

APPENDIX

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

13 February 2020

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Application No: | SMD/2019/0486 | |
| Location | Land adjacent to 17 Saltersford lane, Alton | |
| Proposal | Reserved matters for details of residential development of 22 dwellings for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale | |
| Applicant | Walton Homes | |
| Agent | Geoff Perry Associates Ltd | |
| Parish/ward | Alton | Date registered 7 th August 2019 |
| If you have a question about this report please contact: Jane Curley tel: 01538 395400 ex 4124 Jane.curley@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk | | |

REFERRAL

This is a major application and the outline application was considered by Committee.

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to conditions

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 This site lies within the village of Alton albeit that it is just outside the defined development boundary of the settlement. It is a greenfield site consisting of agricultural fields. Levels of the site fall in an easterly direction. The land features boundary trees and hedgerows. There are no buildings on the site. An existing public footpath runs adjacent to the eastern boundary.

2.2 The site is bordered to the west and south by existing residential development. A single property known as Aarons Head lies immediately to the north of the site. Houses are generally two storey in height and a mix of designs/styles. A surface water retention pond is proposed at the lowest part of the site close to the eastern boundary.

2.3 There are two existing sewers crossing the site each requiring 5 m easements which the applicant says are allowed for in the scheme, easily accessible and will be outside of property covenants.

2.4 Outline Planning permission for 23 dwellings on the site was refused by committee but was subsequently allowed on appeal. (SMD/2015/0435 refers). Access was approved at the outline stage and is taken from Uttoxeter Road.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 This is a reserved matters application for 22 dwellings, 15 of which will be open market units with 7 affordable homes. The affordable homes are a mix of 2 and 3 bed roomed terrace and semi detached properties. The open market homes are a mix of 3, 4 and 5 bed roomed detached properties. A SUDS feature is proposed in the lowest part of the site adjacent to the eastern boundary. A footpath link is shown leading from the site to the existing public footpath beyond the eastern boundary. Access was approved at the outline stage. Despite a 'pinch' point close to the site entrance (by Orchard View) necessitating a single vehicular width access, the Inspector found this to be acceptable from a highway safety and amenity point of view.

Amended plans received 13th January 2020

3.2 During the course of the application amended plans were submitted in response to Officer feedback. Given the nature of these amendments a re consultation exercise was undertaken with local residents and the Parish Council. The plans have been refined further since this re consultation as discussed in the Officer comment section below but the amendments have not been so substantial as to warrant any further public consultation

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

SMD/2015/0435 Outline application for 23 dwellings. Refused. Allowed on appeal

5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

5.1 The Development Plan comprises of:

- Saved Local Plan Proposals Map / Settlement Boundaries (adopted 1998).
- Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted March 2014)

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (1998)

5.2 Development boundaries within the 1998 Adopted Local Plan are still in force until such time as they are reviewed and adopted through the site allocations process. Following consultation last year a Preferred Options Site Allocation DPD is currently out for consultation.

Adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy DPD (26th March 2014)

5.3 The following Core Strategy policies are relevant to the application:-

- SS1 Development Principles
- SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources
- SD3 Carbon-saving Measures in Development
- SD4 Pollution and Flood Risk
- SS6C Rural area strategy
- DC1 Design Considerations
- DC2 Heritage
- C1 Creating Sustainable Communities
- NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
- T1 Development and Sustainable Transport
- T2 Other Sustainable Transport Measures

Local Plan process

The Council agreed to publish the Local Plan Submission Version for representations in February 2018. At this point, the Council agreed that the Local Plan was “sound”. Formal representations were then invited from residents, businesses and other stakeholders to provide them with the opportunity to support or challenge the soundness or legal compliance of the Local Plan. This stage in the process followed three previous public consultations since 2015 which had informed the preparation of the Local Plan alongside a comprehensive evidence base.

In June 2018, the Council subsequently agreed to submit the Local Plan Submission Version to the Secretary of State for examination. An examination in public is ongoing in order to determine whether the Local Plan is sound and legally compliant. Hearing sessions were conducted in October 2018 and the Inspector issued his initial post-hearing advice in January 2019 which set out some actions for the Council and a range of modifications that would be necessary to make the plan sound. The full schedule of modifications was agreed by the Council and the subject of public consultation between 18th September 2019 and 31st October 2019. The schedule consisted of modifications that the Inspector has deemed necessary to make the Local Plan sound. Following the consultation, the Inspector concluded that further hearing sessions were necessary to consider; proposals for safeguarded land at Gillow Heath in Biddulph, housing land supply, Local Green Spaces in Cheddleton (Ox Pasture), Biddulph (Dorset Drive and implications for the emerging neighbourhood plan) and Blythe Bridge. They will be held on 4th and 5th February. The Inspector will outline the timetable for next steps in the process at the close of the hearings.

In this context, the Council’s position on the weight to be given to the policies contained in the Local Plan Submission Version in terms of the three criteria set out in Paragraph 48 of the NPPF is considered below:

- The stage of preparation – the Local Plan is now at an advanced stage of preparation as the main modifications have been subject to consultation

- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies this varies depending on the policy in question – the Inspector wishes to explore outstanding objections on a limited number of issues at the February hearing sessions further before drawing conclusions.
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework – policies have been modified to address soundness issues identified by the Inspector to date. It is the Council's view that the policies (as modified) are consistent with national policy. The Inspector has yet to draw final conclusions, particularly on the matters subject to further hearing sessions.

Given the above, the majority of policies (as modified) can be given substantial weight. However, policies that are subject to the February hearing sessions can only be given moderate weight as they are subject to outstanding objections and scrutiny.

National Planning Policy NPPF

National Planning Policy Guidance

6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Press Notice expiry date: 11th September 2019

Site Notice expiry date: 12th September 2019

Local residents have been notified by letter.

Letter received from Cllr Hayley Plimley, Alton Ward representing concerns of Alton residents and raising the following points:-

- Overly large development with too many large houses – more demand for bungalows
- Residents also do not support social / affordable housing at this location within the village due to poor transport links and lack of bus service, however do support shared ownership and would ask that these are prioritised for local people.
- Access from Uttoxeter Road – difficult for cars to pass, large vehicles, Fire Service vehicles – will not cope with increased traffic volumes and construction traffic
- Uttoxeter Road already busy with Alton Towers traffic
- Plots 1,2, 6, 7, 18, 19, 21 and 22 do not achieve the 45 m distance from homes
- The existing plans do not show enough car parking for 4/5 bed properties, with only 2 spaces. Many of these households will have 3-4 cars.
- Garages/parking behind Gladstone Terrace is out of sight and could become an area for anti-social behaviour

21 Objections received, summarised below.

- There is no demand for further housing in Alton
- 5 bedroom houses are not needed – need bungalows for ageing population
- Proposed car parking for houses 6-7 could become a haven for antisocial behaviour

- Car parking areas too close to existing properties
- Dwellings are too close to Gladstone Terrace – stated 45m minimum not met
 - Outline proposed layout widely viewed as preferable
- Narrow access road not suitable for this type of development – concern that Fire Service minimum not met and no apparent consultation with Fire Safety Officer
 - Access for refuse vehicles and other large vehicles will be very difficult
- Poor visibility at the corner of the access road and Uttoxeter Road at Glenfield
- Proposal for a single track road onto the main route to Alton Towers will create jams on the main road. Alton Towers traffic regularly queues along the main road outside the proposed site entrance
 - Visibility on the access road is poor in the early evening due to sun angle
- The house at plot 1 is too close to the House at Orchard View. Plot 1 was not shown on outline plans. The plan shows no vehicle access to Orchard View
 - Concerns about access to Orchard View during construction of development
 - Flooding concerns at Orchard View when hardcore access drive replaced by tarmac
 - No kerbside parking outside Orchard View
- Proposed at Appeal to reinforce the landscaping on the northern edge of Glenfield to protect from headlights – no longer proposed
- Destruction of wildlife habitats
- Hedgerows and trees must be retained – designs imply removal in contrast with Design and Access Statement
 - Significant pruning to the hedge bordering Glenfield could damage or kill it
- The villagers of Alton should have rights as to how they wish the village to develop
- The D&A refers to the village having frequent public transport – this is not correct
- Existing residents who choose open rear boundaries do not want their boundaries secured – proposal argues this will benefit them
- No details on drawing of service strip necessary for gas pipe to Glenfield and Orchard view
- *The Highway Works plan does not mention the brick pillar supporting the gate post to the current access road*
- *It is not possible to fit a hedge outside Orchard View, a walkway, road and small verge in the space between Orchard View and Glenfield (5.3m) but the plans do not show this in sufficient detail. More detail is required for how this is proposed to be resolved.*

Further letters received in response to re consultation on amended plans

- Car port in a back garden is appropriate and it will mutate into a garage
- Car port is only 1 m from boundary and will take natural light
- Light pollution from headlights for Glenfields, Orchard Terrace and 7 Gladstone terrace
- It is not complaint with Fire access requirements
- Pavement too close to Orchard View

- No detail of street lights
- How has carbon neutrality been addressed
- Access onto Uttioxter Road is unsuitable and potentially dangerous
- As most are 4/5 bed houses residents will have to park on the road

No letters of support received.

Alton Parish Council

- Concerns about isolated parking spaces behind Gladstone Terrace – antisocial behaviour and general insufficient parking spaces
- Concerns about access road off Uttioxter Road – narrows to 3.5m – Fire Service access
- Request clarity on developer proposal that all buildings will be at least 45 m from existing dwellings – plans do not seem to demonstrate this
- Would like the proposed access to Woodbine Cottages removed to reduce congestion
- Too many large houses – would like smaller houses and local occupancy/shared ownership
- Request that street lighting is kept to a minimum
- Houses could better reflect local vernacular – use of Staffordshire Blue roof tiles
- Solar panels would be desirable
- Landscaping maintenance plan would ensure any planting that dies is replaced
- Will there be safety measures at the pond to protect young children?
- Request conditions to ensure the small houses are not delayed while larger houses are built

Regeneration Officer (Housing delivery)

I have a couple of concerns, firstly the applicant is proposing that all the affordable units are 3 bed. Ideally I would like to see a couple of 2 bed dwellings as this would allow a greater flexibility in the lettings process.

Secondly, I appreciate the scheme is of relatively small scale, so I am happy with the proposed location of the affordable units. The only area of concern is the size of the units. The S106 states that the affordable units will be delivered to HQI standards. The applicant is proposing the Broomfield at 82 Sqm and the Millfield at 74 sq m. The Millfield falls well below the expected HQI standard which is 82-85 sq m for a 3 bed dwelling. The layouts for the Millfield also categories bedroom 3 / study which is concerning.

One possible solution would be to re categorise these as 2 bed dwellings and adapt the layout accordingly.

Trees and Woodland Officer

Initially raised concerns about a) relationship of dwellings to existing mature trees along the northern boundary (especially rear outlook of Plots 10/11/12) and the eastern boundary (side of Plot 15) b) lack of provision for substantial planting buffer along the northern boundary as indicated on the indicative layout at outline stage and c) lack of detailed landscaping proposals.

In response to the fully specified landscaping scheme subsequently submitted raised no objection subject to a condition to secure implementation.

Local Highway Authority

No objection subject to conditions

Local Lead Flood Authority

No objection

Severn Trent Water

No objection

Police Architectural Liaison Officer

Welcome the proposed layout
Emphasise robust boundaries where private plots abut public space.

Fire Service

Initially raised concern about the lack of clear width between kerbs of 3.7m. Advised that for fire appliance access to be compliant, 3.7 m between kerbs is required. Commented on the amended plan showing a 3.7 m clearance that if this is achieved the Fire Service would have no objection when formally consulted as part of Building Regulations.

7. OFFICER COMMENT AND PLANNING BALANCE

7.1 As with all applications, the LPA is required to determine this application in accordance with the Development plan, unless there are material circumstances which indicate otherwise and in determining these applications, it shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, in so far as material to the application and to any other material considerations.

7.2 Core Strategy Policy SS1a establishes a 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development' in line with the National Planning Policy (herein referred to as the NPPF) where: (1) planning applications that accord with policies within the Core Strategy will be approved without delay and (2) where there are no relevant policies

or they are out of date, the Council will grant planning permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise considering:-

- I. Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, or,
- II. Specific policies in within the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted

7.3 This application is for the reserved matters of Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping. Access was approved at the outline stage when the principle of housing (22 units) on this site was accepted by an Inspector on appeal (see history above). Accordingly, this application does not present an opportunity to revisit the principle of development on this site. The various reserved matters are considered under the sub headings below.

Layout

7.4 There are a number of site characteristics which provide constraints to the development of this site including its awkward shape, the level change across the site, its location adjacent to open countryside to the north and east with existing trees and hedgerows on these boundaries and a Severn Trent Water foul sewer easement of 5 m which runs north–south close to the site entrance. There is also a ‘pinch point’ on the entrance access close to Orchard View where a 5 m carriageway width cannot be achieved. These matters are discussed in the analysis below.

7.5 The initial layout was not considered to be acceptable in several respects. Many dwellings did not address the street leading to inactive frontages containing blank gables and long lengths of garden fences/walls. There was also concern that an unidentified access was shown adjacent to Plot 19, that the entrance to the site was particularly weak, that insufficient space for planting was provided on the northern boundary, that development was too close to existing trees, that the road was too engineered, that the affordable housing was poorly sited and ‘pushed into the corner’ and that these plots also had a poor relationship with existing housing, Arons Head and Gladstone Terrace in particular.

7.6 Amended plans have addressed these concerns. Dwellings are now positioned to address the road leading to a more active and better defined street scene. Dwellings appropriately turn the corner where necessary and the entrance to the site is also more strongly defined by buildings. The access adjacent to former plot 19 has been removed. The five affordable housing plots (3-7) have been re sited so that they are integrated within the layout and now identified as plots 4-5 and 19-21. This has resulted in frontage parking to plots 19-21 which is the compromise of moving the plots from their original position but a further amendment to the scheme has moved the parking to plot 19 to the side which has enable space for landscaping to break up the four frontage spaces – see landscaping discussion below. The SUDS feature which takes the form of a swale pond in the eastern corner of the site and is part of the sustainable drainage system is landscaped and as this matures should provide an attractive focal feature in its own right as well as biodiversity interest. It is overlooked by plots 13, 14 and 15.

7.7 The amenity of existing dwellings is a material consideration. It is considered that the amended layout plans have addressed amenity concerns. The re siting of Plots 3-7 on the original layout and replacement with a single house (Plot 3) has provided a much better relationship with Aarons Head and the properties on Gladstone Terrace. Although a letter of representation still expresses concern about the location of the car port for Plot 1 being 1 metre from the boundary and potentially taking light, it is in fact approx. 30 m from the rear of the house and at a height of just 3.3 m, no loss of amenity is anticipated.

7.8 In her appeal decision letter the Inspector commented on the amenity particularly of 7 Uttoxeter Road, Glenfield and Orchard View all of whom are affected by the intensification of the access track which forms the primary access to the development. In allowing the appeal the Inspector considered that the amenity of these properties would not be adversely affected by the development. She stated that additional landscaping would be sufficient to protect the privacy of these properties and protect them from the glare of headlights. The Inspector was satisfied that the exact location and nature of the landscaping could be determined at the reserved matters stage. In the revised landscaping scheme the existing boundary hedges to Orchard View and Glenfield are shown to be reinforced. The applicant has confirmed that no further planting is achievable along the access road due to the lack of space within the applicant's ownership to achieve the necessary width of access road, footpath and visibility splays which were determined/approved at the outline stage. If residents felt that further planting was needed, they are of course at liberty to do this on their land. The position of these properties relative to the access road is no different to many situations; no undue loss of amenity is anticipated.

7.9 Orchard view lies adjacent to plot 1. There is, according to the approved plans a principal bedroom window in the side elevation of this property looking towards plot 1 and two secondary windows at ground floor serving a sitting room and kitchen. Plot 1 is angled to Orchard View and has a rear projection. The separation distance between the two facing elevations varies as such between 11 m and 14.3 m. There are, however, no principal windows in the side elevation of plot 1. In these circumstances the Councils Space about dwelling guidelines say that 14 m should be achieved. There is as such a small breach of these guidelines but as this is where plot 1 angles away, it is not considered that it will lead to such a loss of amenity to this property as to be fatal to the application. It is not possible to move plot 1 any further eastwards due to the STW easement.

7.10 All dwellings are provided with the requisite in- curtilage parking, a combination of parking spaces, garages and car ports

7.11 The Layout is now considered to be acceptable and complies with relevant parts of Policy DC 3 and the NPPF.

Appearance

7.12 The initial scheme was considered to lack design consistency with too many house types leading to a rather fragmented appearance. Some of the individual

house types were also not considered to be in keeping in form and others lacked local detailing to reinforce local distinctiveness.

7.13 Amended plans have addressed these concerns. All houses are now of more simple form with brick elevations (no render) under tiled roofs. Windows and doors are appropriately proportioned with brick heads and cills. Chimneys have been added and brick detailing provided to eaves and verges. The applicant has suggested several bricks and tiles. As these are not yet agreed a condition is recommended. High quality materials will be required for this edge of village location.

7.14 The design and appearance is acceptable and complies with relevant parts of Policy DC 3 and the NPPF.

Scale

7.15 All dwellings are now two storey in height which is considered to be entirely appropriate for this area. Ridge heights vary slightly but are generally around 8.2m - 8.3m to ridge. The height of the Millfield and Broomfield units has been reduced. These two house types (terrace and semi's respectively) have deep gables (9 m approx.) but none are sited in highly prominent locations and are therefore considered to be acceptable.

7.16 No objection is raised to the scale

Landscaping

7.17 The Trees and Woodland Officer initially commented that some of the proposed dwellings were too close to existing trees on the northern boundary and that the layout did not appear to include or make spatial provision for a substantial planting buffer along the northern boundary as had been indicated on the indicative layout at outline stage. The revisions to the layout as discussed above have also led to changes to the landscaping scheme.

7.18 The fully specified amended landscaping scheme has been considered by Trees and Woodland Officer. He advises that it includes a good range of mainly native trees (together with some slightly more ornamental species), native hedgerow infilling, structural shrub beds against fences/walls, lower shrub beds against front elevations of dwellings, and privet hedges to the frontages of many plots. Collectively, these will make a good contribution to greening the streetscene. The amended layout has resulted in increased clearance between dwellings and existing mature Ash trees and field hedgerow along the northern boundary, which is beneficial and is at an acceptable level to provide a reasonable amount of private amenity space not directly beneath the crown of these trees, together with suitable clearance between outer edges of tree crowns and rear elevations of dwellings. The amended layout has also provided a slightly increased clearance from the Willow trees in the back garden of the adjacent property Arons Head; a further benefit. The easement strip at the side of Plot 22 is shown to be properly landscaped, with a central grassed strip over the sewer itself and mixed species structural shrub beds against the side boundaries.

7.19 The parking area to the front of Plots 20 and 21 would lead to something of a prominent concentration of vehicles in the streetscene as noted above. An amendment to the landscaping scheme has introduced shrub beds beneath the trees, using the "Plot N Mix A1" from the existing planting schedule. This will help to visually contain this parking area. The applicants also agreed to increase planting in the SUDS feature as this would appear rather engineered and imposing with a constructed bund around the sides which would appear quite prominent when entering the site via the public footpath off Saltersford Lane in the eastern-most corner. This further planting is also shown on the amended scheme.

7.20 Landscaping is now considered to be acceptable subject to conditions to secure its implementation. With this in place there is compliance with Policies NE1 and DC1 and the NPPF.

Other issues

7.21 **Fire access** - As noted above there is a pinch point at the entrance to the site where the intention is now and indeed was when the Inspector granted approval at the outline stage for this short stretch of road to be of single vehicle width. This matter was discussed at length at the appeal in terms of the safety of this and its suitability for fire engines. The Inspector referred to Manual for Streets (MfS) which states at paragraph 6.7.2 that a minimum of 3.7 m is required between kerbs for fire appliance access. However paragraph 6.7.3 goes on to state that the Association of Chief Fire Officers has expanded on and clarified these requirements as follows:

'A 3.7m carriageway (kerb to kerb) is required for operating space at the scene of a fire. Simply to reach a fire, the access route could be reduced to 2.75 m over short distances, provided the pump appliance can get to within 45 m of dwelling entrances'.

7.22 The Inspector was therefore satisfied that the proposal would meet the minimum width of 2.75 m for the passage of a fire engine as set out in MfS and that the carriageway widens out beyond this into the site. She also commented that even if the small possibility that a fire engine did have to mount the pavement at this point, given that the fire engine and other vehicles would be moving slowly at this point any risk to pedestrian safety would be very low.

7.23 The Fire Service has been consulted on this application. They initially expressed concern that the minimum required distance of 3.7 m between kerbs was not achieved. They say this is a requirement of Building Regulations and that they are guided by those Regulations rather than Manual for Streets. To address this the applicant has amended the plan to increase the road width to 3.7 m but reduce the pavement to 1.5 m. This is only for the short stretch of approx. 20 m. The Fire Service has confirmed that this would address their concern.

7.24 **Affordable housing** - The Millfield affordable unit has been reduced to a 2 bedroom unit in line with the comments of the Regeneration Officer – see above.

7.25 **Road surfacing** - during negotiations the applicant was asked to consider surfacing other than tarmac for the internal access road beyond the main entrance. Whilst the applicant does not appear averse to doing this, they have only changed

the surface in part citing issues of adoption raised by the LHA. As Members know this is routinely requested to improve the design quality of small residential schemes and reinforce road hierarchy with no previous issue noted with the LHA. It is therefore recommended that a condition is imposed to deal with the surfacing of the road to enable further discussion with the LHA to secure an acceptable finish.

7.26 Retaining walls - are inevitable on a site such as this which has an appreciable fall from west to east. There have been discussions with the applicant and Officers to reduce the height of these in several locations. The amended engineering drawings show where there will be retaining walls throughout the development both between plots and along external boundaries. Many of these are 1 m or less. There are some walls 1.7 m – 2.8 m on plots 9-11 but the impact will be from within the gardens of these plots rather than having any public view. To the south of the garage to plot 17 the retaining wall is shown up to 3 m. The impact will be felt from 'Woodside' rather than the application site. However the applicant makes the point that it is here the existing ménage straggles the boundary of the application site and the adjacent site, Woodside. The ménage has been cut into the landscape thus as the applicant says exaggerates the levels position. The applicant advises that the owners of Woodside (who have an interest in the application site) will be infilling the land on their side to bring the land back to original ground level before the ménage was constructed. This will reduce the retaining wall accordingly. There are two retaining walls at the front of plots 7 and 8. These are shown at heights ranging from 1.3 m to 2.5 m. These are in visible locations. The applicant has been asked to see if these can be reduced in height. Members will be updated at the meeting. The engineering drawings show that all retaining walls are outside root protection zones.

8. CONCLUSION AND PLANNING BALANCE

8.1 The application has been subject to significant negotiation. The applicant/agent has worked proactively with Officers to address concerns and has been very responsive to suggestions made. It is considered that the outcome is a scheme which protects amenity and provides a good quality design which responds to and reflects this edge of village location. The application complies with the Development Plan. Seven affordable units are achieved. It delivers sustainable development and a recommendation of approval is made subject to a number of conditions.

9. RECOMMENDATION

A. That reserved matters be approved subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans unless required by any other condition attached to this permission:

TBC

Reason:- For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Highways

2. Prior to first occupation of any permitted new dwelling the parking area and turning area for that dwelling shall be provided and surfaced in a bound material in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained for the life of the development for their designated purposes.

Reason:- In order to comply with Paras.108-110 of the NPPF 2018 and in the interest of Highway Safety

External finish

3. Notwithstanding the submitted details and prior to the construction of any of the dwellings above slab level full details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:-

- samples of all proposed facing materials
- Window details including materials
- eaves and verge detail (which shall be dry edges with brick detailing; no barge boards or tile edging strips)
- surfacing of the access road (which should be block paved as far as possible)
- retaining walls including sections where necessary and detail of height, materials and copings

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:- In order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development and its relationship to adjoining properties.

4. Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved plans, the windows and doors of the proposed development shall be set back a minimum of 75mm from the edge of the brickwork around the window opening

Reason:- In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the amenities of the area.

5. The planting scheme shown on TBC 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, shrubs, herbaceous plants and grass 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.

Reason:- To ensure an appropriate landscaping scheme in the interests of the external appearance and the character and appearance of the area.

Informatives

1. The Council has entered into extensive negotiations with the applicant to secure a sustainable development that complies with the National Planning Policy Framework

2. This consent will require approval under Section 7 of the Staffordshire Act 1983 and will require a Section 38 (or S219 Exemption) of the Highways Act

1980. Please contact Staffordshire County Council to ensure that approvals and agreements are secured before commencement of works.

B. In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.