

Public Document Pack



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE SUPPLEMENT AGENDA

Date: Thursday, 17 February 2022

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber - Moorlands House, Leek

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

PART 1

10. NOTE - A Late Representations Report will be circulated prior to the meeting i.e. any representations received since this agenda was published. **(Pages 3 - 6)**

MARK TRILLO
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR & MONITORING OFFICER

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 17th February 2022

| FILE REF. | SITE AND DETAILS | ITEM |
|---------------|---|--------|
| SMD/2020/0589 | <p><u>58 Rakeway Road, Cheadle</u></p> <p>ERRATUM</p> <p>The link to the planning application documentation at the end of the report is incorrect. The correct link is as follows:</p> <p>http://publicaccess.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=141244</p> <p><u>Further objection from Mr and Mrs Gallimore the adjacent neighbours at no 56</u> This takes the form of a series of 12 photographs which can be viewed on line via this link: http://publicaccess.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=141244 as of 15th Feb 2022.</p> <p><u>Further points of objection raised by Mr Powell of 62 Rakeway Road following publication of the committee report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Applicant has completed application form stating no effect on parking (box 8) – LPA: this is their contention – not necessarily endorsed by the LPA see rpt at 7.13 b) No plan to show how site will accommodate 3 vehicles – LPA: combination of existing and proposed garage provide for two; the rpt discusses how the space to the side should provide for a third, see rpt at 7.13 c) No plan to show how site will accommodate 3 vehicles and safeguard trees – LPA: response from tree officer confirms acceptable see rpt 6.5 and 6.7 d) Report has “no reference by the planning officer to the loss of parking and any potential road safety consequences” – LPA: discussed at 7.13 (not assessed as a ‘loss’ of parking) e) Says report does not refer to objection re parking – LPA: alleged “inadequacy of parking space” is 2nd item in summary list of objections at 6.2 and parking is addressed at 7.13 f) Case officer has changed his assessment since the initial application – LPA: the application has changed (and reduced) the LPA assessment has to reach a | ITEM 6 |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 17th February 2022

| FILE REF. | SITE AND DETAILS | ITEM |
|-----------|--|------|
| | <p>balanced view of the final scheme “in the round” – objections based on ‘building line’ are noted at 7.15</p> <p>g) Highways comments on safety have clearly not been addressed even at the time of the recommendation to the PAC to approve the application in Feb 2022 – LPA: SCC HA was consulted at 21.01.2021 – comments expected in time for committee</p> <p>h) “...we do not believe a proper assessment of the on-site parking, turning space and potential road parking safety aspects have been addressed” – LPA: discussed at 7.13</p> <p>i) no correspondence received from the planning officer to address our concerns – LPA: reply e-mails were sent 27.07.2021, 31.01.2022 and 06.01.2022</p> <p>j) No context given in the report to the Historic England comments of 11th Jan 2022 – LPA:– the context is development in the setting of a Grade II* Listed Building for which HE is a statutory consultee.</p> <p>k) No Conservation Officer comments – LPA: discussed informally in Feb 2021 when CO advised it was of such inappropriate scale it should be withdrawn. Following departure of CO on 29th Oct 2021 further consultation on the reduced scheme has not been possible.</p> <p>l) “for a fee of only £206”...”the application has been modified and gone out to consultation 3 times at great stress and anxiety to residents”. “Limit is “one free go”. – LPA: Government expects LPAs to approve planning applications if possible and to negotiate changes if necessary in order to do so (NPPF para 38). There is no limit to the number of amendments that can be made.</p> <p>m) “The recommendation now appears to argue that the strongly defined building line is no longer relevant due to the orientation of the building. Our understanding is that under building regulations the orientation of any one building does not alter the building line”. LPA: ‘building line’ is not a regulation as such in planning –</p> | |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 17th February 2022

| FILE REF. | SITE AND DETAILS | ITEM |
|---------------|---|------|
| | <p>however the implications of the forward development on the street scene and general appearance and character is a material consideration and is discussed at 7.3, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.15 of the report.</p> <p>n) requests that the planning committee refuse the application as it would set a precedent for building in front of the building line.</p> <p><u>Case Officer – add condition re trees:</u> 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 and advisory notices for the protection of the existing trees to be retained, in accordance with guidance in British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations, and these protection measures and notices shall be retained in position for the duration of the period that development takes place, unless otherwise agreed in writing 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 in writing by the LPA. Such temporary tree protection measures shall be required only in respect of the first three remaining protected trees inside the application site access off Rakeway Road, these being protected as T10 (Oak), T12 (Birch) and T13 (Oak) under Tree Preservation Order no. SM.110.</p> <p><u>SCC Highways consultation response</u> No detrimental effect on the highway – therefore no objection.</p> <p>The minimum internal dimensions of the proposed garage are 3.8m wide x 5.4m long. This does not reach the minimum internal dimensions for a single garage (3m wide x 6m long) as stated in the Manual for Streets and Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards. However, following a site visit it was noted the existing driveway will provide sufficient space to accommodate parking and turning for a property of this size.</p> | |
| SMD/2021/0706 | <p><u>Land Adj to Sunnyview, Foxt Road, Foxt</u></p> <p>WITHDRAWN by applicant</p> | 7 |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 17th February 2022

| FILE REF. | SITE AND DETAILS | ITEM |
|------------------|--|-------------|
| SMD/2020/0730 | <u>Land at Milltown Way, Leek</u> Nothing to update | 8 |
| SMD/2021/0831 | <u>7 Lansdown Close</u> No updates | 9 |
| | | |