

Public Document Pack



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE SUPPLEMENT AGENDA

Date: Thursday, 22 October 2020

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Virtual Meeting

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

PART 1

14. 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)**

MARK TRILLO
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR & MONITORING OFFICER

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 22nd October 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
SMD/2019/0766	<p>John Munroe Independent Hospital, Reacliffe Road, Rudyard</p> <p>Additional Third Party Objections</p> <p>The following additional comments have been made since publication of the report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We wish to strongly object to the continued attempts to further extend the John Munroe Hospital premises. As our numerous previous communications have stated, we feel that the further extension of the site will not serve to improve the premises in any meaningful way other than provide the potential for future expansion of the residential capacity and as such impact further on the quality of life for existing local residents. Also, we feel that the plans in no way constitute the special circumstances by which the conservation area designation could be bypassed. We do hope that this will be the end of the matter and that all future planning applications will be refused. • Having reviewed the amended plan submitted by the applicant, our opinion has not changed and we wish to object to this planning application. • We were disappointed that the planning officer in charge of this application changed her decision at the last minute and also that her decision was based purely on “the Green Belt” entirely dismissing the Conservation policy put in place to protect and preserve this area by the SMDC. It appears the officer was not familiar with the wording in this report and dismissed it as irrelevant as the building is not listed. However, the very bay window that is to be removed is an original mullion window which features in this report and should be protected. Historic England stated in September this year that “Local Councils should take care of its Victorian and Edwardian buildings”. • We would also like to point out that the rationale given for this application lacks the justification to grant extending this already extremely overdeveloped site by extending their footprint still further. It suggests they require a new office and medicine store, however the CQC report has no concerns over the current location of these in their existing building. • At the last planning Committee meeting the person that spoke on behalf of the hospital intimated that the new buildings were required because the conservatories get too hot in Summer. Many people 	(Pages 11 - 22)

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 22nd October 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>have this problem with conservatories that directly face the sun and yet have resolved this by adding some form of insulated tiles. If they had an application for this and not to extend their footprint in this area we would not be objecting (as long as they remained in a 'conservatory status' and as long as it was done in keeping with the building). When planning was passed for the original conservatories the rooves had to be pitched in keeping with the original building so their pitch should not be changed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The speaker on their behalf also talked of our the local concern that this extension would provide more bedrooms and suggested that the Council should grant the application but with 'conditions' about bedrooms. Please don't do this as it would be meaningless as which of you would go in the hospital on a regular basis and check these conditions were met? And apparently after 9 years these conditions do not apply, so this would not solve anything. We have seen this with the building works that took place, at the hospital March to May, (creating huge disturbance to area), apparently they waited nine years to carry it out so that the conditions that were applied at approval could be disregarded. We struggle during every planning application to get a full plan of the building and it is only ever half given. They have proved they are cunning at internal rearrangements.• The disturbances the local people have suffered have increased with the growth of this hospital Within this letter we did not want to write a long list of issues /occurrences, suffice to say they are ongoing. This year has been no exception. The hospital sits in this community but is not part of the community. We just want them to go about their business without affecting local people but this does not happen unfortunately. The hospital will have many policies and procedures in place but NONE of them will consider how their actions impact the local community. It is only you, the Council we can turn to, to stop the expansion of this hospital. We ask again that this planning application is rejected, there is no justification for this to take place. The site is over expanded and this building is part of the conservation area and should be preserved.• This letter should be read alongside our original letter of objection written in January, 2020.• It has been satiated at a Staffordshire moorlands planning application enquire into a previous planning application by a member of the Staffordshire moorlands planning committee member that the John	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 22nd October 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>Munroe hospital had saturated the development at this site yet they continue to underhandedly make further applications state false claims .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As residents we intend to keep the area for what it was intended green belt, buildings that go back pre 1900s and footpaths that visitors and children can walk along without the unacceptable swearing and vile language that has become the norm. • Are we the only people along with certain Councillors who say you cannot keep adding bits of buildings or taking glass conservatories down to build a brick building, same foot space, but much warmer etc and a few more beds maybe. • Mr Lichfields letter is very detailed account of facts which must be taken into account when discussions are taking place regarding the planning application. • The Rudyard Conservation Area created in 2016 seems to have been totally ignored. 	
SMD/2020/0315	<p>The Larches, Reacliffe Road, Rudyard</p> <p>ERRATUM</p> <p>The Description of the Development Should Read:</p> <p>Erection of single storey side extension</p>	(Pages 23 - 32)
DOC/2019/0039	<p>Land at Thorley Drive, Cheadle</p> <p>No updates</p>	(Pages 33 - 38)
SMD/2020/0365	<p>Land at Cheddleton Park Avenue, Cheddleton</p> <p><u>Additional condition recommended</u> No development shall take place, including site clearance until such time that details of any offsite regrading work that may be required to the field beyond the access gate has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such work shall be limited to the minimum necessary to provide appropriate levels for agricultural vehicles accessing the field in line with the e-mail received from the Agent dated 14th October 2020</p> <p>Reason:- In the interest of biodiversity and the character and appearance of the area including the setting of nearby Listed buildings.</p> <p><u>Trees and Woodlands Officer</u></p>	(Pages 39 - 54)

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 22nd October 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>Summary: no objection, subject to conditions</p> <p>There are no substantial or significant trees which would be affected by the proposed development. The proposed layout plan appears to indicate, although not explicitly, the retention of the young but established hedgerows along the side (western) boundaries of existing plots at 75 and 84 Cheddleton Park Avenue; certainly the proposed layout would readily accommodate such retention, although I suspect that some additional tapering retaining wall may in fact be required along the eastern side of proposed Plot 1 (which again would have no harmful impact on the existing hedging).</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed development would have very limited additional visual impact on views towards or across the application site, being seen as a very modest extension to (and in the close context of) the existing residential development at Cheddleton Park Avenue where it would be assimilated into its visual surroundings without appearing incongruous or notably intrusive. The exposed northern, western and southern boundaries of the overall application site would be bounded by new mixed native species hedgerow with an appropriate specification noted on the proposed site plan. Also shown is a general swathe of proposed new tree planting along these external sides of the site and between the plots which again is appropriate; however, the representation on the plan has slightly more of the characteristic of a schematic indication of positions/numbers of trees rather than specification, and I would prefer to see the comfort of a tree numbers schedule and specifically identified species positions – which could be readily secured by condition. Tree species are largely suitable, although Common Ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>) is currently unavailable due to the restrictions relating to the spread of Ash Dieback disease, and I would suggest that native Silver Birch be substituted for Ash on the species list.</p> <p>The combined new hedging and tree planting would, once established, assist in further minimising the already very limited visual impact of the proposal.</p> <p>I have no objections to this application, but would request that the following condition be imposed in the event that planning permission is granted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Within 3 months of the commencement of development a comprehensive landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA. Such a scheme shall include full	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 22nd October 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>details of proposed new native hedging as already included on the proposed Site Plan, Drg. No. 2018-2296-18 Rev E, together with position-specific confirmation of species and numbers of the proposed supplementary tree planting schematically indicated on this same plan, and broadly in accordance with the amount of tree planting schematically indicated on that drawing, but with the substitution of Silver Birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>) for Common Ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>). The landscaping scheme so approved shall be fully implemented before the end of the first available dormant season (November to February inclusive) following completion of the development hereby approved. The trees and shrubs planted in accordance with this landscaping scheme shall be properly maintained for a period of 5 years following planting. Any plants which within this period are damaged, become diseased, die, are removed or otherwise fail to establish shall be replaced during the next suitable season.</p>	
SMD/2020/0379	<p>The Top Pub, Hill Top, Brown Edge</p> <p>None.</p>	(Pages 55 - 72)
SMD/2019/0339	<p>Winkhill Garage, Ashbourne Road, Winkhill</p> <p>Third Party Representations:</p> <p>Having read the report for the Planning Committee regarding the WG Tanker application I would ask that the following points be brought to the Committee's attention as a late submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that in the light of the failure by WG Tankers to abide by conditions attached to their previous planning permission for this site, that the conditions now attached be carefully and regularly monitored and rigorously enforced, especially those applying to dust control, operating hours and environmental protection. • as local residents have had to look at the eyesore that this site presents for over twelve years, that the fencing and the location of the tankers further back from the road side be carried out within a maximum of three months from the date of approval. • that the planting of trees and shrubs at the front of the site be carried out during the dormant season (November to February) that is about to start so that 	(Pages 73 - 98)

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 22nd October 2020

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>local residents do not have to wait a further twelve months for this to be done.</p> <p>Waterhouses Parish Council</p> <p>The council reaffirms that it does not wish to speak and the comments on behalf of the council remain as stated earlier this morning i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parish Council of Waterhouses has no objection to the above application. • However, the council would like to place on record that it will closely monitor the adherence to all of the conditions, as laid down by the SMDC in relation to their approval, if granted. • Failure to comply with any of these, within the time frames stipulated, will result in the Parish Council seeking urgent enforcement. • Furthermore, any such failures will be taken into account with regard to any further applications for this site. 	
<p>SMD/2017/0252 & 0253</p>	<p>Caverswall Castle, Caverswall</p> <p>Applicant</p> <p>"I do not agree to the S106 for either the hotel use or photography/filming use as the restrictions make the operation of such use completely unviable. Especially considering the enforcement notices after many requests will not be removed. Any operator will therefore be constantly operating in fear of prosecution. This was exactly same for the approved wellbeing retreat use. I therefore request after 3 years the planning committee finally determine the applications</p>	<p>(Pages 99 - 124)</p>
<p>SMD/2018/0578</p>	<p>Caverswall Castle, Caverswall</p> <p>A letter was received from the applicant on 15.10.20 stating that he does not agree with a S106 Agreement as the restrictions imposed are considered to make the operation of such a proposed use as being unviable.</p>	<p>(Pages 125 - 132)</p>