

Public Document Pack



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE SUPPLEMENT AGENDA

Date: Thursday, 15 December 2022

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

6. Late Representations Report (**Pages 3 - 8**)

MARK TRILLO
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR & MONITORING OFFICER

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 15th December 2022

| FILE REF. | SITE AND DETAILS | ITEM |
|---------------|---|--------|
| SMD/2021/0550 | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Former Fole dairy, Uttoxeter Road, Fole</u></p> <p>Councils Landscape consultant advises as follows:- Recommends that the frontage hedge should be an advanced hedge (as previously proposed) to provide instantaneous effect Recommends that the hedge is realigned slightly around plots 37 and 48 so that it follows a more gentle curve and allows for better maintenance of the hedge itself and the side elevations of the plots. Advises that the 1m timber post and rail fence is appropriate where desire lines are anticipated and says that this is a common detail and reasonably effective.</p> <p><u>Further comment from the Applicant</u> Confirms that the frontage hedge will be an advanced native hedge. Confirms that a simple post and wire fence (stock fence) will be set behind the hedge to reinforce the 'barrier' between road and development whilst the hedge is maturing Confirms that there is flexibility to realign the hedge</p> <p><u>Prior to issuing the decision</u> To obtain an amended Landscaping plan with the native hedgerow along the site frontage clearly identified as 'advanced' and the hedge realigned as suggested by the Councils Landscape consultant</p> | ITEM 7 |
| SMD/2022/0444 | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Land off Rownall Road, Wetley Rocks</u></p> <p><u>Two further letters of objection</u> STRONGLY OBJECT to the above application. This development is within the green belt which I had always thought was to protect the countryside against such developments. I understand that as a country we need to reduce our use of fossil fuels but I think this and then all the subsequent developments in the vicinity that will follow on from this (as they surely will) are just money making opportunities for a few. They are not thought out, carefully considered ways to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels. If this was a bona fide development to improve the efficiency of the Cellarhead substation why is it a local landowner putting in the application? The motive for it seems clear and other landowners will soon follow on so that those of us who live here will be living in a post-apocalyptic landscape with no natural beauty left. The land is seen from afar so it will not be just us who lose out.</p> | ITEM 8 |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 15th December 2022

| FILE REF. | SITE AND DETAILS | ITEM |
|-----------|--|------|
| | <p>I understand that the council needs to be seen to be doing what they can but is this proposal really the answer? Renewable energy is developing apace, very quickly it could be seen that these developments are obsolete – then who will pay to restore the landscape? Once money has been made by the few that will be it.</p> <p>Destroying open countryside, surely we should be supporting local agriculture not getting rid of it?</p> <p>Reading the reasons for the original refusal of the application I cannot see that these reasons have disappeared. Why has it now been recommended for approval? The conditions do not get rid of the noise or the eyesore of the proposed structure.</p> <p>Can we be assured that if this proposal is passed it will be the last one or will you allow all the others to be passed too? I feel a precedent will be set and our fields will be destroyed by money making renewable energy schemes. We should be protecting our countryside for future generations not destroying it on a whim.</p> <p>The house I live in has been in my family since 1867, I am saddened that it is looking that within my lifetime the area is going to be decimated.</p> <p>There are a few of these applications going in at the minute which should all be thrown out. This is a beautiful area of the Staffordshire Moorlands and would like it to stay that way. It is Green Belt land and mostly used for agriculture.</p> <p>These battery storage facilities are dangerous, devalue our homes and will become an eyesore around.</p> <p>Once one of these applications is passed then everyone else will jump on the bandwagon. These people are not thinking of the local area we live in, they just see £ signs, a way of making more money. We have been approached several times by these companies and have said no as we think more about the area we live in than filling our bank accounts.</p> <p>Please consider our objections as I know a lot of people do not want these facilities</p> <p><u>Further clarification from the applicant on the cut and fill operation</u></p> <p>The consulting engineers have advised there is approx. 14 642 m3 of scrape to be removed after cut and fill, the intention is for this to be used to create the extended bund on the eastern field (which was not included in this calculation) and the remainder used on other land owned by the landowner. However the final detail of this will be secured to the LPA's satisfaction by the Materials Management Plan condition.</p> | |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 15th December 2022

| FILE REF. | SITE AND DETAILS | ITEM |
|---------------|---|---------|
| SMD/2022/0532 | <p><u>Land off Sugar Street, Rushton Spencer</u></p> <p>No updates</p> | ITEM 9 |
| SMD/2022/0183 | <p><u>18 Riverside Churnet View, Oakamoor</u></p> <p>No updates</p> | ITEM 10 |
| SMD/2022/0175 | <p><u>Woodhead Garage, Froghall Road, Cheadle</u> <u>Proposed extension to existing yard area to provide additional vehicle parking and associated landscaping works</u></p> <p><u>Staffordshire Wildlife Trust</u></p> <p>SUMMARY – Holding objection -further information/ amendments required.</p> <p>Required prior to determination:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainable drainage scheme <p>Secure via condition should approval be granted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Landscaping amendments and updated/ corrected biodiversity metric 3. Detailed landscaping specification including soils, seeding and planting mixes 4. Long-term (25 years) habitat management plan 5. Detailed drainage scheme 6. Lighting plan 7. Method statements for bird, bat, reptile and mammal protection 8. Tree protection plan 9. Construction Environmental Management Plan to prevent pollution <p>Documents reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary Ecological Assessment June 2022, Elite Ecology • Biodiversity Net Gain Report (August 2022), Elite Ecology • Woodhead Garage Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Calculation Tool dated 14/06/2022, Elite Ecology • New Habitat Map 16/08/2022, Elite Ecology | ITEM 11 |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 15th December 2022

| FILE REF. | SITE AND DETAILS | ITEM |
|-----------|---|------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed and existing site plans and sections <p>DESIGNATED WILDLIFE SITES & WIDER ECOLOGICAL NETWORK</p> <p>The site is within both the Wetland and Pastures ‘habitat connectivity opportunity area’ within the Nature Recovery Map for the district. This means that wetland, grassland and hedgerow habitats are priorities here. The site is near to the Cecilly Brook, which forms an important ecological corridor in the area. Hedgerows, verges and field margins linking the site also form smaller corridors within the landscape.</p> <p>Cecilly Brook Local Nature Reserve</p> <p>This statutorily designated site lies downstream of the proposal- any impacts to the brook such as changes to the quantity and quality of water run-off during and after construction could impact downstream areas.</p> <p>HABITATS</p> <p>The Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) found the site to support a number of lower value habitats including improved grassland and ruderal vegetation, most of which will be lost to development. Intact native hedgerows are classed as priority habitats under the NERC act 2006 and the site supports around 30m of priority hedgerows. These will be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>The proposals include creation of meadow, scrub, woodland and tree planting.</p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain</p> <p>Policy NE1 in the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Adopted September 2020, expects that ‘all development where possible seeks to deliver a net gain in biodiversity proportionate to the size and scale of the development. In circumstances where adverse impacts are demonstrated to be unavoidable, developers will be required to ensure that impacts are appropriately mitigated, with suitable compensation measures towards loss of habitat used only as a last resort where there is no alternative’</p> <p>The submitted biodiversity metric reports a very small gain in habitat units under 1% (0.05, 0.95%) and a large gain in hedgerow units (3.05, 996.62%). However there are issues with the metric that need to be amended.</p> <p>As stated in our previous comments, the baseline habitats for the site need to include the hedge and tree planting along the northern border of the existing industrial site, that was specified and approved within the Site Plan Proposal Scheme 2013-1895-06 RevG 27 Nov 2014 for application</p> | |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 15th December 2022

| FILE REF. | SITE AND DETAILS | ITEM |
|-----------|--|------|
| | <p>SMD/2014/0265. This planting was not carried out, but should have been; therefore the current baseline should include the approved hedge and trees that should now have been established for around 7 years. This needs to be added to the metric. The site is still likely to provide a net gain for hedgerows.</p> <p>The Site Habitat Creation section is incorrect. The total habitat area is larger than the site- an alert box is present stating 'Check Areas- Area cross check failed (Baseline habitat lost does not match development footprint plus area of new habitat creation)'. The proposed Urban Trees area is stated as 0.9156 hectares- this is incorrect; the decimal point is likely to be in the wrong place. This needs to be corrected as it is likely to mean there is actually a net deficit in habitat units.</p> <p>We recommend the area of woodland planting should be reduced in favour of greater wildflower meadow, on the inside of the soil bunds where visual screening is not required. This would fit better with local habitat priorities, as well as giving a larger net gain due to the faster timescale for meadow versus woodland establishment.</p> <p>Given that the habitats to be lost are of relatively low value, it would be acceptable within good practice to offset any biodiversity deficit off-site, either on other land within the ownership, 3rd party land nearby, or via an appropriate financial contribution. Therefore, the amendments to landscaping and the biodiversity metric could be secured via a suitably worded condition, requiring updated plans, and additional compensation should any deficit be found.</p> <p>A detailed plan for landscaping/ habitat creation including soil preparation, planting mixes and creation methods, as well as a long-term management plan, would also be required as a condition.</p> <p>Drainage</p> <p>No further drainage information has been submitted. It appears that Staffordshire County Council Flood team have not been consulted. Flood zones 2 and 3 are close to the site with reported localised flooding of properties in the area.</p> <p>Surface drainage is proposed to drain to the existing storage tank system, without any additional balancing or filtration to serve the proposed additional hard surfaced areas. Measures to reduce, store and filter run-off are required to maintain a greenfield run-off rate. Ideally using the landscaping areas - swales could be added around the edges of the hardstanding, to hold water before any excess is directed to the existing storm drain. However calculations are required; an additional</p> | |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 15th December 2022

| FILE REF. | SITE AND DETAILS | ITEM |
|----------------------|--|----------------|
| | <p>storage tank/ geocellular feature beneath the car park may also be needed.</p> <p>The extensive soil movements have high potential to cause silt pollution run-off if not managed adequately- temporary SuDs/ water protection measures are required within a CEMP.</p> <p>SPECIES</p> <p>The PEA assessed species presence/ likelihood and makes recommendations for precautionary actions which should be secured via condition. The two trees identified on site have potential for roosting bats, but are understood to be retained- a tree protection plan is recommended.</p> <p><u>Officer comment</u></p> <p>It is noted that Staffordshire Wildlife Trust recommend a number of conditions in respect of biodiversity matters. In respect of drainage, although no further drainage information has been submitted, this matter can be addressed by an appropriate condition to secure measures to reduce, store and filter run-off to maintain a greenfield run-off rate and may include swales around the edges of the hardstanding, to hold water before any excess is directed to the existing storm drain.</p> | |
| TPO SM.325 | <u>Hugo Street, Leek</u> No updates | Item 12 |
| TPO/2022/0018 | <u>Lance House, Clay Lake, Endon</u> No updates | Item 13 |