

## **Ranton Parish Council**

**Councillors,**

**You are summoned to attend an extraordinary meeting of the parish council to be held on Tuesday, 09<sup>th</sup> August 2016 at approximately 7.30pm at Ranton Village Hall for consideration of the matters itemised in the following agenda. The meeting will follow on from the Village Hall Committee's monthly meeting and therefore may start slightly later.**

**All members of the parish are entitled to attend and have their say.**

### **Agenda**

- 1) Apologies
- 2) Declarations of interest in the following agenda
- 3) To resolve on planning applications

Gayle Whelan, Ranton Parish Council Clerk

rantonparishcouncil@gmail.com

**MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF RANTON PARISH COUNCIL**  
**HELD ON TUESDAY 09 AUGUST 2016 AT RANTON VILLAGE HALL**

**PRESENT:**

Cllr. J. Forrester (Chair)  
Cllr. N. MacLeod (Vice-chair)  
Cllr. M. Russell  
Cllr. S. Williams  
Cllr. M. Winnington

G. Whelan (Clerk)

**16/78 Apologies**

None were made.

**16/79 Declarations of interest in the following agenda:**

These have been listed under each planning application.

**16/80 To resolve on planning applications**

- **16/24443/FUL Drive Me** – construction of steel frame building replacing Portacabins. Hub for driver experience days.

Comments: A list of 12 points were discussed by councillors as reasons for objections to the application. The main issues relate to the expiry of the current license for operations which expires on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2016. These 12 points have been covered in detail as part of a formal letter to the council (see appendix 1).

**Actions:** It was agreed that it was necessary to speak to the planning officer prior to the comments being submitted which will be carried out by Councillor Forrester. Parish Clerk will write a formal letter to the planning department on behalf of the parish council relating to concerns.

**Action:** A formal response to be submitted to the council by the deadline and parish clerk to submit a notification letter to enforcement at Staffordshire Borough Council reminding them of the expiry of the operating license (appendix 2)

- **16/24566/COU** Yew Tree Barn - Change to exterior façade and Velux windows.

No comments to report.

Cllr Mark Winnington was absent from this discussion reporting prejudicial interests.

- **16/24520/HOU** Ching Lea – Ground floor extension expansion to cover two storey.

No comments to report.

- **16/24558/HOU** Park Nook Cottages - Extension removal of trees .

No comments to report.

Councillors Winnington and Russell declared interests in this application.

- **16/24273/FUL** - update on polytunnels application

Councillor Williams read out an update on the polytunnels application sent to the parish council by Chris Reynolds (appendix 3). Concern was voiced over the application's visual impacts survey.

Councillor Williams proposed that the parish council pay for an independent LVIA report. Councillor Russell seconded the proposal and it was passed.

**Action: Parish clerk to obtain quotes with help from parishioner Chris Reynolds. Best quote to be actioned and submitted to SBC.**

## Appendix 1: Drive Me planning objections letter

Ranton Parish Council  
C/O The Old Meal House  
Ranton  
ST189JU  
16/8/2016

Dear Ms Brown

I write on behalf of Ranton Parish Council on the matter of the planning application ref:16/24443/FUL for the erection of a steel frame building with steel sheeting to provide a hub for driver experience days conducted by Driver Experience Centre, Clanford (Drive Me). The application is to replace existing prefabricated buildings on site.

There are previous applications with planning inspector stipulations for the operation of this site. Many of these planning conditions have been included in this application and as such would constitute a variance in the previous application rather than a new application.

The parish council has a number of issues with the application.

1. The most recent operation licence for Drive Me expired on the 31/7/2016. It is stated in this application that the function of the building would be to facilitate driver experiences. It is the Parish Council's view that by granting this application there is a presumption that any future operation application would be granted. The council suggest that this application be rejected until such time that a new operating licence is approved.
2. It is the Parish Council's view that the application does not meet the requirements under current legislation with regards of the quality of the application. Namely, the planning application does not contain sufficient information and detail regarding drainage, services or waste management. The site plan in particular is below required standards lacking even the most basic dimensions specifying the building or distances to any boundaries.
3. The application is unclear if the current prefabricated buildings will be removed or not.
4. As part of a previous application, trees and hedging were required to reduce the noise footprint of the site. This application states there are no trees on the site. As these were required on a previous application, the Parish Council's position is that a tree survey would be required for this application.
5. The application states that the total car parking is 200. This contradicts the original application where the planning inspector limited parking to 85 cars. With the proposed increase to 200 cars as stated in this application – a rise of over 100% - a road access and safety report should be provided. At the very least County Highways view of the increased traffic should be sought.
6. The design statement is misleading in stating that there is no overall increase in the size of the building. Through creative measuring, and omitting overhangs and covered areas this

might be true. However the footprint of the building on the ground is increased by some 60%. The council would reject the application as the increase in size is not justified by the application.

7. The plans indicate that the building is to support the activities of a **racetrack** which was specifically prohibited in the original appeal, Appeal B: APP/Y3425/A/09/2093718 for operations on this site. By granting this planning as a racetrack it would prejudice any future application for a change of use.
8. As part of the application question 11 asks for details of foul sewage treatment the form is ticked to indicate that the current drainage system will be used but no details have been supplied as required by the application form.
9. There are many further embellishments on the application that are contested by the council. For example: 14 full time equivalents employed on the site. This would be financially unsustainable for a site which was originally granted an operational licence which ran events a couple of times a week at peak times. Clarification would be requested to support this claim.
10. The Stafford Borough Council Planning Portal has a letter From James Pyrah, Robson & Liddle dated 28 June 2016 to J Holmes. Firstly this letter was not included in the application that was sent to the Parrish Council but clearly is the application letter. Secondly, in that letter it states "As agreed with Adrian Allman, the variation for sound condition will follow in September time". As previously stated this was a stipulation in a previous application and would be a variation of the operating licence. To grant planning for this building would be presumptive of any future application.
11. The council would also seek clarity on what Mr Allman has agreed ahead of any planning application as he is not a planning officer his ability to "agree" any variance of a planning inspector decision is unclear. As this has been made part of this application it is the council's view that until all aspects of this application are submitted for scrutiny then the application should be rejected.
12. Finally the Parish council would point at Drive Me's track extremely poor record in complying with previous planning regulations. The subject of which has filled volumes of files at Stafford Borough Council.

Yours sincerely,

S. Williams

Ranton Parish Council

CC: Ranton parish Councillors, Stephen Leighton, Ray Sutherland, John Holmes

Appendix 2: Enforcement letter to enforcement at Stafford Borough Council

Ranton Parish Council  
C/O The Old Meal House  
Ranton  
ST189JU  
22/8/2016

Expiration of planning conditions for Land At Seighford Airfield, Clanford Lane, Seighford, Stafford  
Staffordshire (Drive Me) **12/17567/FUL**

Dear Sir,

On behalf of Ranton Parish Council, we wish to draw your attention to the fact that the most recent operation licence for Driver Experience Centre, Clanford (Drive Me) expired on the 31/7/2016 under planning application reference **12/17567/FUL**. A further planning application (16/24443/FUL) has now been submitted to replace existing prefabricated buildings on site. It is the parish council's view that this latest application cannot be decided upon until its original license expiration has been dealt with as the newest application presumes continuation of the business (for which there is no current permission). Condition 12 of the successful original planning application, states that: "the existing Poratacabins/container hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition no later than three years after the date of this permission". This date has now passed and the buildings are still erect. These buildings are subject of the newest planning application, however, this application does not seek to extend or reapply for premissions as stated in the original application, to use "the land for motor vehicle demonstration, testing, training/instruction and experience purposes to allow for the purposes of portable buildings on site for a further three years".

Yours sincerely

Gaye Whelan, Ranton parish Clerk on behalf of Jeff Forrester, chairman of Ranton Parish Council and Ranton parish councillors.

### Appendix 3: Ranton polytunnels update

1. Staffs County Council's Flood Officer is not satisfied with the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the Planning Application and particularly the strategy for surface water drainage. Further acceptable details have been called for.
2. At the recent monthly Parish Council meeting, which a few Villagers attended, we were told that, despite major transport concerns being raised, around the suitability of local roads and safety issues, if the Highways Department stays silent and doesn't offer any response then the Planning Committee will assume that there are no issues to stop them approving the planning application.

It was felt that this isn't good enough, given the problems raised and subsequently it was established that Mr Mark Deaville is responsible for Highways in Stafford BC. The excellent letter written to him by Angie Manley is shown as a "Document" on the Planning Dept. web site under the planning application 16/24273/FUL and the reference is 692639676.

After giving him a full account of the issues it requests that he bring the matter to the full attention of the Highways Department so that a proper investigation is carried out and a report issued. We understand that there will now be a response.

3. Stephen Leighton, one of our two Borough Councillors attended the Parish Council meeting mentioned above and a few Villagers subsequently met with him to focus on next steps. He said that, due to the issues raised it is unlikely that the planning application will go before the Planning Committee for a decision until around October. He also said that there would be a site visit by the Planning Committee prior to making their decision.
4. Our other Borough Councillor, Ray Sutherland actually sits on the Planning Committee. However we understand that he may declare an interest and therefore be unable to vote. In this case he would then be able to speak for the Village at the Planning Committee Meeting.
5. Conversations with the Planning Officer this week have revealed that, from a Visual Impact point of view he feels that the Voluntary Buffer Zone offered by the Applicant is "generous" and he feels that no further mitigation is required. This confirms our worst fears that the polytunnels, standing 4.5 metres tall, would be less than 50 metres from the houses that adjoin the Voluntary Buffer Zone. Our hope would be that the Planning Committee think otherwise.
6. You may have seen the article in this week's Newsletter which states that there have been 20 letters of objection. An email has been sent to point out their mistake and they have offered to run an article on behalf of the Village in next week's Edition, which we will take them up on.
7. Finally, having lobbied Jeremy Lefroy a few weeks ago we understand that he has now written to the Planning Department on our behalf.

Signed..... Date.....

Gayle Whelan, Ranton Parish Council Clerk

[rantonparishcouncil@gmail.com](mailto:rantonparishcouncil@gmail.com)