be erected as part of the original application, there had been no fire safety concern taken into account;
- there was concern that the height of the acoustic fencing had been reduced and Members asked why this had been done;
- whether the Health and Safety Executive and the Fire and Rescue Service should be involved in the multi-agency review to assess whether the development was safe given its location next to the waste treatment site;
- Members wanted to know the format of the multi-agency review and considered that a site visit should be undertaken by members of the review group.

Members wished to be advised of the Managing Director's response and reaction to the issues raised and to be kept fully informed of the outcome of the review.

The Development Control Manager commented that he had noted all of the issues raised by Members. He would inform the Managing Director accordingly and ask that the concerns raised by the Committee be taken into account as part of the multi-agency review. He would provide another update report to a future meeting of Planning Control Committee.

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the update be noted.
- (B) That the Managing Director be informed of the issues raised by Members, as outlined above, and that these issues be taken into account as part of the multi-agency review currently being undertaken.
- (C) That Members be advised of the Managing Director's response and reaction to the issues raised and be kept fully informed of the outcome of the review.
- (D) That a further update report be provided to a future meeting of the Planning Control Committee.

The meeting closed at 3.25pm.

CHAIRMAN