

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday 15 October 2020 at 5.30pm

Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Held in accordance with the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulation 2020; and conducted according to the Council's Standing Orders for Remote Meetings and those set out in the Council's Constitution.

Present:

Councillor Bird (Chair)
Councillor P. Bott
Councillor Craddock
Councillor Creaney
Councillor Harris
Councillor Harrison
Councillor Hicken
Councillor Jukes
Councillor Murray
Councillor Nawaz
Councillor Rasab
Councillor Robertson
Councillor Samra
Councillor Sarohi
Councillor Statham
Councillor Underhill
Councillor Waters

Officers:

Alison Ives – Head of Planning & Building Control
Andrew White – Team Leader, Development Management
Michael Brereton - Senior Planning Officer
Alison Sargent – Principal Solicitor, Planning
Kevin Gannon – Team Leader, Development Control, Public RoW
Ian Rathbone – Principal Pollution Control Officer
Bev Mycock – Democratic Services Officer

Welcome

At this point in the meeting, the Chair opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and explaining the rules of procedure and legal context in which the meeting was being held. He also directed members of the public viewing the meeting to the papers, which could be found on the Council's Committee Management Information system (CMIS) webpage.

Members and officers in attendance confirmed they could both see and hear the proceedings.

123/20 **Apologies**

Apologies were submitted on behalf of Councillors Perry and Chattha.

124/20 **Minutes**

Councillor Bird **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Rasab that the minutes of the meeting held on 17th September, 2020, a copy having been previously circulated to each Members of the Committee, be approved and signed as a true record.

The Chairman put the recommendation to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members.

Resolved (12 in favour and 1 abstained)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 17th September, 2020, a copy having been previously circulated to each Member of the Committee, be approved and signed as a true record.

125/20 **Declarations of Interest.**

There were no declarations of interest.

126/20 **Deputations and Petitions**

There were no deputations introduced or petitions submitted

127/20 **Local Government (Access to Information) Act, 1985 (as amended)**

There were no items to be considered in private session.

Councillor Statham arrived at this juncture of the meeting.

128/20 **17 Fallowfield Road, Walsall, Reference no. E19/0320**

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted together with some additional information, as set out within the supplementary paper

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points contained therein.

There then followed a period of questioning by Members to Officers in relation to:-

- Could the length of the dropped kerb be a safety issue? The Team Manager, Public RoW confirmed the current dropped kerb was beyond normal acceptance of three droppers and two tapers and therefore verification would be required from Traffic Management as to what had been agreed. The Team Manager, Public RoW further added that should the fence be set back, there must be sufficient space on the drive for the gates to open inwards. He stated that a drawing would be required to demonstrate the gates could open inwards to eliminate any requirement for the gates to open out on to the highway.
- Soakaway? The Team Manager, Public RoW stated that the land owner must provide details of a soakaway on the property to evidence where excess water would travel to.
- How much soft landscaping could be reinstated? The Presenting Officer stated that enforcement officers could only pursue to the point of permitted development.

Following the conclusion of questions to Officers, Members considered the enforcement report and Councillor Bird **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Craddock:-

- i. That authority be granted to the Head of Planning Control to issue an Enforcement Notice under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to require remedial actions to be undertaken as shown in 3.2 of the report.
- ii. To authorise the Head of Planning and Building Control to institute prosecution proceedings in the event of non-compliance with an Enforcement Notice.
- iii. To authorise the Head of Planning and Building Control to amend, add to, or delete from the wording set out in the report stating the nature of the breaches, the reasons for taking enforcement action, the requirements of the Notice, or the boundaries of the site, in the interests of ensuring that accurate and up to date notices are served.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with 14 Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimous)

- i. That authority be granted to the Head of Planning Control to issue an Enforcement Notice under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to require remedial actions to be undertaken as shown in 3.2 of the report.
- ii. To authorise the Head of Planning and Building Control to institute prosecution proceedings in the event of non-compliance with an Enforcement Notice.
- iii. To authorise the Head of Planning and Building Control to amend, add to, or delete from the wording set out in the report stating the nature of the breaches, the reasons for taking enforcement action, the requirements of the Notice, or the boundaries of the site, in the interests of ensuring that accurate and up to date notices are served.

129/20 **Application List for Permission to Develop**

The application list for permission to develop was submitted, together with supplementary papers and information for items already on the plans list.

(see annexed)

The Committee agreed to deal with the items on the agenda where members of the public had previously indicated that they wished to address the Committee and the Chair, at the beginning of each item for which there were speakers, confirmed they had been advised on the procedure whereby each speaker would have two minutes to speak.

The Chair reminded Members that should they be minded to go against officers' recommendations, the Mover of the Motion must make clear the reasons for doing so and ensure that they are based on planning grounds. Once the reasons have been provided and the Motion seconded, the Chair will ask the Solicitor present to read out the reasons and give planning officers the opportunity to comment prior to taking a vote on the matter.

Councillor Nawaz arrived at this juncture of the meeting.

130/20 **PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 1 – 19/1543 – Land North East of Shaylor Anchor Brook Industrial Park, Wharf Approach, Aldridge – erection of a B2/B8 industrial/warehousing unit with ancillary office space and the erection of a retail unit (A1/A3 use class) and provision of accesses, car parking, landscaping and associated works (affecting Public Right of Way ALD17)**

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted.

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional information and revised recommendation as set out within the supplementary paper.

The Committee then welcomed the only speaker on this item, Mr. Instone, who wished to speak in support of this application.

Mr. Instone stated that the application site was an allocated employment site within the Site Allocation Document and would provide a valuable contribution to the economy. The development would create employment for around 40 people. The A1/A3 use class element would provide employment opportunities and service the wider employment area. He added that the development would be of a high quality and that the applicant had worked proactively with officers.

Members were then invited to ask questions of the speaker.

Members had no questions for the speaker.

There then followed a period of questioning by Members to Officers, which included:-

- What colour would the units be? The Presenting Officer confirmed that the units would be dark grey cladding with a red stripe.
- Had any newts or badgers been discovered on the site? The Presenting Officer advised that the applicant had provided an updated ecology report, as detailed within the supplementary paper, which had addressed most of the previous ecological concerns, and that further conditions would be added to the permission as detailed within the supplementary paper.
- Had bats been located in the area and if so, could bat boxes be attached to the industrial units? The Chair referred to the supplementary paper, which included a condition requiring a sympathetic lighting scheme to safeguard local bat populations.
- Would the stream be diverted to ensure flooding does not occur? The Presenting Officer advised the brook would be incorporated into the layout of the scheme. The Chair referred to an additional condition contained within the supplementary paper requiring a Precautionary Working Method Statement, which included a Pollution Prevention strategy regarding the watercourse.

Following the conclusion of questions to Officers, Members considered the application.

Councillor Samra **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Bott:-

That planning application no. **19/1543** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission, subject to conditions and subject to:-

- no new material considerations being received within the consultation period and
 - the amendment and finalising of conditions
- as contained within the report and supplementary paper

Before voting, the Planning Solicitor read out the recommendation for the benefit of Members.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with 14 Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimous)

That planning application no. **19/1543** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant permission, subject to conditions and subject to:-

- no new material considerations being received within the consultation period and

- the amendment and finalising of conditions as contained within the report and supplementary paper

At this juncture of the meeting, the Chair advised Committee that he would take Item 8 on the plans list next.

131/20 PLANS LIST ITEM 8 – 19/1583 – 22 FOREST CLOSE, STREETLY, SUTTON COLDFIELD, B74 2JZ – SINGLE STOREY FRONT PORCH EXTENSION AND RAMP.

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted.

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional information and revised recommendation as set out within the supplementary paper.

The Committee then welcomed the first speaker on this application, Mr. Underwood, who wished to speak in objection to the application.

Mr. Underwood advised Committee that he had lived in the adjoining, semi-detached property to the applicant for over ten years. He stated that an extension and ramp would affect the shared driveway, as he would not be able to reverse or park his car adjacent to his own front door. He stated that his wife had a medical condition, which limited her walking and this had resulted in the need to park his car close to his front door. Mr. Underwood further added that the ramp on the shared driveway would create flooding and he enquired where the rainwater would discharge to following the introduction of a roof gutter, as there was no storm drain in the area of the proposed extension.

The Committee then welcomed the second speaker on this application, Councillor Johal, who also wished to speak in objection to the application.

Councillor Johal stated that within that specific area of Forest Close, the semi-detached bungalows were of the same design with shared driveways, and the mass and scale of the proposal would detract from the street scene. The proposal would prevent the neighbouring property from using their parking space whereas the applicant had additional space on the front of their property to park a car. Councillor Johal referred to the petition mentioned within the report that contained 26 signatures from 14 homes within Forest Close objecting to the application.

Members were then invited to ask questions of the speakers.

Members queried the following:-

- How long had Mr. Underwood lived at the property? Mr Underwood stated that he had lived in the property for ten years.
- Did any other bungalows have similar extensions and were any of the driveways wide? Mr Underwood stated there were no other bungalows with similar extensions and he confirmed that driveways were very narrow and parking had to be staggered.
- How close to the speakers home would the wall of the neighbouring property be? Mr. Underwood stated there would be 2.7m from his front door to the gable wall.
- Was any part of the driveway shared or did the properties have their own drives? Mr. Underwood stated that all the drives were shared and cars had to be staggered on driveways.
- Was the speaker able to exit his car should it be parked in the garage? Mr. Underwood stated that the garage was too narrow and exit had to be from one side only.
- Could the speaker park on the frontage of his bungalow? Mr. Underwood stated that his property had less frontage space compared to the application property and therefore he only had space for one car.

There then followed a period of questioning by Members to Officers in relation to:-

- How much smaller would the porch be should the applicant build one under permitted development? The Presenting Officer stated the applicant could build a slightly smaller porch up to the boundary line at 3m² floor area and 3m height under permitted development.
- Could the applicant erect a fence under permitted development and if so, how high could it be? The Presenting Officer stated that under permitted development, a 2m high fence could be erected up to 1m of back of the footpath.
- There were four bungalows at the end of the close, did one bungalow include a car port and one bungalow include a dormer extension? The Presenting Officer confirmed that was the case.
- Could the wall be conditioned to be clad or rendered in white? The Head of Planning and Building Control advised that a condition with regard to materials used could be included within an approval.

Members considered the application and Councillor Bott **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Craddock:-

That planning application number **19/1583** be granted, subject to conditions as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

Before voting, the Planning Solicitor read out the recommendation for the benefit of Members.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and subsequently declared **lost**, with 4 Members voting in favour and 11 Members voting against.

Councillor Bird **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Samra:-

That planning application no. **19/1583** be refused, against officers recommendation as the proposal would have an impact on number 24 that is so severe that they would lose the amenity that they had enjoyed over the years by the structure being built.

Before voting, the Planning Solicitor read out the recommendation for the benefit of Members.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and subsequently declared **carried**, with 11 Members voting in favour, 3 Members voting against and 1 Member abstaining.

Resolved (11 in favour, 3 against and 1 abstained)

That planning application no. **19/1583** be refused, against officers recommendation as the proposal would have an impact on number 24 that is so severe that they would lose the amenity that they had enjoyed over the years by the structure being built.

Councillor Statham left at this junction of the meeting.

Councillor Creaney arrived at this juncture of the meeting.

132/20 PLANS LIST ITEM NO. 4 – 20/0899 – DEVELOPMENT SITE AT GEORGE STREET AND UPPER HALL LANE, GEORGE STREET, WALSALL, WS1 1RL – CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW TEACHING BUILDING EXTENSION WITH CONNECTING BRIDGE TO THE EXISTING SCHOOL, ACCESS, PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND DRAINAGE

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted.

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional information and revised recommendation as set out within the supplementary paper.

The Committee then welcomed the only speaker on this item, Ms Davies, who wished to speak in support of the application.

Ms Davies stated that the application represented a substantial investment by the Department for Education (DfE) into the town centre. The new teaching block was a much needed education facility to the existing school and would be located within a key vacant site with good transport links. The school provided education for 14 to 19 year olds and the new teaching block

would create a dedicated science lab to the existing school. There would be no pupil increase and the site would include 20 car spaces.

Members were then invited to ask questions of the speaker.

- There were two applications for consideration; were the applications dependent upon each other? Ms Davies stated that the applications were not dependent upon each other.
- Had any historical, archaeological artefacts been photographed or removed? Ms Davies stated that an archaeology desk top study and method statement would be carried out prior to any building taking place.

Members had no questions for officers.

Councillor Underhill joined at this juncture of the meeting and therefore did not take part nor vote on this application.

Members considered the application and Councillor Nawaz **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Bird:-

That Planning application number **20/0899** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning approval, subject to conditions and subject to:-

- the submission of an archaeology desk top study;
- re-consulting the Council's archaeologist to overcome their objection;
- the amendment of finalising of planning conditions;
- overcoming the outstanding ecology, lead local flood authority objections

as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

Before voting, the Planning Solicitor read out the recommendation for the benefit of Members.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with 15 Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimous)

That Planning application number **20/0899** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning approval, subject to conditions and subject to:-

- the submission of an archaeology desk top study;
- re-consulting the Council's archaeologist to overcome their objection;
- the amendment of finalising of planning conditions;
- overcoming the outstanding ecology, lead local flood authority objections

as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

133/20 PLANS LIST ITEM 5 – 20/0900 - DEVELOPMENT SITE AT GEORGE STREET AND UPPER HALL LANE, GEORGE STREET, WALSALL, WS1 1RL – CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SCHOOL BUILDING WITH ASSOCIATED PLAY AREA AND MUGA COURT, ACCESS, PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND DRAINAGE.

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted.

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional information and revised recommendation as set out within the supplementary paper.

The Committee then welcomed the only speaker on this item, Ms Davies, who wished to speak in support of the application.

Ms Davies stated that the development was a new school building and would accommodate pupils from the ages of 13 to 18 years of age. She reported that in 2017, the local authority had identified the need for a new school to accommodate the rise in excluded pupils and prevent excluded pupils from having to be schools outside of the borough. The school would be ideally located on the edge of the Town Centre with good transport links. The site would be landscaped and an archaeological study would be carried out.

Committee Members were then invited to ask questions of the speaker.

Members had no questions for the speaker.

Members had no questions for the officers.

Members considered the application and comments were made as follows:-

- The development should ensure all Walsall's young people were educated within their home authority.
- The area had been neglected for years and there was a need for a school to be located within the Town Centre.
- The current school had made and would continue to make a huge difference to young people.

Councillor Nawaz **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Hicken:-

That planning application no. **20/0900** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning approval subject to conditions and subject to:-

- the submission of an Archaeology desk top study;
- re-consulting the Council's archaeologist to overcome their objection;
- the amendment of finalising of planning conditions;

- overcoming the outstanding ecology, lead local flood authority objections.
- as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

Before voting, the Planning Solicitor read out the recommendation for the benefit of Members.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with 16 Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimously)

That planning application no. **20/0900** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning approval subject to conditions and subject to:-

- the submission of an Archaeology desk top study;
- re-consulting the Council's archaeologist to overcome their objection;
- the amendment of finalising of planning conditions;
- overcoming the outstanding ecology, lead local flood authority objections.

as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

134/20 At this point in the meeting, the Chairman **moved** the suspension of Standing Order of the Council's Constitution to enable the meeting to continue beyond 8.30pm in order to complete the remaining items of the agenda. This was duly **seconded** by Councillor Nawaz. The Committee agreed by dissent to extend the meeting beyond 8.30pm.

135/20 **PLANS LIST ITEM 6 – 20/0254 – LAND OFF DARLASTON ROAD BETWEEN CANAL AND BENTLEY MILL WAY, BENTLEY, WS2 9SG – CONSTRUCTION OF COMMERCIAL BUILDING (USE CLASSES B1(C), B2 AND B8 WITH ANCILLARY OFFICES), ASSOCIATED HIGHWAYS WORKS TO DARLASTON ROAD, PROVISION OF PARKING, ACCESS AND CIRCULATION AREAS WITHIN SITE, PROVISION OF FLOOR COMPENSATION AREA AND ALL OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS.**

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted.

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional information contained within the supplementary paper.

The Committee then welcomed the only speaker on this item, Mr. Plant, who wished to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Plant stated that he was from the Saint Francis Group and they had worked closely with officers over several months. The site would redevelop over 6.4 acres of land identified within the Local Plan for development within the Darlaston West, Wednesfield regeneration corridor. The commercial building would be use classes B1,B2 and B8 and would cover 10,500m2. The site would include parking for nearby residents whose current car parking arrangements would be displaced.

Mr. Plant added that the eight mine shafts would be made safe and stable and any outstanding ecology matters would be resolved

Committee Members were then invited to ask questions of the speakers.

Members queried the following:-

- Did the applicant have an end user at that time? Mr. Plant stated that there was no end user at that time but there had been a number of encouraging enquiries awaiting the end development.
- Had the applicant liaised with the nearby residents in relation to their displaced parking? Mr. Plant stated that a mail shot had been distributed to nearby residents in February. He added that around six households that currently parked their cars on the street outside their homes would be affected and therefore they would be able to utilise a purpose built, secured parking space within the site.
- Would the allocated parking spaces be available in perpetuity for the residents affected by their displaced parking? Mr. Plant confirmed the car parking spaces would be available for the lifetime of the development.

There were no questions to officers.

Members then considered the application. A concern was expressed with regard to the proposed access and whether access to the site from Bentley Mill Lane had been considered as opposed to Darlaston Road and also a concern in relation to the number of residents that would no longer be able to park outside their homes. The Chair asked the Team Manager – RoW to address the Member's concerns.

The Team Manager – RoW stated that with regard to the displaced parking, due to the nature of the development, a signal junction was required and subsequently there was a need to provide junction protection. This would be managed by the provision of double yellow lines to prevent vehicles from parking there. Following dialogue with the applicant, as part of the application they were prepared to provide safe parking for the displaced residents within the site. With regard to access from Bentley Mill Lane, the Team Leader – RoW stated that the signals at Bentley Mill Way junction and the new junction would serve parallel 9 and 10 and would be linked together. Officers were awaiting finalisation of the information for parallel 9 and the proposed railway station so both junctions could be linked and both controlled from the UTC Control Centre in Wolverhampton.

Members considered the application, during which the Councillor Bird stated it was good news to see a company investing in Walsall and thus creating a catalyst for jobs.

Councillor Bird **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Sarohi:-

That planning application no. **20/0254** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and securing a S106 contribution for works off site to improve pedestrian links along the canal and subject to:-

- the amendment and finalising of planning conditions;
- overcoming the outstanding ecology matters;
- addressing any concerns of the Environment Agency and
- Highway England's concerns

as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

Before voting, the Planning Solicitor read out the recommendation for the benefit of Members.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with 16 Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimously)

That planning application no. **20/0254** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and securing a S106 contribution for works off site to improve pedestrian links along the canal and subject to:-

- the amendment and finalising of planning conditions;
- overcoming the outstanding ecology matters;
- addressing any concerns of the Environment Agency and
- Highway England's concerns

as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

136/20 **PLANS LIST ITEM 2 - 20/0746 – FORMER A B WASTE MANAGEMENT LTD, CEMETERY ROAD, DARLASTON, WEDNESBURY, WS10 8NA – CONSTRUCTION OF NEW RAILWAY STATION INCLUDING TWO PLATFORMS, FOOTBRIDGE, INSTALLATION OF STEPS AND LIFT, PLATFORM FURNITURE, LIGHTING, SOFT AND HARD LANDSCAPING, FLOOR MITIGATION, SERVICES AND BOUNDARY TREATMENT AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS. CONSTRUCTION OF CAR PARK (UP TO 300 SPACES) INCORPORATING ACCESSIBLE SPACES AND PARKING, CHARGING FACILITIES FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLES, PARKING FOR CYCLES AND MOTORCYCLES AND INSTALLATION OF MEASURES TO RESTRICT VEHICULAR ACCESS TO KENDRICKS ROAD BRIDGE.**

There were no speakers on this item, however the Chair had requested a presentation.

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted.

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional information and revised recommendation as contained within the supplementary paper.

There then followed a period of questioning by members to Officers in relation to:-

- How soon would the construction of the railway station commence should Members be minded to approve? The Chair confirmed that the application would commence as soon as it was approved. The money was available through the Combined Authority and he thanked Officers who had worked closely with the applicant.
- When was the last time the nearby River Tame had flooded and had mitigation measures been put into place? The Chair advised that following the last flooding of the river, Officers had liaised with the Environment Agency and flood tanks had been installed. The Presenting Officer added that Transport for West Midlands, the local Lead Flood Authority and the Water Authority had all worked together with regard to the Flood Risk Assessment and the works would potentially minimise the risk of future floods.

There then followed a period of discussion, during which Members made the following comments:-

- Excellent development for the local area and the wider Walsall and should be welcomed.
- Prime employment area and will be a boost to job prospects.
- Need to ensure agencies maintain the area to prevent it becoming un-kept.

Following consideration of the application, Councillor Nawaz **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Hicken:-

That planning application number **20/0746** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and the securing of a S106 Agreement for a river level gauge, plus off-site way finding along Bentley Mill Way and works to the adjacent canal towpath including improving accessibility via a financial contribution for the proposed improvement works and subject to:-

- no new material considerations being received within the consultation period;
- the amendment and finalising of conditions;
- no further comments from a statutory consultee raising material planning considerations not previously addressed;

- overcoming the outstanding objections from the Local Lead Flood Authority and Archaeologist plus finalising negotiations between the applicant the Canal and River Trust regarding wayfinding and improvements for accessibility and use of the towpath as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

Before voting, the Principal Planning Solicitor read out the recommendation for the benefit of Members.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with 16 Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimous)

That planning application number **20/0746** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and the securing of a S106 Agreement for a river level gauge, plus off-site way finding along Bentley Mill Way and works to the adjacent canal towpath including improving accessibility via a financial contribution for the proposed improvement works and subject to:-

- no new material considerations being received within the consultation period;
- the amendment and finalising of conditions;
- no further comments from a statutory consultee raising material planning considerations not previously addressed;
- overcoming the outstanding objections from the Local Lead Flood Authority and Archaeologist plus finalising negotiations between the applicant the Canal and River Trust regarding wayfinding and improvements for accessibility and use of the towpath as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

137/20 PLANS LIST ITEM 3 – 20/0748 – LAND ADJACENT RAILWAY AT BILSTON STREET / ROSE HILL, WILLENHALL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION OF NEW RAILWAY STATION INCLUDING TWO PLATFORMS, FOOTBRIDGE, INSTALLATION OF STEPS AND LIFT, PLATFORM FURNITURE, LIGHTING, SOFT AND HARD LANDSCAPING, FLOOD MITIGATION, SERVICES AND BOUNDARY TREATMENT AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS. CONSTRUCTION OF CAR PARKING (UP TO 33 SPACES) INCLUDING ACCESSIBLE SPACES, PARKING AND CHARGING FACILITIES FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLES, PARKING FOR CYCLES AND MOTORCYCLES AND INCLUDING IMPROVEMENTS TO PEDESTRIAN / CROSSING FACILITIES ON BILSTON STREET.

There were no speakers on this item, however the Chair had requested a presentation.

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted.

(see annexed)

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points therein. In addition, the Presenting Officer drew the Committee's attention to the additional information contained within the supplementary paper.

There then followed a period of questioning by Members to Officers in relation to:-

- If a pedestrian crossing were situated outside of the entrance/exit of the site, how would a vehicle exiting the site turn left towards Willenhall in a safe manner, due to the vehicles that currently park on the bridge? The Lead Officer – Public RoW stated that as part of the discussions with West Midlands Rail Executive in relation to the development of the site, it was agreed that a crossing point either side at that point was required and that either side would be built out to ensure a shorter distance for pedestrians to cross the road. There would also be some hatched areas to be curved out to widen the footpath across the bridge. The Lead Officer – Public RoW added that the design would not allow for any vehicle to park on the bridge.

Members considered the application, during which the following comments were made:-

- Huge investment had been made by the Government and Combined Authority to bring life back into Walsall's railways.
- Welcomed application and important to Walsall's economy and for its regeneration.
- Fantastic opportunities for Willenhall and Darlaston. Will boost local income and make the towns desirable.

Members considered the application further and Councillor Hicken **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Bird:-

That planning application no. **20/0748** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to Conditions and subject to:-

- no new material considerations being received within the consultation period;
 - the amendment and finalising of conditions
 - no further comments from a statutory consultee raising material planning considerations not previously addressed;
 - overcoming the outstanding objection(s) from Conservation and the Local Lead Flood Authority
- as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

Before voting, the Principal Planning Solicitor read out the recommendation for the benefit of Members.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with 16 Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimous)

That planning application no. **20/0748** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to Conditions and subject to:-

- no new material considerations being received within the consultation period;
- the amendment and finalising of conditions
- no further comments from a statutory consultee raising material planning considerations not previously addressed;
- overcoming the outstanding objection(s) from Conservation and the Local Lead Flood Authority

as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

138/20 PLANS LIST ITEM 7 – 19/0285 – 107-110 PADDOCK LANE, WALSALL, WS1 2EH - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – 13 NO. 1 BED APARTMENTS AND 2 NO, 2 BED APARTMENTS AND INCLUDING DEMOLITION WORKS WITHIN A CONSERVATION AREA.

There were no speakers on this application.

Councillor Bird **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Samra:-

That planning application no. **19/0285** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and securing a S106 for urban open space contribution, and subject to:-

- the amendment and finalising of planning conditions as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

Before voting, the Principal Planning Solicitor read out the recommendation for the benefit of Members.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with 16 Members voting in favour and none against.

Resolved (unanimous)

That planning application no. **19/0285** be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and securing a S106 for urban open space contribution, and subject to:-

- the amendment and finalising of planning conditions as contained within the report and supplementary paper.

139/20 **Walsall's Response to Planning White Paper: Planning for the Future.**

The report of Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted together with some additional information, as set out within the supplementary paper (see annexed).

The Presenting Officer advised Committee of the background to the report and highlighted the salient points therein.

Members considered the report further and the following comments were made:-

- The Planning White Paper would take away local planning powers and could be potentially detrimental to Walsall;
- taking democracy away from local people;
- Local people are best placed to make local decisions;
- Ministers do not understand the complexities of our brownfield sites that need further local investigation;
- Concerns regarding Walsall's Green Belt;
- No consideration for infrastructure such as schools and G.P. surgeries;
- If prior approvals not built in accordance with the decision, they will bring in more enforcement work

Members considered the report and Councillor Bird **moved** and it was duly **seconded** by Councillor Hicken:-

That Committee delegates authority to the Head of Planning and Building Control and the Head of Regeneration, Housing and Economy to submit a Walsall response to the consultation on the White Paper, with the following comments to be included:-

- If prior approvals not built in accordance with the decision, they would bring in more enforcement work
- No consideration for infrastructure such as schools, G.P. surgeries;
- That Ministers do not understand the complexities of our brownfield sites that need further local investigation
- Concerns regarding green belt impacts
- Taking democracy away from local people

Before voting, the Principal Planning Solicitor read out the recommendation for the benefit of Members.

The Motion was put to the vote by way of a roll call of Committee Members and was subsequently declared **carried**, with all Members present voting in favour.

Resolved (unanimous)

That Committee delegates authority to the Head of Planning and Building Control and the Head of Regeneration, Housing and Economy to submit a Walsall response to the consultation on the White Paper, with the following comments to be included:-

- If prior approvals not built in accordance with the decision, they would bring in more enforcement work
- No consideration for infrastructure such as schools, G.P. surgeries;
- That Ministers do not understand the complexities of our brownfield sites that need further local investigation
- Concerns regarding green belt impacts
- Taking democracy away from local people

140/20 **Termination of meeting**

There being no further business, the meeting terminated at 9.10pm

Chair

Date

