

Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 3rd May, 2017.

Present: Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E.(Chairman), Cllr Eileen Johnson(Sub Cllr Stephen Parry(Vice-Chairman)), Cllr Helen Atkinson, Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Nigel Cooke, Cllr Gillian Corr, Cllr Sally Anne Watson (Sub Cllr Philip Dennis), Sub Cllr Lynn Hall, Cllr Elsi Hampton, Cllr Paul Kirton, Cllr Mick Stoker, Cllr Tracey Stott, Cllr Ian Dalgarno (Sub Cllr Sylvia Walmsley), Cllr David Wilburn

Officers: Greg Archer, Jade Harbottle, Barry Jackson, Peter Shovlin, Jonathan Stocks, Julie Butcher(DHR, L&C) Sarah Whaley(DCE)

Also in attendance: Applicants, Agents and Members of the Public.

Apologies: Cllr Stephen Parry(Vice-Chairman), Cllr Philip Dennis, Cllr Sylvia Walmsley

P Evacuation Procedure

10/17

The Evacuation Procedure was noted.

P Declarations of Interest

11/17

There were no declarations of interest.

P 17/0464/VARY

12/17

**Fairfield Garage, 318 Bishopton Road West, Stockton-on-Tees
Section 73 application to vary condition no2 (Approved Plans) of planning approval 16/1029/FUL- Proposed extension to rear, raising of roof height, and installation of retaining wall and 1.8m high timber fence to northern and western boundary**

Consideration was given to a report on planning application 17/0464/VARY Fairfield Garage, 318 Bishopton Road West, Stockton on Tees, which at the 12th April 2017 Planning Committee, Members deferred to enable officers to discuss with the applicant the provision of landscaping screening. Members were now required to reconsider the application taking into account the planning policies and material planning considerations which were set out in the original report.

Officers explained to the Committee that the Highways, Transport and Design Manger had assessed the potential of planting however taking int account the constraints of the site, the presence of services within the grass verge area to the rear and the requirements for parking and manoeuvrability space within the site, it was considered that planting was not feasible.

The recommendation remained as previously set out in the report made to Members at the Planning Committee held on 12th April 2017 contained within Appendix 1 that the application be granted conditional Approval.

Objectors attended the meeting and were given the opportunity to make representation. With the exception of those submissions already provided during the consultation period, and detailed within the report, objector's comments could be summarised as follows:

Questions were raised as to whether the garage was an extension or a new build. Some residents felt that the applicant had ignored the planning permission he had been granted and built what he wanted.

Comments were made suggesting the building was more akin to an aircraft carrier.

One resident expressed her concerns in terms of being directly overlooked resulting in a loss of privacy,

The building would have a detrimental effect on people's lives.

The business was operating outside its permitted hours.

Residents felt the building had breached the original permitted development and therefore the building should be taken down.

Councillors Maurice Perry and Bill Woodhead Ward Councillors for Fairfield attended the meeting. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

The building did not enhance nor fit in with the surrounding area. It was not what was envisaged from the original plan and was a monstrosity.

The building impacted on residents.

It was disappointing to find there were no screening options.

Some sort of screening was required whether it be ivy/fencing, anything to obscure the scene.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by Objectors. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

In terms of impact on neighbours, policies had been considered when the original scheme was determined. One of those considerations was impact on residential amenity.

There was still a 1.8 metre fence to be erected to the rear, which had not changed from the original approved plan.

Screening had been fully considered, however this would impact on parking and was not considered to be achievable.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions/make comments on the application and these could be summarised as follows:

Some Members felt that the building had breached some of the original conditions which included operating outside permitted operating times.

Reference was made to the material planning considerations in terms of impact on street scene and character of the area.

It was felt that the scale of the building amounted to overdevelopment.

Questions were raised in relation to the possibility of future complaints should the applicant operate with doors open, and who would enforce this should it be required?

It was suggested that the 1.8 metre fence which was still to be erected was too low and the fence should be at least twice the agreed height.

Some Members felt that the roof had been raised by the applicant to allow for larger vehicles to be worked on.

The building would be more appropriate on an industrial estate.

The building should revert to the original plan.

As the rear of the building had not changed the only part of the building that could be changed was the front.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by Members. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

Officers agreed that an increase of the 1.8 metre fence could be explored however it was unknown as to what that would be.

In terms of overdevelopment, there had not been an increase in the footprint of the scheme.

The rear of the structure had been built in accordance with the original approved plans.

If any conditions were breached then enforcement would take appropriate action.

The most Officers felt they could do was reduce the roof to the original 6 metres as approved on the original scheme.

Officers were prepared to approach the Councils Landscape Architect to look at screening and discuss with the applicant the height of the 1.8 metre fence.

A motion was proposed and seconded that the development be deferred to discuss further with the applicant additional screening/buffer.

A vote took place and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that planning application 17/0464/VARY Fairfield Garage, 318 Bishopton Road West, Stockton on Tees be deferred to enable discussions to take place with the applicant to reconsider the screening of the development including the rear boundary fence and increase the height to an appropriate level.

Members were asked to consider and note a report which updated members on the current performance of Planning Development Services for the last two quarters of 2016/2017 and the cumulative total for the year.

In February 2016, the Planning Committee decided that the future reporting of performance to committee would be on a six monthly basis. The performance level for this year therefore remained at 75% for majors, 80% for minors, 88% for other applications and 75% for County matters.

The reporting timeframe ran from 1st April-31st March each year. The report presented the performance of the last two quarters of 2016/2017 and the cumulative total for the year.

Current performance position

Performance results achieved for the year 2016/17 were 88.46% for major applications, 85.95% for minor, 93.6% for others and there were no County matters applications dealt with in that time frame. The results for the year were as shown in tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 and chart 1 which were contained within the main report.

RESOLVED that the planning committee note the performance report and acknowledge the hard work and dedication of Planning Staff and colleagues within other service areas to determine applications within the target periods and improve performance and the reputation of the Council.