

Public Document Pack



Simon W. Baker B.Ed MBA MISPAL
Chief Executive

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE SUPPLEMENT AGENDA

Date: Thursday, 13 February 2020

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

15. NOTE - A Late Representations Report will be circulated prior to the meeting i.e. any representations received since this agenda was published. **(Pages 3 - 10)**

SIMON BAKER
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 13th February 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
SMD/2019/0486	<p>ITEM 6 <u>Land off Saltersford Lane, Alton</u></p> <p><u>Further comment from the applicant</u> Advises that all retaining walls on the site can be reduced in height but this needs further work from their engineers etc to consider in detail. Is happy therefore, notwithstanding the submitted plans to accept a pre commencement condition to agree details of retaining walls and finished ground levels.</p> <p><u>Letters of representation</u> Two further letters received raising issues of existing problems with foul sewage and capacity of systems in Alton, inappropriate, inadequate access and adverse impact on neighbouring properties</p> <p><u>Amendment to conditions</u> Removal from Condition 3 request for details of retaining wall and road surfacing. To be placed in new conditions – see below</p> <p><u>Additional conditions recommended</u> to protect amenity and/or ensure an acceptable external finish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No development shall take place above slab level until details of the proposed road lighting have been submitted for the written approval of the LPA. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details 2. Notwithstanding the submitted plans road and parking spaces shall be block paved from plot 19 to plots 14/15, details of which shall be first agreed in writing with the LPA 3. Notwithstanding the submitted plans and prior to the commencement of any development (including site stripping and clearance) full details of all proposed retaining walls and proposed ground levels within the site including finished floor levels and sections where necessary shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details 	
SMD/2019/0664	<p>ITEM 7 <u>Land off Thorncliffe Road, Leek</u> No updates</p>	
SMD/2019/0150	<p>ITEM 8 <u>Middle School, Greenhills, Dog Lane, Ipstones Edge</u> None Received</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 13th February 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
SMD/2019/0746	<p>ITEM 9 <u>Land East of 39 Brookfields Road, Ipstones</u></p> <p><u>Conservation Liaison Panel – 5th February 2020</u> OBJECT. An unsuitable site for development as it is clearly beyond the historic building line for the settlement. The building is of poor design and would require extensive engineering operations to occupy the site. Harmful to setting of Conservation Area. [Cllrs Roberts and Emery declared an interest in the application and took no part in the discussion.]</p> <p><u>Officer – additions to recommendation</u> Refusal reason 1 second sentence, after ‘scale and character’ add “or design”.</p> <p>Refusal reason 2 first sentence, after ‘scale’ add “design” to read “As a result of the scale, design and siting...”</p> <p><u>Agent – heritage statement submitted</u></p> <p>References Historic England Guidance HEAG180 – The Setting of Heritage Assets for the step by step approach to assessment and also NPPF para 190.</p> <p>Identifies at fig.7 a zone of visual influence potentially up to 100m in radius</p> <p>Discusses points from the CA appraisal; discusses the Brookfields Road terrace north of the development access and that “it is evident that most if not all of the dwellings have been extended at the rear”; notes that “the stepped ridge-line described in the appraisal remains undisturbed so the extensions have little impact on the setting of the conservation area”. Notes at 6.6 that the CA Appraisal “makes no direct reference to the land on the east side of Brookfields Road”. Notes the SMDC Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment [as referenced in the officer rpt] and that it does not identify any significant views for Ipstones but identifies Footpath 59 as a significant public footpath and the land to the east of Brookfields Road as an important landscape setting comprising areas of irregular shaped fields often with strong vegetation along the streamlines. Notes changes over the last 25 yrs for land rear of 35 to 39: “has become domesticated with the construction of the access and parking areas, the formation of private garden and the construction of garden sheds and greenhouses. These make a negative contribution to the</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 13th February 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>landscape setting. However the visual impact is localised and longer range views are mitigated by the aforementioned vegetation. Overall this recent development has a minor negative impact.”</p> <p>Agent’s assessment concludes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• no impact upon the street scene; provides sufficient off-road parking so there will be no further negative impact in this respect; proposed dwelling will be set into the ground and will present as a traditional single storey brick and tile building when viewed from the rear of the neighbouring properties on Brookfields Road, but would be two storeys when viewed from the east; the ridge lies well below the roofscape of the houses along Brookfields road, so it will not break the skyline when viewed from the east or disrupt the outlook from the rear of the houses either side of No 39. It will not therefore affect the roofscape described in the Conservation Area Appraisal;• will be visible from Footpath FP59, across the valley, particularly at a range in excess of 100m. However the building will be seen against the backdrop of the houses on the east side of Brookfields Road. The low height of the building, the traditional design and detailing and traditional facing materials will limit the impact; will not be visually prominent at close quarters by virtue of the vegetation growing along the stream;• will have a minor negative impact on the setting when viewed from land to the east. However, since the domestication of the land at the rear of 35-39 has already had a minor negative impact, the net effect of the development is neutral;• proposed development will not affect the setting of the Sea Lion by virtue of the degree of separation, the low visual massing when viewed from Sea Lion and mature planting around its perimeter. <p>Agent’s final conclusion: the proposed development will have no impact from within the Conservation Area and no net impact when viewed from land to the east. The overall level of harm to the significance of the Conservation Area and The Sea Lion is therefore assessed as (significantly) less than substantial.</p> <p><u>Officer response</u></p> <p>The submitted heritage statement discusses a series of factors which, broadly, have also been considered in the Officer Report. The officer report finds greater harm and impact but reaches the same ‘less than substantial harm’ conclusion. The NPPF is emphatic that “great weight is to be</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 13th February 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>given to heritage asset conservation, “irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm” and, “any harm” should have “clear and convincing justification”. Where there is ‘less than substantial harm’, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.</p> <p><u>Agent’s visual topography transect</u> In discussion with the case officer the agent has submitted a visual transect profile to establish the impact or otherwise on the setting of the Grade II Listed Sea Lion PH – see rpt para 7.35. As a result of the transect the LPA can accept conclusion of no identifiable impact for the Listed Building.</p> <p><u>Conservation Officer</u> The site affects the setting of Ipstones Conservation Area and will have an impact upon it.</p> <p>The site is in a rural setting on the slopes of a clough to the east of the village which contributes greatly to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and feels visually very separate to the settlement with mature hedges, a woodland character and a sinuous stream in the bottom.</p> <p>Creates a development site which is visually out on a limb from the settlement and would require a building which will have to be engineered into the hillside with substantial ground excavation, split levels, retaining walls and terraces with glass balustrades resulting in visually incongruous elements; also includes awkward design elements such as the design and proportions of windows on the east elevation facing the valley. The visual harm would be viewed from the rear gardens and communal path of properties to the north of the site and from the public footpath running through the Clough.</p> <p>Does not agree the agent’s assessment for impact on the CA in views from the east. Any harm triggers a strong presumption in favour of the preservation of Conservation Areas and their setting and requires that considerable weight be given to the desirability of preservation. I would agree that the development will constitute less than substantial harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and in accordance with the NPPF this must be balanced against the public benefits of the proposal (para 196).</p> <p>Re Sea Lion “I anticipate that there may be a view of the rooftop of the new dwelling from Brookfields Road across the Sea Lion car park but I do not consider that this would harm the Listed Building’s setting”.</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 13th February 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><u>Tree officer</u> Although there are trees at the northern boundary close to the proposed dwelling position, at this stage they would be unlikely to be significantly affected by the development. However, in the longer term, the proximity of the dwelling to trees of such potentially large mature size would be unlikely to be sustainable due to issues such as shading, over-bearing, potential damage to the structure and perceived danger from falling branches, noting that T7 is situated on adjacent land and largely outside the applicant's control. Despite these concerns, due to a combination of lack of significant public amenity value and poor structural form it is considered that the trees would not be appropriate to protect by TPO.</p> <p><u>Further public comments</u></p> <p><u>Mr and Mrs Bowcock (site owners):</u> They use the access and parking at the rear, in the application site, on a daily basis; no.37 cannot restrict use by no.39; don't accept there should be any difficulty for larger vehicle access</p> <p><u>F. Davies of Brookfields Rd., Ipstones</u> Previously lived at no.39 and regularly used the rear access to park my car when I lived there as did my brothers. I got married from home and the rear access was used to for all kinds of large deliveries and was in constant use up until 18 months ago when my parents become the only residents of the property.</p> <p><u>Mr and Mrs Craddock occupiers of no.37</u> Their view is that cars to the rear have been "extra" vehicles some on a long term basis. Further concern about impacts on their trees and the hedges to the side of the access route. Were not consulted prior to the application submission – despite as stated in the application.</p> <p><u>N Mosley of no.35</u> Not consulted prior to the application submission – despite as stated in the application. Disruption to outlook rear of 33, 35 and 37. Looking outwards the development will not appear below any existing building back drop. Photo illustrations supplied.</p>	
SMD/2019/0700	<p>ITEM 10 <u>Land adjacent to Foxt Road, Foxt</u></p> <p>Conservation Liaison Panel comments –</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 13th February 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>OBJECT: Detrimental impact on the setting of the Listed Church. The church has an open, rural setting and the application site is critical to this open setting. Also object to siting, design and appearance.</p>	
<p>SMD/2018/0790</p>	<p>ITEM 11 <u>Land South East Of A521, A50 Blythe bridge bypass Blythe bridge, Staffordshire</u></p> <p><u>Erratum</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report states that the total amount for the Education Contribution is £621,603 (pages 2 and 9) – however this figure relates to the 118 unit scheme. For the current 146 unit scheme the total figure should in fact be £739,211 (the figures for the 3 elements of the Contribution are correct; it is the stated total that is incorrect). <p>Recommendation should state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.47% affordable contribution, (8 units) with 70% (6 units) rented and 30% (2 units) intermediate tenure in accordance with the Schedule and Phasing as set out in the previous report to committee. 	
<p>SMD/2019/0722</p>	<p>ITEM 12 <u>Land Adjacent to Rakeway Grange</u></p> <p>Cheadle Unite</p> <p>Please ensure planning officers fully consult with the Highways Agency on road safety concerns raised by residents in Cheadle. The attached email details the concerns raised SMD/2019/0722 (Land Adjacent to Rakeway Grange) between the 4th of April 2019 and the 16th Dec 2019. Including pictures of the concerns. As of 6th of Feb 2020 the SMDC web site/portal shows only one document from the Highways Agency (dated 13th Dec 2019) and this does not address the concerns raised. With due respect, the Planning Applications Committee District Councillors case officers and members of the public including myself are not experts in Road Safety. Therefore as a matter of due diligence please ensure case officers have a suitable response from the Highways agency that address the points raised in the attached document before recommending approval to the committee. I'm writing to you directly given the current date for consideration is the 13th of Feb 2020 and as stated the issue</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 13th February 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>raised concerns matters of road safety.</p> <p><u>Officer response</u> The comments received from Cheadle Unite were forwarded to the Highway Authority on receipt. The following comments have been provided by the Highway Authority:</p> <p>The comments made seem very similar to those made on the last application (SMD/2019/0126) which was considered at committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SMDC now has draft parking standards which have been approved by members and which this proposal meets. Access road is 5.5m wide – adequate for on access parking if required. A standard residential access road would only be expected to be 5m wide and these often accommodate on road parking with no major detriment. Not sure how long the grassed areas in front of plots 2 and 4 will last. 2. Access is not on a blind bend by measurement of forward visibility for the speed limit of the road. A vehicle to the west of Manifold Drive has forward visibility of 80m (43m is required). A vehicle just to the east of Manifold Drive has forward visibility of 180m (maximum of 120m is required with part of that distance still within the 30mph zone). Visibility splays for the access are shown on the submitted drawings and achievable. 3. Turning area is the access road itself. It is a private access road for 6 dwellings. It is 5.5m wide which is adequate for residential manoeuvring. 	
<p>SMD/2019/0308</p>	<p>ITEM 13 <u>99 School Lane, Caverswall</u></p> <p>The LPA is awaiting an amended plan to show a reduction in the height of the proposed building to a height no greater than 3m.</p> <p>The following condition is therefore recommended:</p> <p>Notwithstanding the details on the approved plan, the building hereby approved shall be no greater than 3m in height. Reason:- Having regard to the openness of the Green Belt and visual amenity of the area.</p>	
<p>SMD/2019/0717</p>	<p>ITEM 14 <u>White Hart Hotel, Alton</u> None received.</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank