

Public Document Pack



Simon W. Baker B.Ed MBA MISPAL
Chief Executive

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE SUPPLEMENT AGENDA

Date: Thursday, 17 October 2019

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: The Council Chamber, Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek

Please find below an additional report which was unavailable when the agenda was published.

PART 1

13. NOTE - A Late Representations Report will be circulated prior to the meeting i.e. any representations received since this agenda was published. **(Pages 3 - 8)**

SIMON BAKER
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 17th October 2019

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
SMD/2019/0436	<p><u>Olive Tree Park, Uttoxeter Road, Checkley</u></p> <p>No update.</p>	13 – 21
SMD/2019/0398	<p><u>School Green, Ipstones</u></p> <p><u>Agent – name of applicant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant is Mr Alan Swancott. <p><u>Case Officer – Change to recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approve subject to result of ecology survey to be submitted – with final decision delegated to the Head of Development Services in consultation with the Chair <p>With reference to paragraph 6.4 at page 27 of the agenda it will be noted that an ecology survey report had been requested by the LPA. The agent has declined to provide this in time for committee but requests that a decision be reached on all other matters with a final decision delegated for determination by officers based on the results of the ecology survey. If PAC is minded to approve, the decision will only be issued once the status of protected species at the site is known, together with any further necessary conditions and/or informatives. If PAC is minded to refuse the decision can be issued with an additional reason for refusal being the absence of a protected species report.</p> <p><u>Case Officer – Conservation Area</u> Paragraphs 7.12 to 7.22 of the report discuss the impacts on heritage assets – the Ipstones Conservation Area and the nearby Listed Buildings as itemised at paragraph 2.3. In terms of the impact on the Conservation Area and the s.72 duty, the scheme is judged to bring some benefit by securing a future for a building judged to contribute some character to the Conservation Area, albeit with a small extension, and further improvement by removing an unsightly breeze block garage.</p> <p><u>Case Officer – additional condition to remove PD rights</u> Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no development as specified in Part 1 Classes A; B; C; D; E; F and G and Part 2 Classes A and B other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be carried out without express planning permission first being obtained from the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the</p>	23 – 38

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 17th October 2019

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>development and so safeguard the character and visual amenities and heritage of the area being a Conservation Area and to ensure that adequate private or shared amenity space is retained within the curtilage of the building.</p> <p><u>Additional Neighbour Representation</u> A further representation has been received from solicitors acting for an objector whose title to a neighbouring dwelling includes a right of use, in common with two others, of the application land as a yard for drying clothes. A copy of the Land Registry Title and Plan detailing the rights has been supplied. The LPA assessment of this issue remains as at paragraph 7.23 of the report.</p>	
<p>SMD/2019/0213</p>	<p><u>Land at Macclesfield Road, Leek</u></p> <p><u>Agent:</u> Confirm the submission of a revised landscaping scheme by the close of the week and agree to a time extension to the 31st October 2019 to allow the landscaping details to be assessed.</p> <p>Revised facing material palette as follows:</p> <p>Roof tile- Sandtoft 20/20 Interlocking Clay Tile - Antique Slate Facing brick - Ibstock Townhouse Blend Road- standard tarmac Driveways - Marshalls tegula driveway paviors charcoal Paths, patios and steps - Marshalls Pendle riven buff slab</p> <p><u>SMDC Aboricultural Officer:</u> Good to see new native hedgerow is now shown proposed for the west and south boundaries, with an appropriate species mix/density/planting pattern specified on the amended “Alternative Site Plan” Drg. No. 2019-2408-20 Rev J.</p> <p>Also noted that new tree planting is now properly specified in terms of (mainly – see note 7 below) appropriate species, sizes etc and both the Planting Schedule and the Planting and Five Year Maintenance Schedule specify tree planting to be minimum 5m from buildings, as suggested.</p> <p>However, there are a few points of detail to be resolved:</p> <p>1. The title/main heading of the Planting and Five Year Maintenance Schedule document refers to “Brighter Futures – Greenfields and Scotia Road” so presumably lifted from another development site elsewhere. Whilst the submitted maintenance specification is largely relevant and comprehensive, should we ask for it to be amended to refer</p>	<p>39 - 60</p>

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 17th October 2019

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>to the site in question Land off Macclesfield Road, Leek for SMD/2019/0213 ?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="440 501 1262 663">2. In the Maintenance Schedule, the first section on “Existing Trees and Shrubs” refers to BS 3998 (1989) ‘Recommendation for Tree Work’, however this is superseded and the current version is BS 3998 (2010) ‘Tree Work - Recommendations’.<li data-bbox="440 672 1262 1267">3. The same section also refers to BS 5837 (1991) ‘Code of practice for Trees in relation to Construction’, but this is also superseded and the current version is BS 5837 (2012) ‘Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations’. This paragraph goes on to specify Chestnut Pale Fencing for temporary tree protection during construction, but this is no longer standard guidance and the 2012 edition of BS 5837 defaults to welded mesh panels securely fixed to a framework of vertical and horizontal scaffolding well braced to resist impacts. However, this may be adapted to suit specific site and construction circumstances (the key point being that it should be effective and fit for the purpose of excluding construction activity and appropriate to the degree and proximity of work taking place around the retained trees), and it would be sufficient and appropriate simply to specify temporary tree and hedgerow protection barriers in accordance with guidance in BS 5837 (2012).<li data-bbox="440 1276 1262 1639">4. In the “Stakes & Ties” section on page 2 of the Maintenance Schedule document, a 1.5m exposed (above ground) length of stake for a tree over 120cm in height is excessive and potentially taller than the whole tree! The purpose of the stake is to hold the rootball firm while it establishes beyond the original planting pit, not to hold the stem upright – for decent quality planting stock the stem should be self-supporting. Therefore a stake of 0.75m exposed length would also normally be sufficient for a tree of over 120cm. In any event, the exposed length of stake should not normally project into the branches/crown of the tree.<li data-bbox="440 1648 1262 1908">5. It would be useful if it could be explicitly stated that the annual maintenance for species-rich grassed areas proposed for years 1 – 5 in the Maintenance Schedule would apply to the blue-edged land to the rear (south) of Plots 3 – 10. It would also be appropriate if, following the first year’s cut and rake-off, there could be an application of a suitable meadow wildflower seed mix to enhance species diversity.<li data-bbox="440 1917 1262 2074">6. It would be useful if we could seek a few additional new trees within the streetscene of the cul-de-sac which in relation to the frontages of Plots 3 – 10 in particular would otherwise be very open and visually dominated by the dwellings and parked vehicles. I’d suggest one each on the	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 17th October 2019

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>frontages of Plots 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9 chosen from the tree species already submitted on the Planting Schedule – but not Tree E (Ash) which is commercially unavailable due to Ash Dieback disease, and not Tree G (Sloe/Blackthorn) which is a dense suckering hedgerow shrub rather than an individual standard tree).</p> <p>7. Further to point 6 above, Tree E (Ash) should be omitted from the schedule due to its unavailability and the 2 “Tree E” proposals on the plan changed to other species from the list.</p> <p>In fact points 1 – 5 above relate to the 5 year landscape management/maintenance specification which is required under Condition 14 of the outline planning permission SMD/2013/1201 rather than as part of the reserved matters submission, and so there is no panic to secure any minor amendments as indicated in points 1 – 5 in time for Planning Applications Committee on 17th October – these can be dealt and Condition 14 then discharged in due course.</p> <p><u>Case Officer:</u> NMA/2019/0015 for the amendment to red edge on location plan ref SMD/2013/1201 was approved on the 16th October 2019.</p> <p>An additional planning conditions is recommended for the protection of trees during construction:</p> <p>The first action on commencement of development, prior to any further action (including any site clearance, site stripping or site establishment) shall be the erection of temporary tree protection barriers fencing and advisory notices for the protection of the existing trees and hedgerows to be retained, in accordance with guidance in British Standard 5837:2012 <i>Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations</i>, and this shall be retained in position for the duration of the period that development takes place, unless otherwise agreed by the LPA. Within the fenced areas there shall be no excavation, changes in ground levels, installation of underground services, provision of hard surfacing, passage of vehicles, storage of materials, equipment or site huts, tipping of chemicals, waste or cement, or lighting of fires unless otherwise agreed by the LPA.</p> <p>The scheme has been time extended to the 31st October 2019 to allow reserved matters ‘landscaping’ to be resolved. This could be achieved within the framework of the delegated authority of the Head of Development Services should Members be minded to approve the scheme.</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 17th October 2019

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
SMD/2019/0005	<p><u>Land off Black Lane, to the east of Nos 4 and 5 The Plain, Whiston</u></p> <p><u>Case Officer/Agent</u> There was discussion with the agent for this application about the choice of materials.</p> <p>The application proposes brick with stone quoins alongside the use of blue plain clay tiles. A “high quality dark red brick” would be proposed. As noted at 6.3 of the report the Council’s Conservation Officer recommends stone “reflecting the stone of all adjacent buildings”.</p> <p>The agent responds that public street scene views of the development are limited; some modern development has taken place closer to the road; the application site is comparable to the development to the north west of Black Lane which is set behind the thoroughfare and existing dwellings fronting Black Lane where the residential properties comprise of a mixture of materials, with the most prominent gables being finished in stone whilst the elevations not visible from the thoroughfare are finished in mixed brick; Whiston is made up of both stone and brick built properties and the variation in material is more evident on buildings towards the edge of the village; use of stone should not be fundamental to the acceptability of the scheme; the style and design of the dwellings is such that they would appear as workers properties subservient to the hall and these typically would have been constructed out of different materials, albeit ones that are of a high quality; a requirement for stone may lead the applicant to revert to the two dwelling outline scheme.</p> <p><u>Case officer</u> Reference at paragraph 7.27 to two dwellings should read as “four dwellings”.</p>	61 – 75
SMD/2019/0465	<p><u>71 Woodhouse Lane, Biddulph</u></p> <p><u>Case Officer</u> Delete condition 4 and re-number condition 5 as condition 4.</p>	77-83
Agenda Item 11	<p><u>Section 106 Agreement at Churnet View Road.</u></p> <p>No update.</p>	85 - 88
Agenda Item 12	<p><u>Appeals Report</u></p> <p>No update</p>	89 - 102

This page is intentionally left blank