

**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

16th February 2023

Application No:	SMD/2021/0491	
Location	Land off Tenford Lane, Upper Tean	
Proposal	Reserved Matters application seeking approval of the details of scale, layout, appearance and landscaping comprising a residential development of up to 40 houses.	
Applicant	Mr A R Alcock	
Agent	Hewitt and Carr Architects	
Parish/ward	Cheadle	Date registered: 26 th July 2021
If you have a question about this report please contact: Chris Johnston, tel: 01538 395400 ext. 4123, email: Christopher.johnston@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk		

REFERRAL

The application is before the committee because it involves a major application, the outline for which was approved at Committee in June 2017 (ref: SMD/2016/0811) and which has attracted a large number of objection letters. The applicant is also related to one of the Members (Cllr Deaville).

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to Conditions

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application site comprises two adjoining fields on the north side of Tenford Lane, a road running along the north edge of the village with existing housing to the south, facing the road. The development boundary for Upper Tean runs along the road with the application site excluded and so the site is deemed as being within the "open countryside" but is not within the Green Belt. The land slopes upwards towards the north. A short distance to the north of the site there is a former quarry (Mobberley Quarry) much of which is wooded and within an SMDC Nature Conservation site and covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). There is an adjoining open field to the east side of the site. To the west is a group of farm buildings, some of which were formerly used as a dog kennels. The south boundary of the site is marked by a long hedgerow and there are a number of mature trees on this boundary, six of which are protected by TPOs. There is a field access in the south-west corner of the site, off Tenford Lane. Although the site is on the edge of Upper Tean, it is within the Parish of Cheadle. The Parish boundary runs along Tenford Lane.

3. THE APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 This is a Reserved Matters planning application following the granting of outline planning permission for up to 40 houses on 2nd August 2018 following approval by Members at the Planning Applications Committee in June 2017. The proposed access to the development and road layout was also approved under the outline consent. This new application seeks approval for the scale of development, the layout of development, the design and appearance of the development and the landscaping of the site. Also included with this application is details to tackle some of the conditions which were imposed on the outline approval, including those required to be submitted at the Reserved Matters stage. These include details pursuant to Condition 7 relating to ground and finished floor levels, Condition 13 requiring the drainage scheme, Condition 17 requiring the Landscape & Habitat Enhancement and Management Plan (LHEMP) and Condition 20 requiring a trees and hedges retention and protection scheme.

3.2 The plans submitted with this current application have been amended several times since first submitted. The final amended plans were received on 21st November 2022 resulting in a final round of re-consultation and re-notification of adjacent residents and additional previous objectors. The final plans show forty redbrick and tile two-storey dwellings served by a long distributor road from the approved site access where the current field access is and which would run parallel with Tenford Lane after a bend and which would have three short cul-de-sacs to the north of it. The dwellings comprise the following:

- 11 x 4-bed detached dwellinghouses ("Type 1")
- 17 x 3-bed detached dwellinghouses ("Type 2" and "Type 3")
- 4 x 3-bed semi-detached dwellinghouses ("Type 5")
- 8 x 2-bed semi-detached dwellinghouses ("Type 4")

3.3 In terms of affordable housing, 13 of the above units would be affordable, in line with the outline permission, secured by a signed Section 106 Agreement and which would comprise the following:

- 2 x social-rented 3-bed semi-detached houses
- 1 x social-rented 3-bed detached house
- 6 x social-rented 2-bed semi-detached houses
- 2 x shared ownership (i.e. part-owned, part-rented) 3-bed semi-detached houses
- 2 x shared ownership (i.e. part-owned, part-rented) 2-bed semi-detached houses

3.4 The affordable units are in three small clusters in the western half of the development but are integrated into the development and separated by groups of the 100% privately-owned units.

3.5 The original plans had a much greater number of three-bed units (31no) but far less two-bed units (2no) and less four-bed units (7no).

3.6 With regard to housing mix, there are five separate “types” of housing but which all follow the same ‘design code’ with a redbrick and grey/blue tile traditional rural cottage appearance with side gables, chimneys, vertical 4-light white windows (on the primary elevations), stone lintels and dual-pitch canopy porches. They would be laid out in a conventional housing estate form, all facing the distributor and cul-de-sac roads and with front and rear gardens and with either front parking areas or driveways to the side leading to separate garage blocks to the side or rear. There would be two different types of red brick as main facing brick to add to the variety.

3.7 With the road layout agreed at the outline stage, the main difference with the plans originally submitted is that the houses to the south of the distributor road on the original plans, faced Tenford Lane and turned their backs on the distributor road. The amended plans turn those houses 180 degree to face the distributor road and also push many of these away from the south boundary (Tenford Lane) and closer to the distributor road.

3.8 The houses would be largely located on the eastern half of the site with a large public open space occupying the west side. This would be immediately visible on entering the site from the approved access off Tenford Lane and with the first dwellings only appearing after a right bend in the road.

3.9 The open space would have new trees and scrub/woodland planting and pedestrian paths with benches. A detailed landscaping scheme has been submitted with the proposed landscaping and ecological features including new planting to improve the hedgerow along Tenford Lane and bring this up to a height of 2.0 where deficient. There would be different planted zones including some wildflower areas. The boundary fencing would comprise timber post-and-rail fences separating the public realm from the open fields to the north, hedge planting separating the dwelling plots from the open fields and within the development, a mix of hedge planting and hit-and-miss timber fencing with brick piers where boundaries face a road or the public realm, whilst individual adjacent plots are separated by standard timber fencing. A 3m acoustic fence would be installed along the west boundary of the site screened by existing and proposed vegetation.

3.10 The application was accompanied by a ‘Noise from Kennels’ Noise/Acoustic Report, Tree Report with Tree Protection details, Landscape and Habitat Enhancement and Management Plan and Ecological Survey Reports. In September 2021, an Affordable Housing Statement and Drainage Strategy were submitted. In February 2022, an amended Drainage Strategy and amended Landscape and Habitat Enhancement and Management Plan were submitted. There have been several amendments made since to the drainage strategy with the final amendments submitted on 25th January 2023. The finalised site plan was received on 6.1.23 and shows only minor amendments to the one submitted in November 2022, which local residents were consulted on. Those amendments are outlined in para 3.12.

3.11 The drainage strategy has been designed to respond to the sloping nature of the site. The main features which affect the layout of the development include three “sustainable drainage ponds” (which are shallow at the edges even if completely full in the case of extreme water run-off) and two swales to in the open western half of the site either side of the distributor road. Two of the ponds are located a short

distance to the north of the south boundary road-side hedge and to the south of the distributor road. These are designed to control the flow and catch and contain surface water flows (via underground drains) to prevent flooding particularly of Tenford Lane and adjacent properties. These would have a depth below ground level of between approx. 1.8m and 3m.

3.12 Since the final round of consultation and notification in November 2022, the following minor alterations have been made (other than the technical drainage information submitted in January 2023):

-Addition of a hedge on the side boundary of Plot 1 resulting in Site Plan drawing 0017 Revision J received on 6.1.23.

-Minor revisions to the landscaping scheme received on 6.1.23 (Revisions B).

-Ground levels plan alteration (Revision C) received on 24.1.23 which shows slight alterations to ground levels of the gardens and driveways for some of the houses, as requested by Staffs County Council as local flood authority.

3.13 Details of the application including the plans, drawings, reports, consultation responses and letters received from local residents can be viewed at:

<http://publicaccess.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=151144>

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

SMD/2016/0200 Outline planning application for residential development of up to 49 houses with all matters reserved except for access. Refused.

SMD/2016/0811 Outline planning application with some matters reserved (except access) for a residential development of up to 40 houses (resubmission of SMD/2016/0200). Outline permission granted on 2.8.18.

5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Adopted Sept 2020)

5.1 The Development Plan comprises the Local Plan Development Document (adopted September 2020).

5.2 The following Local Plan policies are relevant to the application:

- SS1 Development Principles
- SS8 Larger Villages Strategy
- SS10 Other Rural Areas Strategy
- H1 New Housing Development
- H3 Affordable Housing
- DC1 Design Considerations
- DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
- NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources

- NE2 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
- T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Revised (2019)

5.3 The following chapters of the NPPF (2019) are particularly relevant to this application:

- 5: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- 12: Achieving well-designed places
- 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) and Guidance (SPG's)

Council's Design Guide (February 2018) SPD
Council's Space About Dwellings SPG

6. CONSULTATIONS

6.1 Letters were sent to 48 nearby properties on 28.7.21. In addition, a site notice was put up on Tenford Lane on 21.9.21. Due to the application being for a Major Development, a newspaper advert was posted in the Cheadle Tean Times on 11.8.21.

Public response to consultation

6.2 Twenty-one letters or emails of objection were received in response to the original Reserved Matters submission in July/August 2021. Most of the letters raise concerns relating to planning matters already considered at the outline planning application stage i.e. traffic, highway safety on existing roads, safety risk to children from new houses so close to nearby quarry ponds, pressure on existing infrastructure and village facilities, loss of green open land, harm to wildlife, new houses on the site will cause flooding, no demand for new housing in this area and properties lying empty and the presence of nearby brownfield sites which should be used instead. The main planning-related points raised in the letters/emails in relation to the matters this new application seeks approval for i.e. scale, appearance, layout and landscaping of the development are as follows:

- Loss of light affecting Tenford Lane dwellings caused by new buildings on higher ground.
- Overlooking and loss of privacy affecting Tenford Lane dwellings due to houses on higher ground.
- "Bland modern estate" out of keeping with the character of the lane.
- Concern that proposed public open space will be the subject of future housing proposals in the future
- Concern that foundations will damage tree roots
- Concern that future residents will want to remove existing trees and hedgerows that are in their gardens

- The west boundary hedge next to the kennels should no longer be replaced by an acoustic fence now the kennels are no longer operational
- No details relating to street lighting
- Plots 34.35 and 36 too close to the south boundary causing harmful overlooking of Tenford Lane properties
- Loss of mature tree (no. T4541)
- No pavements on both sides of the proposed roads
- No specific details of brick or tile type
- No purpose of empty cul-de-sac opposite plot 40
- Proposed public open space path should be gravel and not tarmac which will lead to surface water run-off and harm habitats
- Insufficient information in the drainage strategy
- The location of the three drainage infiltration basins could lead to flooding of Tenford Lane, service runs and adjacent properties
- Plots on the south side of the road too close to one another and trees would cause overshadowing of the backs of those properties

6.3 There have amendments to the scheme submitted in February 2022, May 2022, August 2022, October 2022 and finally in November 2022 which have resulted in public consultation. There were 15 letters were received in response to the February 2022 consultation. The points raised which directly relate to the particular Feb 2022 amendments scheme were as follows:

- Drainage information still insufficient and incapable of preventing flooding
- There would still be overlooking and overshadowing affecting existing Tenford Lane dwellings
- Lack of details of the funding of the landscape and ecology areas/public open space
- Lack of tree protection details

6.4 There were six objection letters received in response to the May 2022 amendments. The additional points raised were as follows:

- Insufficient details of proposed ground levels of houses and therefore concerns over loss of light affecting existing residents.
- Lack of details of the maintenance of the swales and ponds and this would not solve flooding problems further along Tenford Lane and Gorsty Hill
- New residents on the south side of the new road would be likely to replace the hedge with fences affecting the appearance of the lane and also remove trees due to safety concerns

6.5 There were five objection letters received in response to the August 2022 amendments. The additional points raised were as follows:

- Drainage plans difficult to understand
- Houses will still be elevated due to higher land affecting light and privacy of existing residents
- The drainage strategy including swales and ponds would not prevent the flooding of the surrounding area and would be a safety concern if overflowed
- the cut-off drain would damage the hedgerow on the lane

- insufficient parking provision
- Removal of ancient oak tree
- Too much of the site would be lost to development or infiltration basins

6.6 There were two letters received in response to the October and November 2022 amendments. The letters focussed on traffic and drainage/flooding.

Cheadle Town Council

6.7 March 2022: *It was resolved that Cheadle town Council object to this application on the grounds of Highways (narrow width of the road leading to proposed development), Elevation (proposed development is significantly higher than existing dwellings in the area and would overlook at upper floor height), drainage and the overbearing aspect of the development against existing properties.*

6.8 November 2022: *It was resolved that Committees would accept the amendment, but would recommend that a Planning Observation be made in order to highlight concerns relating to drainage and a lack of recreational facilities.*

Checkley Parish Council

6.9 March 2022: *The applicants process of application and commitment appears to be exceptionally piecemeal and non-committal. Their responses to the statutory consultees are very poor and lacking in detail if not nonexistent. The ignorance of attention to dealing with surface water runoff in an area that suffers considerably from an inadequate surface water drainage system that is already over capacity. The ignorance of any detail on the affect an increased population and corresponding travel requirements will have on the infrastructure of an already over developed village.*

The suggestion that any increase in education provision will affect only Cheadle primary is incorrect this development would in fact impact both Greatwood Primary and St Thomas Catholic schools. The inadequate study of the impact on the existing environment regarding both flora and fauna. The reduction of agricultural and green space provision within a village environment. The inclusion of a cul-de-sac with no dwellings and no apparent destination raises concern that the applicant is considering further development of the site at a future date which will greatly increase the impact. No comments received.

SCC Highway Authority

In response to the original Reserved Matters submission – July 2021

6.10. Garage sizes of 5.5m x 3.4m are less than the minimum size to be included in parking provision. This affects parking provision of plot 6 where an additional space is required. Driveway to plot 6 does seem wide. It could be narrowed slightly but lengthened? Road widths are acceptable including for refuse vehicles. If no dwellings are to be provided off the first cul de sac, should it be provided? Highways would not wish to adopt such a road.

In response to August 2022 Amended Plans

6.11 No objection subject to further conditions relating to the parking, turning and garaging areas for each plot and the provision of visibility splays at the internal junctions of the cul-de-sacs. Drawing 00438 AL(0)16 A clearly shows garages with internal dimensions to meet minimum parking standard. At outline stage, highways provided comments on site plan 00438 AL(0)04. The drawing approved under SMD/2016/0811 was 00438 AL(0)04 A. This drawing shows culs de sac narrower than those seen by highways. Cul de sacs of (scaled, not dimensioned) 4.2m and 4.5m may not meet adoptable standard. As this is an REM application, there are highway conditions included on the OUT approval which consider access and will need to be complied with.

In response to October and November 2022 amendments

6.12 No additional comments.

SMDC Environmental Health

In response to the original Reserved Matters submission – July 2021

6.13 The kennels which caused noise concern when original outline application was submitted has now been closed. The mitigation set out in the submitted noise report should be completed in full. No objection is raised to this new application subject to Conditions 11, 15 and 16 of the outline permission being complied with.

In response to the October 2022 amendments

6.14 The Environmental Health Department have no objections to the approval of reserved matters regarding landscaping, and layout subject to the conditions in the original outline application are applied.

Staffordshire Wildlife Trust

In response to the original Reserved Matters submission – July 2021

6.15 Further information is required regarding drainage proposals, landscaping and towards the Landscape and Habitat Enhancement & Management Plan (LHEMP) in order for the proposed development to comply with Condition 17 of the outline planning permission. This information is as follows:

1. Badger Method Statement.
2. Great Crested Newts/Amphibian Method Statement.
3. Reptile method statement.

4. Bats/Tree felling method statement detailing survey of tree T4541 prior to removal, along with any recommended soft felling measures.

Additional comments in Feb 2022

6.16 GCN Statement now received but Amphibian MS still awaited. The LHEMP states within management objectives 'Ensure any works to trees that may involve protected species such as bats or nesting birds, an approved ecologist undertakes assessment prior to removal.' Because the plan is for long-term management, this may not be sufficient to ensure that tree T4541 (Tree 55 within the ecology report) with moderate bat potential, to be felled, will be surveyed before site clearance. Survey need to happen no more than a month before felling, so a survey can't be included now in the LHEMP. Recommends including survey/ soft felling in a method statement.

In response to October Amended Plans

6.17 Holding objection further mitigation details required:

“Required prior to determination:

- 1. Amend SuDs pond shape/ position to avoid loss of hedgerow*
- 2. The following are required as part of condition 17 of SMD/2016/0811 to be submitted as part of reserved matters, unless these can be secured as part of a condition:*
 - a. Badger method statement.*
 - b. Reptile method statement.*
 - c. Amphibian method statement.*
 - d. Bat method statement with survey of tree 55 (T4541) prior to felling- unless this tree can be retained.*

Secure via condition should approval be granted:

- 3. Inclusion of rainwater harvesting and rain gardens, as per the original drainage strategy suggestions plus amphibian friendly road design (such as dropped kerbs and escape features within any drainage gully pots).”*

6.18 With regard to the landscaping scheme, LDS517-01 Landscape 1 of 2 AMENDED and LDS517-01 Landscape 2 of 2 AMENDED are appropriate- locally sourced meadow seed would be preferable to seed mixes if available.

6.19 With regard to the drainage strategy, the Strategic Drainage plan K22-001-002 Oct 2022 shows proposed SuDs ponds cutting through Hedge 2. This seems unnecessary- the ponds could be shaped or moved eastwards to avoid losing any hedgerow. This should be amended now. Details of the bund creation have been provided. The cut- off drainage pipe previously shown along the southern boundary that would have impacted on the RPAs of several trees is no longer in the drainage plan.

6.20 With regard to the LHEMP required under Condition 17 of the outline permission:

“The condition requests amongst other details surveys for badger, reptiles, amphibians, and bats. As per the relevant ecological reports, the survey findings for amphibians, badgers, and reptiles were that a method statement is required to mitigate for potential impacts. We feel that these should be provided now prior to determination, as condition 17 clearly states that the surveys must be provided at first reserved matters, and these method statements are a recommendation based on those surveys. We would be happy for these to be provided as part of a pre-commencement condition if suitable, otherwise they will need to be provided now to ensure they will be in place.

A bat survey of tree 55 (tag 4541) that will be felled has not been conducted. As per the condition 17, a bat survey must be undertaken to provide additional information, this should be no more than 48 hours prior to felling. If no bats are present a soft fell can be undertaken following a precautionary method statement. Please see sections 3.15 through 3.20 of the submitted ecological report (Apex Ecology, July 2021) for recommendations. A licence from Natural England will be required if a bat roost is present. The bat survey requirement could be avoided if the tree was retained – could this be confirmed?”

Response to November 2022 Amendments and further ecology information submitted

6.21 No objection subject to conditions requiring rainwater harvesting and amphibian friendly road design.

6.22 The amended Planting Plans LDS517-01 and -02 Rev A dated 21Nov22 are appropriate and would appear to provide a net biodiversity gain within the site. It would be positive if all or parts of the eastern open space area could be seeded with wildflower mix instead of the Germinal Seeds A19 mix, as this would provide a net gain closer to 10% which would be good practice. We understand that it is proposed to apply for a “Non Material Amendment” application to vary the wording of Condition 17 so that a Bat Report be submitted and approved 48 hours before removal of the tree 55 (tag 4541) and that other species method statements be submitted before the commencement of works. This would be a suitable amendment.

SMDC Trees and Landscape Officer

In response to the original Reserved Matters submission – July 2021

6.19 Generally there would be little direct harmful impact on existing trees/hedgerows arising from the proposed layout – but with the exception of the soakaways within Root Protection Areas of trees, which is not acceptable. The proposed landscaping scheme is heavily based on the use of native species which is good to see and supported. This would provide a new native hedgerow along the northern edge of the development area, and includes appropriate standard trees within the hedge. Individual native trees and massed woodland/scrub type planting are shown for the open space areas, together with orchard fruit trees in some locations on the open space which supports the council’s current Community Orchard Initiative. On-plot planting is more ornamental/garden-orientated as

expected, but even so also includes native trees and hedging. A Landscape and Habitat Enhancement and Management Plan (LHEMP) is submitted in accordance with condition 17 of the outline planning permission; this is considered to be appropriate and acceptable, subject to any further advice/comment/request from Staffs Wildlife Trust.

6.20 Further full comments are given as follows:

“Proposed layout would largely retain existing field structure, no existing trees would be removed in order to accommodate the development and only 2 short stretches of hedgerow (total 23.5m) at the proposed access point which would be readily mitigated by replacement planting as part of site landscaping scheme. 6 trees in the tree survey have been assessed as Category U (poor/dangerous condition) however the applicant’s tree report notes that 5 of these 6 could actually be retained for habitat value (these 5 are all situated along the woodland edge/treeline at the northern boundary of the site, well away from dwellings, gardens, roads and open space areas. The 6th cat U tree (ref T4541) is in the Tenford Lane frontage hedgerow virtually opposite the junction with Cavendish Road, and removal is advised due to stem base decay with potential failure targets of adjacent public highway and proposed plots on the development – this is agreed and supported; this tree is not included in the TPO so no further procedural issues apply prior to removal.

Other than for new main site access noted above, no dwelling footprints, garage footprints, private drives or estate roads would encroach within tree Root Protection Areas (RPAs). A small corner of the indicated rear patios of Plots 35, 36 & 37 would very slightly encroach into RPAs, but would be low impact and as noted in applicants tree report could be constructed using no-dig geocell specification to avoid significant impact. Plot boundary fences in some cases would traverse through RPAs, but intermittent fenceposts at typical intervals would not have a significant adverse impact on roots and is considered acceptable.

However, the strategic drainage plan submitted with the application shows individual soakaways to each plot specified as a cellular block system typically 9m x 9m, excavated/installed to 1m below incoming invert level (which itself will be below ground level) and where, as in some cases for plots backing on to Tenford Lane, these soakaways are shown beneath existing tree canopy extent this would also inevitably involve significant excavation and likely substantial root damage within RPAs. It is not possible to be certain which plots this issue would relate to, as the strategic drainage plan is notably not in accordance with the proposed layout plan. However, as a general principle excavation for and installation of these soakaways would not be considered acceptable within the RPAs of existing trees to be retained – especially, but not exclusively, those protected by the Tree Preservation Order.”

6.21 Some of the dwellings are too close to trees in respect of problems caused by overshadowing, loss of light, loss of outlook and potential for damage from falling branches etc and therefore lead to possible tree cutting and/or felling by future occupants.

6.22 *“More larger residential developments are these days being designed as “outward-facing” to avoid presenting a closed off rear aspect to either the public*

realm or adjacent open countryside, which often involves provision of tall solid fences to gardens in order to provide privacy and security which can be visually abrupt and intrusive, especially in a rural edge location such as Tenford Lane. Whilst for instance the existing hedgerow to Tenford lane (and its trees) would be retained, such established hedges are often not considered by occupants to provide sufficient standard of privacy and security, especially if gappy or when out of leaf in winter. In addition, an outward-facing layout for this site would address and overcome some or all of the issues and also improve the appearance and setting of the development itself, allowing it to be assimilated better into the landscape with less intrusive visual impact.”

In response to the amendments to the landscaping scheme in October 2022

6.23 *“Proposed layout has evolved since first reserved matters submission, and generally now provides notably greater clearance from the existing hedgerow and mature trees along the Tenford Lane boundary, which is a welcome improvement.*

If I understand the latest amended drainage strategy correctly, the previously proposed individual plot soakaways have now been omitted (this is good: several would have required significant excavation within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of established mature and in most cases protected trees with inevitable resultant damage to roots). Instead, porous paving driveways are proposed to each plot to deal with its surface water drainage, and these are all well clear of RPAs.

The proposed landscape/planting scheme is acceptable overall, with a large proportion of native tree species, native shrub planting areas, mixed native hedges to open space areas and a mixture of amenity grass, wildflower meadow grass and wetland/pond edge meadow grass. Specific points:

- *New garden hedges are generally of ornamental, single-species specification; whilst not objectionable, greater use of mixed native species hedging including for individual plot frontage boundaries would be less suburban in character and more in keeping with the rural character of this village edge location.*
- *The indicated avenue of fastigate Hornbeam trees along the main site access road leading off Tenford Lane (“CAR FRA” on the landscape plans) would be overly formal and perhaps not best in keeping with the rural character. This variety of Hornbeam is relatively compact, with a very regular, tightly narrow/upright crown and whilst useful for instance in very constrained urban roads and car parks it would be a bit incongruous on an informal open space area in a rural setting. Instead, from the existing species schedule an irregular mix of more Oak (“QUE ROB”) and Wild Cherry (“PRU AVI”) would be better suited.*
- *There appears to be a complete absence of planting along the side boundaries of Plot 1, Plot 17, Plot 18 and Plot 25 and rear boundaries of Plots 18 – 24 where these abut the adjacent undeveloped area of field (blue-edged site). I have not found a proposed boundary treatments plan, but “standard” garden fencing would be anticipated, to provide privacy and security. However, this would give a very abrupt and harsh visual transition at the edge of the development area between gardens and field, and mixed native*

hedging along the plot/field interface would be a much more appropriate treatment in keeping with the rural location – to reduce visual impact of the dwellings/gardens and enhance biodiversity provision.”

SCC Flood Team

In response to the original Reserved Matters submission – July 2021

6.24 *“There is insufficient detail to fully demonstrate that an acceptable drainage strategy is proposed. It should be demonstrated that infiltration is viable for this site before a full assessment can be made of the proposed drainage strategy. As the proposed drainage strategy is based on infiltration and it is unclear if the infiltration testing was carried out to BRE365 standards (especially the filling of each trial pit 3 times) and locations of trial pits are not recorded, it is recommended that these tests be undertaken again to BRE365 standards. This is especially necessary given that the modelled half drain time is 108hours which is above the recommended 24hours. The Landscape Proposals drawing shows a different layout to those included in the Flood Risk Assessments submitted for the Outline application and cited in Condition 10. In addition, although there are no drainage details on the Landscape Proposals plan, it is not clear whether the previously proposed attenuation basin in the open space towards the north of the site remains, or whether the submitted plan just lacks detail. In light of the above, we would recommend that permission is not granted until these issues have been resolved.”*

In response to the November 2022 Amended Plans

6.25 More specific details and further information is required in order to fully assess if the drainage strategy is effective in preventing flooding, including further calculations. These relate to the swales and infiltration basins (the “drainage ponds”), the landscape bund and fencing on the Tenford Lane boundary in the event of “exceedance”, the finished floor levels of the proposed houses in relation to ground levels and also a Ground Investigation (GI) report is required. Details of the maintenance of the basins and swales is also required.

In response to the information submitted as requested (date: 25th January 2023):

6.26 SCC Local Flood Authority removes its objections providing the following conditions are applied:

The development permitted by this planning permission to only be carried out in accordance with the Staffordshire SuDS Handbook and the approved Drainage Strategy Document (Strategic Drainage Plan, K22-001-002 Rev H, Keytech Development Design Ltd, 25/01/2023) and the following mitigation measures detailed the strategy:

1) An infiltration-based solution for surface water drainage containing the 1 in 100yr + 40% event within the drainage network.

Provision of 3 infiltration basins on the site to a 1 in 1000year standard. With minimum storage volumes of:

Basin 1: 491.5m³

Basin 2: 652.2m³

Basin 3: 602.1m³

Provision of landscaping to provide erosion control in infiltration basins and swales as per document LDS517-01 (Rev B), Planting Plan 1 of 2, Landscape Design Solutions (NW) Ltd, 05/01/2023.

Provision of bunds around all 3 infiltration basins (to provide extra storage volume) at least 200mm above the top of bank levels of each basin shown in the approved drainage plan.

Provision of swales prior to discharge into Infiltration Basins 1 and 2 and a catch pit prior to discharge into Basin 3.

A minimum of 2 levels of water treatment for highway drainage.

Provision of an amount and configuration of permeable paving either the same as, or demonstrating betterment, in area and water quality treatment than the provision in the approved drawing.

Finished Floor Levels to be at least 150mm above surrounding ground levels.

Provision of a cut-off drain along the southern boundary of the site to capture residual runoff.

Exceedance flows to be managed using ground profiling as outlined in Flood Exceedance Plan, K22-001-006 Rev E, Keytech Development Design Ltd, 25/01/2023 with all ground slopes being profiled away from property entrances.

2) Prior to the occupation of the development the following additional details to be incorporated in the scheme approved under Condition 1 and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- Provision of a finalised management and maintenance plan to ensure continued performance of the system for the lifetime of the development. Details of the maintenance arrangements should be provided, to include a schedule of activities with frequencies, together with the name and contact details of the party or parties responsible for ongoing maintenance. This should include permeable paving.*
- Provision of the name and contact details of the party or parties responsible for the construction phase maintenance strategy.*

The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

3) Developer to ensure that satisfactory arrangements for the control of surface water are in place as part of any temporary works associated with the permanent development, to ensure that flood risk is not increased, and water quality is managed prior to the completion of the approved drainage strategy.

Severn Trent Water

6.27 The submitted drainage plan shows all foul sewage is proposed to discharge to the public foul sewer, and all surface water is proposed to discharge to on site soakaways. Based upon these proposals I can confirm we have no objections to the discharge of the drainage related condition.

SMDC Regeneration/Affordable Housing

In response to the original Reserved Matters submission – July 2021

6.28 The applicant does not appear to have submitted an Affordable Housing Statement with their application. A S106 agreement, signed on the 2nd July 2018 secured a 33% affordable housing contribution with a 70% rent, 30% shared ownership split. The applicant will need to provide a contribution in line with this agreement.

In response to the Affordable Housing Statement submitted in September 2021

6.29 Affordable Housing Statement and layout needs to be amended to shared ownership rather shared equity as currently stated. Location of affordable units on site is acceptable. Proposed mix of rent and shared ownership is in line with the agreed S106. I note the applicant is proposing to deliver the affordable housing as all 3 bed units. Data from our housing register indicates that is a need for smaller units of 1 and 2 bed accommodation. The inclusion of a couple of smaller units would bring the proposed mix in line with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

In response to the final dwelling amendments (November 2022)

6.30. Applicant is proposing a change in the location of the affordable units. The revised locations proposed are noted below. Whilst the revised location does mean that all the affordable units will be located on the northern section of the site, the proposal is acceptable.

House type	Plots April 2022	Revised plot location Nov 2022	No. beds	No. of units	Tenure	Property size
Type 3	25, 26	16,17	3	2	Rent	106sqm
Type 4	4, 5, 13-16	18-23	2	6	Rent	81sqm
Type 2	28	36	3	1	Rent	102sqm
Type 2	35, 36	4,5	3	2	S/O	102sqm
Type 4	39,40	2,3	2	2	S/O	81sqm
				13		

SCC Archaeologist

6.31 I do not wish to raise any archaeological issues with this application.

SMDC Leisure Services (Sport and Public Open Space Provision)

In response to the original Reserved Matters submission – July 2021

6.32 The development includes a very generous area of public open space to the west of the site. It is welcomed to see that there will be a pedestrian hard-surfaced pathway around this open space giving opportunities for gentle exercise. The

extended paths which will be provided by way of mown sections of the wider open space are also welcomed. Path distance signs and seating/benches are also recommended. Joined-up paths on both sides of the proposed road is requested. It is noted from the Outline Application (SMD/2016/0811) that off-site provision for both play and playing pitches will be provided within the agreed s106 document.

In response to Amended Plans – February 2022

6.33. “No further comments.”

SCC Education/Schools

6.34 A Section 106 Agreement was signed when the Outline Application was granted and the education contribution amount and terms should be calculated in line with this.

Environment Agency

6.35 No objection.

SCC Minerals and Waste

6.36 “No comments to make”

AES Waste

6.37 No issues regarding waste collections.

Staffordshire Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor

6.38 The design and layout of the development is deemed to be safe and further crime prevention measures are advised.

7. OFFICER COMMENT AND PLANNING BALANCE

7.1 The main issues relate to:

- Whether the proposed housing layout, scale, design/appearance and landscaping in terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the area, residential amenity and the ecological value of the area
- Whether the proposal applied for under this Reserved Matters application is in line with the outline permission for housing and the planning conditions and Section 106 Agreement attached to it.

Principle of Development

7.2 The principle of a housing development with up to 40 houses on the site has been accepted in granting outline planning permission in 2018. The access to the site and road layout (deemed to be part of the “Access”) was also approved. Matters such as traffic creation, impact on highway safety and general impact on the

ecological value of the area have also therefore been assessed and considered to be acceptable. It is therefore not necessary to re-visit the principle of the development (including impact on local facilities and services), traffic, impact on the road network or impact on the wider environment.

7.3 This Reserved Matters application is solely concerned with the particular layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the proposed development.

7.4 A Section 106 Agreement was secured with the outline planning permission to deliver 13 affordable housing units (i.e. roughly a third of the total number of dwellings) comprising social-rented (via a Housing Association) and “intermediate” units (i.e. part-owned, part-rented), contributions towards increasing capacity at local schools, off-site contributions towards sports facilities, public open space and play areas locally and also a managed public open space within the site itself. The terms of the S106 will not be affected by this Reserved Matters planning application.

Scale and Form of Development

7.5 Forty houses are proposed, all of which are two-storey in form but with some with rooms in the roof-space above first floor level. There is an appropriate mix of semi-detached and detached units and unit sizes ranging from 2-bed units to 4-bed units which is in line with the Council’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment which has shown a particular shortage of smaller units. The number of affordable units is in line with the Local Plan and the terms of the S106 Agreement attached to the outliner permission. This will be in the form of a mix of 2-bed and 3-bed units which meet the size thresholds for affordable housing and the units are well integrated into the overall development as encouraged in the NPPF. The SMDC Housing Officer raises no objection to the finalised affordable housing proposals of October 2022.

The impact on the character and appearance of the area

7.6 Policy DC1 of the Local Plan requires all development to be well designed and reinforce local distinctiveness by positively contributing to and complementing the special character and heritage of the area in line with the Council’s Design Guide SPD and in particular, regarding character and appearance, new development should:

1. be of a high quality and add value to the local area, incorporating creativity, detailing and materials appropriate to the character of the area;
2. be designed to respect the site and its surroundings and promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, height, density, layout, siting, landscaping, character and appearance;

7.7 It is considered that the particular style and design of the dwellings is of sufficient quality to approve and appropriate to the edge of a large village location. The dwellings have significant detailing and traditional features and their gable-sided form, brick and tile materials (and colours) and fenestration reflects local distinctiveness in line with the aims of the government planning guidance in the NPPF and is also in general accordance with the Council’s adopted Design Guide. There are five different house types and these are distributed around the

development and provide a satisfactory interest and appearance to the development. Each building has been placed with sufficient space around the dwellings to avoid an over-cramped appearance and due consideration has been given the scale, siting and design of development in order to minimise the visual impact of development on the wider landscape. The original plans showed bungalows placed next to the northern boundary on this sloping site to reduce visual impact on the landscape. These have been removed from the scheme and further houses have been added on the adjacent cul-de-sac next to it (which originally was to be removed from the development). However, the houses on the north side of the distributor road in the far east part of the site, where the land steepens towards the north, have been removed and this reduced the visual impact when viewed from the lane to the east and overall the landscape impact would not be worsened by those changes. The boundary hedge along Tenford Lane is to be improved and would provide better screening. No development would be immediately visible from the access off Tenford Lane as the public open space would be placed in the part of the site where this is located. The amended plans show that all dwellings would address the proposed roads. Whilst it would also be desirable to have dwellings facing Tenford Lane and provide an active frontage to it, this is not possible due to the agreed road layout at outline stage and the desire to maintain the roadside hedge and trees.

7.8 With regard to landscaping, the public open space and orchard meadows and other green spaces provided would contribute positively to the appearance of the development. None of the valuable and healthy trees which contribute positively to the appearance of the site would be removed and the siting of proposed buildings would not interfere with their root systems or crown spreads. There is one tree proposed to be removed ('T4541') but this is deemed to be in poor health/decayed. Further tree planting would be provided in the shared open spaces and less formal planting in the gardens. The boundary treatments would comprise hedges to separate the plots from the shared open spaces (and also between the large gap separating plots 38 and 39) and fields to the north as appropriate and simple post-and-rail fencing to separate the public open space from the open countryside to the north and also a new native hedge along the north boundary. Elsewhere within the site, timber fences separated by brick piers on those boundaries visible from the streets to separate plots from grass road verges would be an improvement on 100% timber fences. These would be restricted to side or rear boundaries separating plots where they are not seen from the road or open spaces. Fencing would be placed along the inner edge of the Tenford Lane hedgerow to help protect it and due to its height and design, this would not be prominent from the road. The hedge would be retained and enhanced.

7.9. The Tree Officer raised concern over the positions of three of the proposed soakaway grids due to their impact on tree roots but these have been removed from the final amended plans. Whilst the houses are not considered to lead to direct harm to tree roots, some of the houses were considered to be close enough to lead to pressure by occupants to cut them back or remove them to allow more light and a better outlook. The final amendments show the repositioning of a number of houses, particularly those on the south side of the distributor road close to the Tenford Lane hedge and tree line, pushed closer to the distributor road and away from the lane and the Tree Officer is satisfied with this. The final amended plans take account of

the final comments of the Tree Officer e.g. hedges have been added to some of the plot boundaries.

7.10 A 3.0m high acoustic fence was formerly proposed on the west boundary to reduce noise from the adjacent dog kennels. However, as this no longer operates, there is no need for the fence and although “landscaped bund/acoustic fence” is annotated on the landscaping drawings, it is considered that solely soft landscaping should form this boundary in the interests of the appearance of the development.

7.11 Overall, it is considered that the scale, siting, design/appearance and landscaping of the development would respect the character and appearance of the area and would comply with Policy DC1.

The Impact on Residential Amenity

7.12 Local Plan policy DC1 and paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF (2021) seek to secure development that protects amenity, including residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping.

7.13 Policy H1 of the Local Plan (2020) seeks to ensure that all new dwellings must be of sufficient size to provide satisfactory levels of amenity for future occupiers of the dwellings whilst respecting the privacy and amenity of occupiers of existing dwellings; and that all new dwellings should aim to provide flexible accommodation which is capable of future adaptation by seeking to achieve adequate internal space for the intended number of occupants in accordance with the Nationally Described Space Standards.

7.14 The Space About Dwellings SPG outlines separation distances between dwellings, both proposed and existing, and details the minimum garden size for dwellings in order to provide a sufficient level of private amenity space.

Amenity of Existing Residents

7.15 The SPG requires minimum distances of 24.4 metres between rear elevations of houses and facing principal windows of other houses in the case of one of the houses being a 2-bed property (this is reduced to 22.0m in the case of both houses having three or more bedrooms). Minimum distances of at least 30 metres have been achieved between the rear elevations of all of the proposed houses to the south of the distributor road and the front elevations of the existing houses on the south side of Tenford Lane, well in excess of the standards. Although the proposed houses would be built on land which slopes upwards from the lane, the ground next to the south boundary is not higher to the extent that a harmful level of overlooking from the upper rear windows would result to the detriment of the level of privacy enjoyed by the existing Tenford Lane residents. The separation distances are such that there would be no significant light loss to Tenford Lane properties as a result of the new houses which would in any case be placed to the north of the Tenford Lane houses with no scope for blocking light.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

7.16 The SPG requires minimum distances of 22.0m between opposing front elevations. This has been achieved for all proposed dwellings in the amended layout plans and there is therefore no concern over privacy levels for the new residents.

7.17 Although rows of dwellings would be placed in a slightly staggered formation to avoid too much of a uniform appearance of development, the 45 degree lines measured from main windows at the front and rear of the proposed houses would not be broken by neighbouring development and this is sufficient to allow adequate light into those new houses. This accords with the SPG.

7.18 With regard to private amenity space (in this case, rear gardens), the SPG requires mean lengths of 11.0 metres and minimum overall garden sizes of 65 sq.m, or 85 sq.m in the case of the 2-bed units. All of the rear gardens would exceed the size threshold. Two of the gardens (Plots 7 and 8) would not reach mean lengths of 11.0 metres but are sufficiently wide to compensate for this. Overall, it is considered that each dwelling would have sufficient private garden space in the interests of the residential amenities of the residents.

7.19 All of the dwellings would meet the standards for internal space provided in accordance with the governments Nationally Described Space Standards and would therefore allow the future occupants satisfactory living conditions.

7.20 At the outline stage, Environmental Health raised the concern over noise from the adjacent kennels to the west of the site affecting proposed dwellings on the cul-de-sac immediately to the other side of the public open space. The plans submitted with this application had removed this cul-de-sac at one stage. However, the kennels has now closed down. The cul-de-sac has been re-introduced into the plans with dwellings but due to the kennels no longer existing, the residential amenities of those dwellings next to the public open space would not be affected.

7.21 Overall, it is considered the scale, siting/layout and design of the development would not harm the existing or future residential amenities of the area and would comply with Policy DC1.

Details Submitted to Comply with the Planning Conditions Attached to the Outline Planning Permission.

7.22 Although the Reserved Matters planning application deals solely deals with matters relating to the scale, siting, appearance and landscaping of development, further details have been submitted with this application to tackle some of the conditions attached to the outline planning permission which require further information to be submitted to the Council for approval before works commence.

7.23 Condition 13 of the outline permission requires details of a surface water drainage scheme and a Sustainable Drainage (SuDs) system to be submitted for approval at the Reserved Matters stage. Furthermore, three "infiltration basins" and two swales have been added to the development in the open west part of the site to deal with water run-off from this considerably sloping site and that these therefore affect the "layout" of development and this aspect would therefore need to be determined at this Reserved Matters stage. The details originally submitted were

deemed by the local flood authority (Staffs County Council) to be insufficient. An amended drainage scheme has been submitted in February 2022 and again in October 2022. SCC Flood Team has been consulted and have constantly throughout the course of the determination of the application asked for amendments and further specific information to be satisfied that the sustainable drainage strategy achieves its purpose of avoiding or exacerbating localised flooding on Tenford Lane, adjacent properties and the wider area in general. In January 2023, on the basis of the further information requested from the agents, which included proposed ground and floor levels of the dwellings, cross sectional drawings, a Ground Investigation report, flow calculations, exceedance measures, and specific design details of the drains, basins and swales, SCC Local Flood Authority removed their earlier objections on the basis of insufficient information and consider the drainage scheme to be acceptable.

7.24 The two basins closest to Tenford Lane have been modified to avoid harm to the hedgerows.

7.25 Condition 17 of the outline permission required a 'Landscape and Habitat Enhancement & Management Plan' (LHEMP) to be submitted with the Reserved Matters application and this was submitted with the application. Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (SWT) and the Council's Trees and Landscape Officer were consulted on this and approve of the Plan which includes different planted areas within the open space including a wildflower area. SWT considers that a Net Biodiversity Gain would be achieved via the planting and landscaping scheme and habitat measures. Condition 17 requires the LHEMP submitted at Reserved Matters stage to include species survey reports (for bats, amphibians, badgers, reptiles and newts) and these have been submitted and SWT approves of them. However, these reports recommend Method Statements outlining the works to protect the species from the construction phase. For bats, this is a problem as a bat survey would need to be undertaken before the proposed removal of "Tree 55" to establish what protection methods need to be agreed and this can only be undertaken no more than 48 hours prior to felling and if no bats are present a soft fell can be undertaken following a precautionary method statement. Condition 17 requires the complete LHEMP (which includes bat surveys of trees) to be fully approved at the Reserved Matters application stage. The solution to this problem is to vary outline condition 17 to require the bats in trees survey to be undertaken and a method statement for the tree removal to be agreed before the commencement of the development rather than at Reserved Matters stage. SWT have verbally agreed to this practical approach and a planning application has been submitted to vary the condition accordingly (ref: SMD/2023/0046) and SWT has been formally consulted.

Other Points

7.26 The design of the proposed roads and cul-de-sacs is acceptable to the local highways authority (SCC) and in line with the highways conditions imposed onto the outline planning permission although they point out that the cul-de-sacs, due to their width may not be adoptable by the authority. The parking areas/driveways and garages sizes for each plot are in accordance with the Council's parking standards which require two off-site spaces for each 2 or 3-bed unit and three spaces for the 4-bed units.

7.27 A large number of objection letters were again received from local residents and most of the points raised related to matters decided at the outline planning application stage and hence have not been addressed in this report. With regard to the points raised in relation to the specific scale, layout, design/appearance and landscaping of development, these points have been largely addressed in Section 7 of this report. As well as traffic and highways issues, determined at the outline stage, drainage and the impact on flood risk is another main concern to local residents. However a sustainable drainage strategy involving swales and basins (which would not harm the appearance of the proposed public open space), the design of which has been approved by SCC Local Flood Authority, would deal with the issue of water run-off.

Planning Balance & Conclusions

7.28 The scale, siting/layout, design/appearance and landscaping of the development as shown on amended plans is acceptable in terms of the impact on the visual and residential amenities of the area and there is no conflict with the outline permission and the planning conditions attached to it, or the Section 106 Agreement. The Reserved Matters application, as amended, is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions attached to any Reserved Matters approval as below.

8. RECOMMENDATION

A. That planning permission be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted including the landscaping of the site shall be carried out in accordance with the following amended approved plans:

- AL(0)22H
- AL(0)14D
- AL(0)16A
- AL(0)17 Site Plan Revision J
- AW0127 PL002
- AL(0)10B
- AL(0)11B
- AL(0)19B
- AL(0)24B
- AL(0)25A
- K22 001 002 Drainage Strategy Revision H
- K22 001 001C
- K22 001 003C
- K22 001 004D
- K22 001 005A
- K22 001 006E
- K22 001 019
- Basin 1 received 6.1.23

- Basin 2 received 6.1.23
- Southern Boundary Grips drawing received 6.1.23
- LDS517(B) LS Landscaping Scheme
- LDS51701B Landscaping Scheme
- LDS51702B Landscaping Scheme
- 00438 Materials Schedule Rev A with the use of Forterra Heather Multi and Rannoch Red Multi bricks.

2. The landscaping of the site shall be undertaken before any part of the development is brought into use and in accordance with the written specifications of the plants including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment, schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities and also implementation timetables to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason:-

To ensure the appropriate landscape design and in the interests of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

3. The planting scheme shown on Landscape Design Solutions (NW) Ltd Planting Plan 1 of 2 and 2 of 2, Drgs. Nos. LDS517-01B & 02B and Landscape Specification LDS517-LS 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 the appropriate landscape design and in the interests of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no further development as specified in Part 1 Class(es) AA,A, B, C, D, E and F or Part 2 Classes A to C shall be undertaken without express planning permission first being obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development and so safeguard the character and visual amenities of the area and to protect the residential amenities of neighbouring residents.

5. The development hereby permitted shall not proceed above the damp proof course until details of types and colours of all hardsurfacing materials including those of the proposed paths for the shared open spaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:-

In the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

6. Before the development is first brought into use, seating benches and signage for the public open space hereby approved shall be installed in accordance with the with siting and elevation drawings and details of finishing materials to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of the amenity value and appearance of the public open space.

7. The boundary fences, hedges and walls hereby approved shall be installed in accordance with the approved drawings in Condition 1 including fencing along the southern boundary of the site to the north side of the existing hedgerow alongside Tenford Lane before any part of the development is brought into use. The bricks used in the boundaries shall match those of the dwellinghouses approved on site.

Reason:-

In the interests of tree and hedge protection and the overall appearance of the development.

8. The development hereby permitted shall not proceed above the damp proof course until details of which of the facing bricks approved in Condition 1 will be used for each plot and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:-

In the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

9. Notwithstanding the details in the drawings listed in Condition 1, all new boundary hedgerows and trees adjacent to the access road shall be provided in accordance with revised details of species and species mix to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

10. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Staffordshire SuDS Handbook and the approved Drainage Strategy Document (Strategic Drainage Plan, K22-001-002 Rev H, Keytech Development Design Ltd, 25/01/2023) and the following mitigation measures detailed the strategy:

A. An infiltration-based solution for surface water drainage containing the 1 in 100yr + 40% event within the drainage network.

B.-Provision of 3 infiltration basins on the site to a 1 in 1000year standard. With minimum storage volumes of:

Basin 1: 491.5m³

Basin 2: 652.2m³

Basin 3: 602.1m³

C.Provision of landscaping to provide erosion control in infiltration basins and swales as per document LDS517-01 (Rev B), Planting Plan 1 of 2, Landscape Design Solutions (NW) Ltd, 05/01/2023.

D. Provision of bunds around all 3 infiltration basins (to provide extra storage volume) at least 200mm above the top of bank levels of each basin shown in the approved drainage plan.

E. Provision of swales prior to discharge into Infiltration Basins 1 and 2 and a catch pit prior to discharge into Basin 3.

F. A minimum of 2 levels of water treatment for highway drainage.

G. Provision of an amount and configuration of permeable paving either the same as, or demonstrating betterment, in area and water quality treatment than the provision in the approved drawing.

H. Finished Floor Levels to be at least 150mm above surrounding ground levels.

I. Provision of a cut-off drain along the southern boundary of the site to capture residual runoff.

J. Exceedance flows to be managed using ground profiling as outlined in *Flood Exceedance Plan, K22-001-006 Rev E, Keytech Development Design Ltd, 25/01/2023* with all ground slopes being profiled away from property entrances.

Reason:-

To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site. To improve and protect water quality.

11. Prior to the occupation of the development the following shall be incorporated into the development as approved under Condition 10 and in accordance with details to be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

Provision of a finalised management and maintenance plan to ensure continued performance of the system for the lifetime of the development. Details of the maintenance arrangements should be provided, to include a schedule of activities with frequencies, together with the name and contact details of the party or parties responsible for ongoing maintenance and construction phase maintenance strategy. This should include permeable paving.

The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason:-

To ensure the long-term management and maintenance of the SuDS infrastructure.

12. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the parking and turning areas for each individual plot have been provided in accordance with the approved plans 00438 AL(0)17 J. The parking and turning areas shall thereafter be retained unobstructed as parking and turning areas for the life of the development.

Reason:-

In the interests of highway safety.

13. No individual plot on the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until the access to that individual plot has been completed.

Reason:-

In the interests of highway safety.

14. Prior to first occupation of any permitted new dwelling the parking area and turning area for that dwelling shall be surfaced in a bound and porous material for a minimum distance of 5m rear of the highway boundary, which shall thereafter be retained for the life of the development.

Reason:-

In the interests of highway safety.

15. Garages shall be minimum internal dimensions of 3m x 6m in accordance with the approved drawings and shall be retained for the parking of cars and bicycles and shall not be converted to living accommodation without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of highway safety.

16. Any driveway/parking area of any plot which falls towards the highway shall be constructed with a drainage interceptor sited immediately rear of the highway boundary, with outfall to SUDS or surface water drainage system.

Reason:-

In the interests of highway safety.

17. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until details of the 2.4mx20m visibility splays at internal junctions have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The visibility splays shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions to visibility over a height of 600 mm above the adjacent carriageway level and be provided in accordance with the approved plan prior to the development being brought into use.

Reason:-

In the interests of highway safety.

18. The first action on commencement of development, prior to any further action (including any site clearance, site stripping, site establishment or formation/improvement of temporary/permanent access) shall be the erection of temporary tree protection barriers and advisory notices for the protection of the existing trees and hedges to be retained, in accordance with guidance in British Standard 5837:2012 *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations*, and as set out in the Braemar Arboriculture Ltd “BS5837 Tree Report” reference BALDS019-21 Rev B dated 14th July 2021 submitted in support of the application hereby approved, and these shall be retained in position for the duration of the period that development takes place, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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 Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of the appearance of the site.

Informatives

1. Developer to ensure that satisfactory arrangements for the control of surface water are in place as part of any temporary works associated with the permanent development, to ensure that flood risk is not increased, and water quality is managed prior to the completion of the approved drainage strategy.

2. Whilst the proposals are deemed to achieve a Net Biodiversity Gain, SWT recommends that all or parts of the eastern open space area be seeded with a wildflower mix instead of the Germinal Seeds A19 mix as this would provide a net gain closer to 10% which would be good ecology practice.

3. The works required for the proposed internal road network which are to be proposed for highway adoption require approval under Section 7 of the Staffordshire Act 1983 and will require a Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. Please see <https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/Highways/highwayscontrol/HighwaysWorkAgreements.aspx> and contact Staffordshire County Council at road.adoptions@staffordshire.gov.uk to ensure that approvals and exemptions are secured before commencement of works. Due to carriageway widths, the internal roads may not be suitable for adoption (see notes below) In which case exemption under S219 Highways Act 1980 will be required. This estate road and drainage layout will require approval under Section 7 of the Staffordshire Act 1983 and will require an agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 if it is to be adopted as 'highway maintainable at public expense'. There are detailed issues that need to be approved in order to achieve technical approval under that process and the developer should be advised to contact Staffordshire County Council to ensure that approvals and agreements are secured before commencement of works. The obtaining of planning permission for this design/layout will not be considered as a reason to relax the required technical standards for the adoption of the road and drainage and any changes may necessitate the submission of further planning applications. If the road is to be private then the residents should be advised that they may be taking on the responsibilities and liabilities of the highway authority with regards to maintenance, snow clearance etc and are advised to take advice on public liability insurance against claims associated with those responsibilities.

4. Informative to advise of Crime Prevention Design Advice measures as provided by Staffs Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor in its consultation response.

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.

