

# **THE PLANNING AND BUILDING COMMITTEE**

## **Minutes**

**These minutes are draft until confirmed by Chairman**

**Friday 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009**

**1.30pm in the Liberation Room, Secretariat**

Distribution List:-

**Hon J Birmingham  
Hon R Stevens  
Hon M Rendell  
Hon R Cockwell  
Mr G France  
Mr R French  
Miss A King  
Miss H Norman**

**Environmental Planning Officer  
Building Adviser  
Director of Public Works  
Senior Crown Counsel  
Chief Fire Officer  
Chief Medical Officer  
Historic Buildings Committee**

**THE PLANNING AND BUILDING COMMITTEE**  
**Friday 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009**  
**1.30pm**  
**Liberation Room, Secretariat**

**Minutes**

<b>Present:</b>	The Honourable Mr J Birmingham The Honourable Mr R Cockwell	Chair
	Mr R French Mr G France	RF GF
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Mr A Payne Mr N Stephens Mr M Keenleyside Ms A Inglis	EPO BA DPW SCC
<b>Secretary:</b>	Mrs F Wallace-Nannig	Sec

**Public & Press: 1**

**PART I**

**1 Apologies for absence**

Members noted that apologies had been received from Miss Anna King, Miss Heather Norman and Mr Gardner Fiddes (CFO).

**2 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3 Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2009**

The minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> June will be confirmed at the scheduled meeting taking place on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2009.

**4 Matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2009**

**4.1 Lay Member** (Page 1, Item 4.1) – This matter will be discussed at the meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2009.

**5 Planning applications  
Decisions**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Key Policies</b>
<b>5.1</b>	54/09	Land south and west of Mink Park, Moody Brook Road, Stanley	Outline application for development of land into fully serviced residential plots for up to 19 houses	Structure Plan policy BE2

Item	Ref	Site	Proposal for FIG	Key Policies
------	-----	------	---------------------	--------------

Planning Permission is **granted** subject to the following conditions:

1. All foul water drainage shall connect to the proposed bio disc located on the north side of Moody Brook Road.
2. The development shall be served by a single access point onto Moody Brook Road.
3. No dwelling shall have direct access onto Moody Brook Road.
4. All dwelling plots shall provide at least two off street parking spaces.
5. A pedestrian link shall be provided between plots 19 and 20 from the access road to land south of the development.
6. The ground floor area of each dwelling shall not exceed 25% of the area of the plot.
7. Dwellings on plots 20, 21, 22 and 23 shall be staggered as per the approved plan.
8. Dwellings on plots 5, 6, 22 and 23 shall be either one or one and a half storey.
9. Fire hydrants shall be provided within the access road, the precise location and number of which shall be agreed with the Chief Fire Officer.

#### **Reasons for Conditions**

1. In the interests of securing appropriate drainage for the development.
- 2, 3 & 4. In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety.
5. To enable access to the golf course, Stanley Common and proposed children's play area to the south west of the site. This access could also link with the proposed adjacent development of the Old Butchery site, if approved.
6. To ensure that each plot is not over-developed.
7. To reduce inter-visibility between properties and maximise scope for

Item	Ref	Site	Proposal	Key Policies
------	-----	------	----------	--------------

passive solar gain.

8. This built form adjacent to Moody Brook Road continues that established by the Mink Park phase 1 development.
9. In the interests of fire safety.

*EPO advised members that the intention was to develop the plots in terms of infrastructure and then sell them to individual purchasers for further development. The plot sizes varied between 530 m<sup>2</sup> to 880m<sup>2</sup>, with the indicative dwelling footprints being between 80m<sup>2</sup> and 104m<sup>2</sup>. Each plot would provide two off street parking spaces. EPO concluded that he had no issues with the broad development*

*EPO went on to say that two issues had precluded further development in the Mink Park area. The first was foul water drainage, which will be resolved by connecting the properties to a biodisc on the north side of Moody Brook Road. The second was the condition of Moody Brook Road. Previous applications along the road had been refused until such time as there was a firm commitment from Government to upgrade the road. Budget provision had recently been made to upgrade the road as far as Mink Park, with the works due to be completed in 2009/10 and this should address this issue.*

*EPO then said that Members might wish to consider whether a further condition is necessary requiring the road to be upgraded to a standard capable of taking the additional traffic prior to the occupation of the first dwelling. This would help ensure that the current planned upgrade is completed, and to an acceptable standard.*

*This generated considerable discussion, with Councillor Cockwell stating that he felt it unreasonable and draconian to implement such a condition, when the works to the road were to be done by a third party, over whom property owners would have no control. He added that the reason for bringing this development ahead was to meet increasing demand for housing plots, such a condition would only cause further delay to the houses being built and occupied. DPW acknowledged that it would take some time for the Moody Brook Road to be upgraded and for the new road to be built but envisaged that a majority of it would be done whilst the infrastructure works on each property were being installed. He did not envisage any delay in terms of road upgrading or building. Ultimately, it was agreed that this condition would not be added to the Planning Permission.*

*Debate then centred on the proposed condition that the maximum height of the buildings on plots 5, 6, 22 and 23 be limited to one or one and a half-storey. Councillor Cockwell suggested that a stipulated roof height would be more accurate in terms of controlling the height of finished buildings. RF responded that he was not in favour of this idea. After some discussion, Members agreed with DPW's comment that the condition could remain but that buyers be made aware that they could apply for planning permission to erect a different size dwelling and that this would be judged*

