

### Attendance

#### Councillors

Cllr Dr Michael Hardacre (Chair)  
Cllr Harman Banger (Vice-Chair)  
Cllr Alan Bolshaw  
Cllr Keith Inston  
Cllr Anwen Muston  
Cllr Wendy Thompson  
Cllr Jonathan Yardley

#### Employees

Stephen Alexander	Head of Planning
Lisa Delrio	Senior Solicitor
Tracey Homfray	Planning Officer
Vijay Kaul	Senior Planning Officer
Paul Lester	Planning Officer
Colin Noakes	Planning Officer
Gerwyn Owen	Professional Lead - Transport Development
Ragbir Sahota	Planning Officer
Helen Tambini	Democratic Services Officer

### Part 1 – items open to the press and public

*Item No.*     *Title*

**1        Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Welcome Koussoukama, Phil Page, John Rowley, Judith Rowley and Mak Singh.

**2        Declarations of interest**

Councillor Harman Banger declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of agenda item 6, application 17/00925/FUL, land formerly known as Bridge Cross Garage, 295 Parkfield Road and bowling green to rear of Old Ash Tree Inn, Dudley Road, Wolverhampton, as a license holder for a banqueting suite in Wolverhampton. He would leave the meeting when the application was considered.

**3        Minutes of the previous meeting - 16 January 2018**

Resolved:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 January 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4 **Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

5 **17/01487/FUL - New Testament Church of God, 32-39 Woden Road, Wolverhampton**

The Committee considered a report regarding application 17/01487/FUL, use of part of the car park as a hand car wash facility.

Ragbir Sahota, Planning Officer reported an update to the report since it had been published. He advised that he had received comments from Councillor Sandra Samuels OBE requesting that the Committee consider the possibility of granting the application with the imposition of suitable conditions.

Bishop Ruben King addressed the Committee and spoke in support of the application.

Resolved:

That planning application 17/01487/FUL be refused planning permission for the following reasons:

- The proposed use of the part of the car park as a hand car wash facility will result in the loss of parking to the detriment of pedestrian and highway safety.
- The application lacks a noise impact assessment and lighting detail in order to fully appraise the impacts of the proposal on local amenities.

6 **17/00925/FUL - Land formerly known as Bridge Cross Garage, 295 Parkfield Road and bowling green to rear of Old Ash Tree Inn, Dudley Road, Wolverhampton**

Councillor Harman Banger left the meeting during consideration of the application.

The Committee considered a report regarding application 17/00925/FUL, the erection of a 600-capacity banqueting hall with a 400-capacity function hall over and a 30-bedroom hotel with associated car parking and landscaping.

Councillors raised concerns regarding the lack of car parking for the size of the proposed development, together with the impact on highway safety due to the increase in traffic and therefore the impact that would have on the surrounding road network and the adjacent 24-hour NHS facility.

Resolved:

That planning application 17/00925/FUL be refused planning permission, contrary to the recommendation in the report for the following reason:

- The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site due to the lack of car parking for a venue of this size. This is a major concern, as a venue of this nature (Banqueting Suite/Function Hall), would result in an increase in visitor traffic, which would have a severe impact to the surrounding road network, and the adjacent NHS facility, to the detriment of highway safety. A usage of this size would also result in an adverse impact to neighbouring amenity by way of noise disturbance from visitors/vehicles. Contrary to Policies UDP AM12:

Parking and Servicing Provision; AM15: Road Safety and Personal Security; EP5 Noise Pollution; and B5 Design Standards for Employment Sites.

Councillor Harman Banger returned to the meeting.

**7 18/00093/FUL - 310 Bushbury Lane, Wolverhampton**

The Committee considered a report regarding 18/00093/FUL, proposed single-storey side extension.

Resolved:

That planning application 18/00093/FUL be granted planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

- Matching materials.
- The extension must not be used as a separate or independent dwelling.

**8 18/00078/OUT - Wolverhampton Environment Centre, Westacre Crescent, Wolverhampton**

The Committee considered a report regarding 18/00078/OUT, outline permission for the demolition of derelict glasshouses and ancillary buildings, to include the derelict bungalow and the redevelopment of the site with 14 x two-storey dwellings, along with access road and car parking (all matters reserved).

Colin Noakes, Planning Officer advised that he was updating Councillors in response to two questions raised during the site visit the Committee had undertaken earlier in the day. He confirmed that the developers would be financially responsible for the update to the road and in respect of the 12 letters of objection, five of those were from local residents.

Mr John Rowley addressed the Committee and spoke in opposition to the application.

Ms Jane Trethewey addressed the Committee and spoke in support of the application.

A Councillor confirmed that the site had been languishing in a poor state for some years. She referred to the many hours and hard work taken to write the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan and expressed concern that if little or no account was being taken of that Plan, then of what relevance was it and what had been the point in writing it. If a policy document was being ignored then there should be very good reasons why, and it was difficult to identify the reason in this case. Although the site was in a poor state, there could be other uses for it. The access would need to be widened and that would not be straightforward. There had been several objections from local residents who lived closest to the site and those objections should be taken into account and it was unfortunate that those residents had not been involved enough during the application process. She questioned if the £80,000 would be a one-off payment as that would be insufficient for maintenance of such a valued country park, which made a significant contribution to the local neighbourhood and surrounding areas. She was concerned that a principle or precedent would also be set, even though the full footprint would not be used. It would be beneficial to see

the issues raised being resolved; however, not at the expense of the Neighbourhood Plan and local environmental concerns.

A Councillor referred to the potential impact of the proposed development on the Green Belt and expressed concern regarding any future changes, particularly given the significant wildlife presence. He agreed that the site required maintenance and upkeep and he expressed reassurance that the submitted ecological and protected species surveys were satisfactory and the Highway Authority had not objected.

Colin Noakes, Planning Officer advised that four ecological surveys had been undertaken; one general survey, one for newts, one for bats and one for reptiles and he confirmed that all would have to be adhered to if planning permission was granted. He also advised that the houses would not be built in the green space and the developers would be required to pay for the upgrade of the road.

Resolved:

1. That planning application 18/00078/OUT be granted planning permission, subject to the following conditions:
  - Levels survey.
  - Drainage details.
  - Removal of permitted development rights.
  - Control external lighting.
  - Demolition and Construction Management Plan.
  - Maximum two-storey.
  - Maximum volume.
  - Parking only in designated areas.
  - Parking spaces only to be used for parking.
2. That a Section 106 Agreement be required and authorised (to be signed by the purchaser from City of Wolverhampton Council immediately after the purchase after planning permission is granted) requiring the payment of £80,000 to meet the costs of 10 years maintenance of the remainder of the WEC as part of the Smestow Valley Local Nature Reserve.

9 **17/00971/FUL - 164 Dudley Road, Wolverhampton**

The Committee considered a report regarding 17/00971/FUL, Change of Use from D1 to A1, shop front alteration and relocation of staircase.

Mrs R. Kaur addressed the Committee and spoke in support of the application.

In answer to a question regarding the criteria to be met, Paul Lester, Planning Officer advised that there were four criteria which all had to be met under Policy CEN6. Those criteria included that it met a specific day to day need, local provision could not be better met by investment in a nearby centre, existing facilities that met day to day needs would not be undermined and that it had good accessibility. He advised, that whilst it might not undermine other businesses and it had good accessibility, nevertheless, it was still contrary to other parts of the Policy and could not be supported.

A number of Councillors suggested that the shop would not have a detrimental impact in its new location and there was likely to be less footfall compared to the

previous use of the building as an advice centre. It would hopefully also reduce the problems with ASB associated with the current site. There had been no objections from local residents or statutory consultees. The area was thriving and would benefit from additional investment and the site was close to a bus stop and good arterial routes. If the application was for a new business that would be different; however, as this was for a relocation it was acceptable and should be encouraged.

A Councillor referred to a principle being established if the application was granted as other local centres also wished to extend. Significant numbers of people were on the housing list and this property could be returned to a dwelling which would be beneficial. It would be of interest to know if exceptions had previously been made and other properties had been converted.

Paul Lester, Planning Officer reminded Councillors that they should consider the merits of this planning application.

A Councillor stated that the Committee should be mindful of what its view would be if the application was for the location of a new shop in the building.

Several Councillors also expressed the view that it was important to note that the application did not comply with Policy.

In answer to a question regarding the use of the existing mobile phone premises if it was vacated, Paul Lester, Planning Officer confirmed that the existing premises would retain an A1 use and could still be operated as a shop. He advised that clarification could be provided to Councillors on previous exceptions along Dudley Road.

Resolved:

That planning application 17/00971/FUL be refused for the following reasons:

- The application does not demonstrate a need for a new retail unit to meet specific demand for the local population. Local provision could be better met by investment in nearby local centres. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Black Country Core Strategy Policies CEN1, CEN2 and CEN6.
- Detrimental to the amenities of residents of the adjoining terraced property. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Unitary Development Plan Policy EP5.

## 10 **17/01466/FUL - 1 The Spinney, Wolverhampton**

The Committee considered a report regarding 17/01466/FUL, demolition of an existing bungalow and erection of one, three bed dormer bungalow and two, two bed bungalows.

Ragbir Sahota, Planning Officer reported a correction to the report. The site was within Tettenhall Wightwick ward and not Tettenhall Regis ward as stated in the report.

A number of Councillors expressed concern that the proposed development would be out of keeping and lead to over development of the site and it was not surprising that 10 letters of objection had been received.

Ragbir Sahota, Planning Officer advised that the amenity areas and number of car parking spaces exceeded stated guidance.

Resolved:

That planning application 17/01466/FUL be refused planning permission, contrary to the recommendation in the report, for the following reason:

- The proposed bungalows would result in an unacceptable sub-division of the existing bungalow/garden, detracting from its setting and level of spacious amenity and provide insufficient spacious amenity for the proposed bungalows. This would result in an overdevelopment of the site, leading to a cramped appearance and be out of keeping with the existing spaciousness pattern to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene.

11 **17/01495/FUL - Land rear of 45 Rookery Road, Wolverhampton**

The Committee considered a report regarding 17/01495/FUL, residential development comprising 10 semi-detached houses to include improvements to Bayliss Avenue.

Vijay Kaul, Senior Planning Officer reported an update to the report since it had been published. He advised that a further letter of objection had been received which reiterated issues raised in the report.

Councillor Malcolm Gwinnett addressed the Committee and spoke in opposition to the application.

Mr Jake Sedgemore addressed the Committee and spoke in support of the application.

In response to a request from Councillor Gwinnett to amend the condition related to intrusive site investigation (coal mining), to include a reference to any remedial work if required, Vijay Kaul, Senior Planning Officer confirmed that appropriate wording could be added to the condition. He advised that in the report the Coal Authority had referred to undertaking remediation work if required.

Resolved:

That planning application 17/01495/FUL be granted planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

- External materials.
- Levels
- Construction Management Plan (including operational hours).
- Land contamination and ground gas.
- Intrusive site investigation and remediation work if required (coal mining).
- Drainage.
- Landscaping and boundary treatments.
- Electric charging points.
- Renewable energy.
- No external lighting without approval.
- Remove permitted development rights for rear extensions and dormers.

[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

- No more than three dwellings to be occupied prior to Bayliss Avenue road widening.
- 1.8m footway on both sides of widened road.