

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th May 2022

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	ITEM
SMD/2021/0730	<p><u>The Former Black Head Inn</u></p> <p><u>Rights to Speak</u></p> <p>The person who was included to speak against the application at the Planning Applications Committee has dropped out but would like the following to be presented to Members:</p> <p><i>“Unfortunately, I cannot be present to attend the meeting on Thursday, due to teaching commitments. I was hoping to be able to address this issue in person, but I will attempt to convey via email the points I wish to raise in relation to the development.</i></p> <p><i>I have owned Nutwood Cottage, 4, Old Road, Upper Tean since 1996. During that time, the property has been completely renovated and all attempts have been made (very successfully) to retain original features and to ensure the external aesthetic compliments the surroundings. To me, this means choosing windows and doors carefully and ensuring that the style replicates the period in which the property was constructed.</i></p> <p><i>As the property sits within the conservation area, I was not able to have external insulation fitted to the gable end. When the garden wall which faces the street needed replacing because it was falling down, I had to match the bricks to the existing. This was extremely costly, but I considered it worthwhile to keep within the planning rules in which the property is located.</i></p> <p><i>The property is currently let through Sykes as a holiday cottage and last year, we were fully booked. All guests are given info on all the local eateries, shops and attractions and I know that all of our guests spend money in the shops in the village and local area.</i></p> <p><i>We have had problems with dust and noise during this development and some guests have complained about the works. When the facade of the pub fell down, due to the mismanagement of the contractors, the roads were closed and our guests who were not familiar with the area, were stranded. I have had to give them a week at no charge this year, because of the disruption this development caused during their holiday.</i></p> <p><i>When the original planning application was submitted for the public house, I did not object. The reason for this was because the original, historic facade was being kept and from what I could understand of the plans, the roof height to the rear of the property was to be the same height as the existing</i></p>	Item 6

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th May 2022

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	ITEM
	<p><i>building. At no point was an extension or increase in height referred to.</i></p> <p><i>The rear of my property faces New Road, so it looks out across the building site.</i></p> <p><i>From that window you could see over the roof of the public house to the roofs and upper storeys of properties in New Road.</i></p> <p><i>Now all I can see is a wall with windows facing directly into my property. The development blocks the natural light, blocks the sunlight and blocks the view. Furthermore, it looks down into my property, so that there will be no private areas to sit in the garden as all will be overlooked. The rear bedroom which is a child's bedroom will be overlooked directly, along with the kitchen and bathroom.</i></p> <p><i>It has made the exterior and interior of my property dark and gloomy.</i></p> <p><i>What I cannot grasp is why this development is deemed suitable for Tean High Street, it does not fit with any of the historic buildings, it blocks my light and also that of my neighbours.</i></p> <p><i>If we all have to adhere to planning rules, why has this development which is so out of place been allowed to go ahead?</i></p> <p><i>It was obvious to all that the front facade of the public house was going to collapse, there was no scaffold to hold it up and the ground around it was taken away.</i></p> <p><i>This development will affect my business and that in turn, will also affect the businesses that my guests visit.</i></p> <p><i>It is affecting my mental health as every time I visit the property, the development looms over it, making everywhere dark and gloomy. It is a constant worry that the development has severely devalued my property and certainly those that are adjacent.</i></p> <p><i>The applicant has in my opinion, taken liberties and has been dishonest regarding the true intent of the historic facade and the actual size and height of the building. This applicant does not see or understand historic beauty, tradition or even planning laws and certainly has no affection or respect for the residents of Tean village.</i></p> <p><i>I urge the planning committee to stop this development with immediate effect and request the applicant to submit revised plans.”</i></p> <p><u>Letters of objection</u></p> <p>Two letters of objection have been received since the report was published and one of those is from the above speaker. The points raised in the two letters are as follows:</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th May 2022

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	ITEM
	<p>-The height of the building exceeds the height of the former pub -Loss of privacy and light provision to properties off Old Road -Overdominant when viewed from the rear of properties off Old Road -Design of new building out of keeping with the Conservation Area -Building Inspectors are not carrying out checks -Impact on values of other properties in the village</p> <p><u>Response from Case Officer</u></p> <p>It is alleged that the building is being built higher than the former pub and not in accordance with the plans. Although the development is not yet complete, when I visited the site for the second time (on 10.5.22), it appeared the frame is complete and building materials were added to the rear extension part. It does not appear to be built larger than the plans which are effectively the same as those previously approved but they will be required to complete the development in exact accordance with the current application plans if approved via standard planning conditions or enforcement investigations will be undertaken.</p> <p>Members are reminded that the plans presented at the Committee are the same as those previously approved. It was considered the previous plans would not lead to any significant harm to the visual or residential amenities (i.e. light provision, privacy, level of dominance) of the area. The point about impact on property values is not a material planning consideration.</p> <p><u>Environmental Health Consultation Response (including noise assessment)</u></p> <p>With regard to noise, the following comments were made:</p> <p>Construction and Management Plan: The construction management plan submitted with this application was not complied with during the construction phase. Specifically the Environmental Health Department received noise complaints against a building site radio which was found to be excessively loud and located next to residential dwellings.</p> <p>There is no advice contained as to how dust will be monitored or indeed was monitored during the development. The condition below sets out what this Department would have expected to have seen for a development of this size and</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th May 2022

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	ITEM
	<p>location. The fact this development commenced without approval of an appropriate construction plan is a concern.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sound transmission between residential units and commercial area will be dealt with through building regulations. Environmental Health would recommend pre-completion testing is undertaken to ensure noise transmission between apartment units and commercial area does not impact residential amenity. 2. Condition timings of deliveries. 3. The noise assessment has been updated and the prediction based on specific plant acoustic detail is that noise from plant will not adversely impact existing background sound levels at neighbouring properties (ref table 3). The predicted noise levels have been assessed under BS4142. A condition is advised to take account of the advice contained in the assessment. 4. A site specific scheme of sound insulation should be submitted to ensure that road traffic noise does not impact future residential amenity. This should be submitted in compliance with BS8233:2014 and the PROPG: New Residential Development. <p><u>Officer Comment</u></p> <p>The Environmental Health Section has approved the amended details of the plant/machinery design and location (immediately to the west of the extension) but has concerns that the submitted Construction and Environment management Plan (CEMP) is not being followed. Conditions are proposed to be applied in the event of an approval, as recommended by Environmental Health, which will ask for a revised CEMP to be submitted within a limited time-frame and other conditions requesting a Noise Insulation Scheme and compliance with plant/machinery noise limits, restrictions on delivery hours and details of external lighting to be submitted.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <p>The agent has confirmed that the underground fuel tanks have been removed and therefore the contamination/remediation condition set out in the report would be altered accordingly in the event of an approval.</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th May 2022

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	ITEM
SMD/2019/0632	<p><u>The Royal Oak</u></p> <p>The Chairman of Friends of The Royal Oak which submitted the application for the Asset of Community Value status would like to clarify a wider reason for the ACV application which is follows:</p> <p><i>"Should the property be sold, and the group finds the funds to purchase and renovate the building, examples of the types of use the building could have are:- an arts/heritage centre, café and meeting/function rooms"</i></p> <p>In a separate email, the Chairman also points out that the community has expressed an interest in the Royal Oak building and has been working towards an alternative with some co-operation from Mr. Gough (by allowing access).</p>	Item 7
SMD/2021/0530	<p><u>The Swan Inn Town End Cheadle</u></p> <p>No updates</p>	Item 8
SMD/2021/0546	<p><u>The Swan Inn Town End Cheadle</u></p> <p>No updates</p>	Item 9
SMD/2021/0676	<p><u>Bradstones, Bottom Lane, Ipstones</u></p> <p>No updates</p>	Item 10
SMD/2021/0656	<p><u>Land at Eastern End of Mill Lane, Wetley Rocks</u></p> <p>Staffordshire County Council (Highways): No objections subject to conditions and informative notes as follows:</p> <p>1. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the accesses, parking, servicing and turning areas have been provided in accordance with the approved plan RMW10 B. The parking, turning and servicing areas shall thereafter be retained unobstructed as parking, turning and servicing areas for the life of the development. Reason:- In the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>2. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the access drive rear of the public highway has been surfaced and thereafter maintained in a bound material in accordance with the approved plan RMW10 B. Reason:- In the interests of highway safety.</p>	Item 11

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th May 2022

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	ITEM
	<p>3. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until details of the surface water drainage interceptors to be provided across the accesses immediately to the rear of the highway boundary, connected to a surface water outfall or on SUDS principles, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being first brought into use. Reason:- In the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>4. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the access to the site within the limits of the public highway has been completed. Reason:- In the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>5. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until details of the reinstatement of that part of the existing site access to verge and footway, which shall include the access crossing between the site and carriageway edge made redundant as a consequence of the development have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. That part of the existing site access made redundant as a consequence of the development hereby approved shall thereafter be reinstated as verge and footway in accordance with the approved plans. Reason:- In the interests of highway safety and to avoid a proliferation of over wide access crossings and return that part of the redundant access to verge.</p> <p><u>Highways informative to be included on decision notice.</u></p> <p>The dropped crossing to the site shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted drawing SCC Highways requirements. Please note that prior to the access being constructed you require Section 184 Notice of Approval from Staffordshire County Council. The link below provides a link to 'vehicle dropped crossings' which includes a 'vehicle dropped crossing information pack' and an application form for a dropped crossing. Please complete and send to the address indicated on the application form (or email to nmu@staffordshire.gov.uk) Vehicle access crossing (dropped kerb) - Staffordshire County Council http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/transport/staffshighways/licenses/ The reinstatement of the part of the redundant access to</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th May 2022

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	ITEM
	<p>verge shall require permit to dig. Please contact nmu@staffordshire.gov.uk as above.</p>	
SMD/2022/0552	<p><u>Caldon & Uttoxeter Canals Trust</u> Notes that there is a typo in the recommendation - surplus should be £815,000.00 - as referred to in 6.13 d) and agreed by the Applicant in 6.8. Asks that this is amended so that the full surplus be directed towards funding a canal basin. Also suggests the term 'canal basin' is used (as per the Head of Regeneration) as this is typically used to describe accessible waterspace, as opposed to the term marina which is typically used for commercially operated waterspace which in this case has repeatedly been proven to be unviable.</p> <p><u>Officer Recommendation A</u></p> <p>Point c) to read '..planning surplus of £815 000 to be directed towards a Marina and /or canal basin'</p> <p><u>Letter of representation</u> I am sure there will be those present much more competent than I to make the case for developing the amenity and tourist value of this unique site with its canal, river, park and railway features. I would just like to add one more suggestion to the planning for this ideal - which is to create a circular right of way (wheel chair friendly) that progresses from Bestwicks circle to the aqueduct over the Churnet river and then along the canal towpath to the first bridge - West Bridge Nos 9, and then follows the line from this bridge across the Churnet [needing a small footbridge across the Churnet to do this] and then crosses the railway line to join the new footpath along the line back to Bestwicks circle. That route would allow taking in all the features this area of special interest provides. Could this be included in the plan for the proposed canal basin as well as extending the Ladderedge Country Park south along the Churnet as far as the Sewage Works boundary fence. Could these two innovations be a Jubilee project??</p>	