

**BIDDULPH TOWN COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 11 APRIL 2017**

The Chair opened the meeting and read the following statement:

“Please be aware that meetings open to the public may be recorded by representatives of the media or by members of the public. Biddulph Town Council has produced a guidance document for the recording of public Council meetings that is available on the Council’s website.

Any persons intending to record this meeting are:

1. Requested not to film the public seating area and to respect the wishes of members of the public who have come to speak at a meeting but do not wish to be filmed; and
2. Reminded that it is not permitted for oral commentary to be provided during a meeting.

As Chair I may ask people to stop recording and leave the meeting if they act in a disruptive manner.”

The meeting was filmed by a member of the public.

PRESENT

Deputy Mayor - Councillor Wood
Councillor Baddeley
Councillor Court
Councillor Davies
Councillor Hawley
Councillor Jones
Councillor Lawson
Councillor McGuinness
Councillor Nicosia
Councillor Rogers
Councillor Swift
Councillor Whilding

73.16 APOLOGIES

The Mayor - Councillor Salt
Councillor Rushton
Councillor Harper

74 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

a Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Dispensations: None

b Other Interests:

SMD/2017/0129 - Councillor Jones, one of the objectors is a friend; he won't vote.
Councillor Court had been working closely with one of the objectors on the Neighbourhood Plan and wouldn't vote.
Councillor Hawley had been working closely with one of the objectors on the Neighbourhood Plan and wouldn't vote or Chair this item.

Councillor Nicosia had also been working on the Neighbourhood Plan.

SMD/2017/0166 – Councillor Jones’ wife works at Sainsburys; he will vote.

SMD/2017/0182 - Councillor Jones knows the applicant.

Councillor Davies stated that he was a member of the SMDC Planning Committee and as such he had a listening role at this meeting.

75 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2017 were **Approved** and signed as a true record.

76. BIDDULPH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- a) A copy of the Notes from the meeting held on 8 March 2017 was tabled; a verbal update had been given previously.

Councillor Hawley read aloud the following resolutions:

- b) To **resolve** that the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group should apply for the maximum grant from the Locality Fund to contribute to the cost of consultancy support:
- Consideration of a questionnaire, before distribution
 - Analysis of returned questionnaires to identify key themes
 - Support to develop policies that reflect the findings from the consultation and emerging evidence base
 - Support with the process of consulting on and adopting a Neighbourhood Plan.
- c) To **resolve** that the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group begins the process of seeking a suitably qualified and experienced consultant. The Chief Officer will oversee a competitive tender process in line with the Procurement Policy, seeking a minimum of three quotations.

There was a vote and all agreed to support the resolutions.

77. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SMD/2017/0129	Hurst Quarry Hurst Road	Outline planning application with all matters reserved (except access) for residential development (up to 28 dwellings) resubmission of SMD/2016/0127
---------------	----------------------------	---

This item was brought to the start of the agenda as there were a number of members of public in attendance.

Councillor Hawley stood down as Chair for this item and Councillor Wood (Deputy Mayor) Chaired this discussion.

Jerry Knights (Poolfold Residents Association) wished to address the Committee. Mr Knights confirmed that he had no objection to being filmed. Councillor Wood explained that in order for Mr Knights to speak, Standing Orders would need to be suspended. There was a vote and all agreed that this was appropriate.

A copy of Mr Knights' address is included below:

In July 2016 The Poolfold Residents' Group made representation on this application, and we'd like to do so again now. I have our written submission here, and I'll briefly address the key points.

Fundamentally, despite the large array of documents presented with this revised application, nothing has changed, and our 4 main objections remain as follows:

- 1 The proposed development is not in a sustainable location.
- 2 It would adversely affect openness and would be highly visible from all round the site.
- 3 The site is a rural location where development is only permitted to meet essential local need, of which there is none.
- 4 And last, there would be a substantial increase in daily vehicle movements.

These will form the keystones of our representation once again, and they were also the basis on which you rejected the application last July.

The new application has 43 attachments, and we have not yet addressed every issue, but The Poolfold Residents do feel that we are in a position to make representation now in the following 4 areas:

1. Sustainability, particularly regarding the reliance on the private car and how it is proposed to mitigate its use.
2. The Impact on wildlife, in particular badgers and bats.
3. The Flood Risk.
4. And the fact that this is only an "Outline Planning Application".

It is also noted that, as of today, the majority of the District Council's consultees have so far failed to respond to the new application. We keenly await the opportunity to review their inputs hopefully before the SMDC Planning Committee Meeting.

Sustainability

In the Highways Technical Note 3 document the applicant suggests that walking is a realistic and healthy option to using private cars and that, for example, children would walk the cross country public rights of way to Woodhouse Middle School and to Moor First School. However, the supporting Department for Education's Statutory Guidance of July 2014 has the further requirement that the route should be safe. We contest that the length and isolation of the route would still leave children at risk of harm from predatory individuals, and from accidents due to the absence of lighting, the effects of weather on the terrain and the unmade nature of the footpath fabric. Their parents would simply use their private car.

Likewise, contrary to the applicant's suggestion, using the nearby cycle network as the route to the local schools would prove impractical through steep hills as well as the requirement to leave the cycle route for the main A527 section of the journey. Indeed, to suggest that the elderly or mothers with young children would use this route to complete their shopping in the town centre is completely naïve. The new occupants would simply use their private cars.

Impact on Wildlife

The applicants bat survey identified 7 different species within the site including Natterers, Myotis and Brown long-eared bat. Two of these species have an adverse reaction to both light and artificial light. They have proposed downward facing LED street lights in mitigation. However, Staffordshire Police's "Multi Agency Burglary Dwelling Reduction Tactics" initiative recommends well-lit security lighting on domestic properties. Clearly, the application proposal would fly in the face of police advice. The current bat survey is incomplete because it did not investigate roosting

in the site's derelict buildings due to safety issues. It would be an offence to kill, injure or disturb any of these bats or to destroy any place that they use for rest or shelter.

The applicant's Badger survey records 3 live badger setts and 3 latrines, and states the use of heavy machinery is restricted to within 20m of the sett entrances. It is difficult to understand how, given the extensive amount of grading work that would be required to the quarry sides and floor, moving the 69,058 cubic metres of substrate anticipated in the "Indicative Remediation Contours Plan" document, would be achieved. That is a weight of between 88,000 and 121,500 tonnes depending on the nature of the sand. Indeed, this whole area is an interrelated jigsaw of badger setts and highways so, again the survey appears both incomplete and inadequate to meet the provisions of the *Protection of Badgers Act, 1992*.

Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy Document

The flood risk assessment has been carried out on an incorrect number of proposed houses, so the dwelling locations relevant to each other are therefore flawed. Every one of the mitigation options has been ticked on the Planning Application form, and yet there is no explanation of how it is proposed to develop these regimes.

Outline Planning Permission

A number of the applicant's reports admit that they do not provide an adequate assessment because there is insufficient information and detail in what is only an outline planning application. We agree. Furthermore, the application remains deficient in that it provides nothing to mitigate our previous objections as I detailed earlier.

In conclusion

In addition to our original objections that you supported in July last year, this new application goes no further to mitigate the site's sustainability particularly regarding children travelling to school. The development would still have an adverse impact on wildlife and the new flood risk assessment is fundamentally flawed.

Therefore, the Poolfold Residents' Group once again **OBJECTS** to the planning application for the erection of 28 dwellings at the Hurst Quarry.

Councillor Rogers felt that this was a desirable development, but it was not brown field and therefore should not be developed. It is not appropriate for this area.

Councillor Jones stated that Mr Knights had made good points. To suggest that children should walk up Spout Bank to go to school was 'a joke'. Now that the quarrying has finished, this should be returned to its original state, as had previously been agreed. This development is in the wrong place.

Councillor Lawson felt that this had been discussed in detail last year, and noted that this had been a sand quarry and 'wise men don't build their houses on the sand'. The access road is only suitable for sheep and cattle. This is a nice hamlet and development would spoil it.

Councillor Whilding proposed that the Town Council should **reject** this planning application; this was seconded by Councillor Lawson. There was a vote; all were in favour. Councillors Davies, Jones, Court and Hawley abstained.

Councillor Hawley took back the Chair and Standing Orders were resumed. Members of the public left the meeting.

SMD/2016/0649	Brook Works Brook Street	Outline planning application with some matters reserved (except access And layout) for proposed residential development and creation of new vehicular access
---------------	-----------------------------	--

There was a discussion about access and the fact that this was brownfield site. Councillor Jones noted that this did not seem like over-development.

No adverse comments

SMD/2017/0065	Top of the Trent Woodland Street	Demolition of public house and redevelopment of the site to provide 14 dwellings comprising 6 semi-detached 3 bedroomed dwellings and 2 detached 4 bedroomed dwellings and associated works
---------------	-------------------------------------	---

Councillors noted that the previous rejection of this site had been before the demolition of the pub had been a factor. Councillor Hawley stated that this now seemed to be a big plot. Councillor Wood felt that there was a significant risk of leaving a pub derelict.

No adverse comments

DET/2017/0008	Top of the Trent Woodland Street	Demolition of public house prior to redevelopment of the site
---------------	-------------------------------------	---

It was agreed that Planning Officer should determine this application.

SMD/2017/0118	Slang Farm Top Road	Removal variation of condition 2 SMD/2013/0956 (repositioning of ménage)
---------------	------------------------	--

No adverse comments

SMD/2017/0166	Sainsbury's Wharf Road	Installation of one internally illuminated fascia sign
---------------	---------------------------	--

Councillor Lawson recommended approval; this was seconded by Councillor Whilding. There was a vote and all agreed there should be **no adverse comments**. Councillors Nicosia, Rogers and Court abstained; Councillor Baddeley voted against.

SMD/2017/0182 455 New Street Demolition of existing attached garage to provide a two storey side extension to existing dwelling

Councillor Jones noted that this was 'plan B' in relation to development of this site, and noted that it doesn't overlook any other sites.

No adverse comments

SMD/2017/0185 Bentley House
Newtown Road Proposed 2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension, demolition of existing garage

No adverse comments

SMD/2017/0193 25 Tunstall Road Proposed conversion of a 3 bedroom terraced property to 2 one bedroom self-contained flats

Subject to no valid neighbour objections

SMD/2017/0201 Moorlands Court
Wells Close Proposed change of use and alterations to Scheme Manager's House to create a mobility scooter store at the ground floor level and a self-contained one bedroom flat at first floor level

Subject to no valid neighbour objections

SMD/2017/0215 3a Lyneside Road Proposed rear extension, alterations to existing roof, canopy to front entrance and internal alterations

Subject to no valid neighbour objections

78. DECISIONS AND NOTICES RECEIVED FROM THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

No decisions on website. This was noted.

79. APPEAL

SMD/2017/0668 2 Potters End Erection of detached dwelling and new vehicular access

Town Council Decision – RECOMMEND REFUSAL

This was noted.

The meeting closed at 7.10 pm

Signature

Date