

Minutes of the Planning Committee held in The Council Chamber, Walsall Council House

Thursday 8 February 2024 at 5:30pm

Committee Members present:

Councillor M. Bird (Chair)
Councillor M. Statham (Vice-Chair)
Councillor P. Bott
Councillor N. Gandham
Councillor A. Harris
Councillor A. Hussain
Councillor I. Hussain
Councillor K. Hussain
Councillor R. Larden
Councillor R. Martin
Councillor J. Murray
Councillor A. Nawaz
Councillor S. Samra

Officers Present:

P. Venables	Director – Regeneration and Economy
A. Ives	Head of Planning and Building Control
M. Brereton	Group Manager – Planning
M. Crowton	Group Manager – Transportation and Strategy
K. Gannon	Development Control and Public Rights of Way Manager
C. Dean	Senior Environmental Protection Officer
S. Hollands	Principal Planning Officer
K. Knight	Senior Transport Planner
A. Scott	Senior Planning Officer
A. White	Team Leader Development Management
L. Wright	Senior Planning Officer
N. Picken	Principal Democratic Services Officer
E. Cook	Democratic Services Officer
L. Cook	Assistant Democratic Services Officer

Councillor Statham in the Chair.

81 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Bains, Bashir, Follows and Garcha.

82 Declarations of Interest and Party Whip

There were no declarations of interest.

83 **Deputations and Petitions**

There were no deputations or petitions submitted.

84 **Minutes**

A copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on the 15 January 2024 was submitted.

[annexed]

Resolved

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2024, a copy having previously been circulated to each member of the Committee, be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

85 **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 (as amended)**

Exclusion of the Public

Resolved

There were no items for consideration in the private session.

86 **Application List for Permission to Develop**

The application list for permission to develop (the plans list) was submitted, together with a supplementary report which provided additional information on items already on the plans list.

(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 first. The Chair, at the beginning of each item for which there were speakers, confirmed they had been advised of the procedure whereby each speaker would have two minutes to speak.

The Chair advised the Committee that Plans List Item 2 Green Lane Motor Salvage had been withdrawn by the applicant.

The Chair advised that the Committee had been requested to defer Plans List Item 3 - 25 and 27 Little Aston Road. Councillor Statham **moved** that the order of proceedings be changed to consider Plans List Item 3 as the first item of business, to which the Committee **consented**.

87 **Plans List 3 – 23/0613 – 25 and 27 Little Aston Road**

The Chair advised that the Committee had been requested to defer Plans List Item 3 - 25 and 27 Little Aston Road.

A Member raised concerns that the applicant had had significant time to overcome objections to the application, that there was significant interest in the item and that under the Council's policy applicants ordinarily only had one opportunity to amend an application. These points were noted by the Chair.

It was **moved** by Councillor Statham and **seconded** by Councillor Bott and upon being put to the vote it was;

Resolved (Unanimously)

That application 234/0613 be deferred to a future meeting to allow further time for all parties to consider and respond to concerns raised by the local highway authority.

Councillor Bird entered the meeting and took the Chair.

88 **Plans List 1 – 22/1548 – Bescot Triangle, Bescot Road**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control, including information contained in the supplementary paper.

(annexed)

There was one speaker in support of the application, Mr Crossen, who explained that the applicant had worked closely with officers and that there were few similar sites available for development.

Responding to questions Mr Crossen expressed the opinion that it was unlikely there would be issues regarding access arrangements with the landowner and that these would be reserved matters. The site and surrounding area experienced significant traffic but the proposed development would have minimal impact as, though a large site, the area being developed was relatively small.

Responding to questions to officers, the Group Manager (Planning) explained that the application was recommended for approval despite being contrary to the development plan, as at the time of the designation there were no potential developers. It was thus determined to keep the area as a green 'buffer'. Under the proposal much of the previously undeveloped land would remain and so on a balanced view it was deemed acceptable. Conditions regarding the public right of way had been included and could be developed at the reserved matters stage.

Debating the application, several Members expressed support for the proposal and stressed that the principle of access was well established.

It was **moved** by Councillor Nawaz and **seconded** by Councillor Bott and upon being put to the vote it was;

Resolved (unanimously)

That Planning Committee delegate to the Head of Planning & Building Control to grant planning permission for application 22/1548 subject to conditions and subject to:

- **The amendment and finalising of conditions;**
- **No further comments from a statutory consultee raising material planning considerations not previously addressed.**

89 **Plans List 4 – 23/1162 – 10 Downham Close**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control, outlining the planning history of the site and the recommended reasons for refusal.

(annexed)

There was one speaker in support of the application, Mr Clifton, who expressed the opinion that the 'fallback' position (Ref: 20/0273) was inappropriate as that application had been made by a previous applicant and the additional increase in footprint relative to the 'fallback' was not 'unnecessary' as stated in the officer's report. He added that in his opinion the glazing and gabling was not excessive, that amendments had been made to reduce glazing and that 8 Downham Close had a similar three-gabled feature and so the proposal was not incongruous.

Responding to questions Mr Clifton described gable ends as the principal feature of Downham Close. Elmstead Close also had prominent gable ends. The land adjacent to the property, mentioned in previous Application 19/0725, had been built upon by the previous owner who had later sold 10 Downham Close separately. Amendments included removal of a two-storey glazed feature and though the footprint increase was significant, the existing property did sprawl, with several outbuildings. The remaining amenity space would be large as the current garden was approximately 250sq.m. Regarding the surrounding area Mr Clifton stated that there were similar properties but they were all different. There were significant extensions at Numbers 8 and 9 Downham Close and numerous extensions along the street.

Responding to questions to officers, the Senior Planning Officer explained that the considerations of the street scene and surrounding area were focussed on the immediate area and Downham Close, rather than the wider neighbourhood. There had been amendments, but the design was in essence still very similar to the previous application and the bulk and height of the proposal would be incongruous. Number 8 Downham Close did have three gables however two were clearly subservient to the main gabling and the plot at Number 10 was a prominent corner plot. As such, Number 8 did not

represent a completely similar design. Whilst significant amenity space would remain, from the street perspective the proposal filled most of the plot and would be unacceptable.

Debating the application Members discussed the subjective nature of the recommended reasons for refusal and debated whether the application would be out of place in the neighbourhood.

It was **moved** by Councillor Nawaz and **seconded** by Councillor K. Hussain and upon being put to the vote it was;

Resolved (10 in favour, 0 against)

That Planning Committee delegate to the Head of Planning and Building Control to grant planning permission for application 23/1162 and to include all necessary planning conditions, contrary to the officer's recommendations, for the following reasons:

- **The application represents a quality design in keeping with the built environment in the immediate locality;**
- **The application reflects nearby development and building lines, with multiple large properties of similar size in the area;**
- **The scale of development can be accommodated within the plot and complies with all Council policies;**
- **The support from the Highways authority subject to the proposed conditions indicated in the officer's report; and**
- **Conditions from the previously granted application can be incorporated where applicable.**

90 **Date of next meeting**

The date of the next meeting would be 7 March 2024.

There being no further business, the meeting terminated at 6:30pm.

Signed:

Date: