

## **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 18 FEBRUARY 2020**

### **PRESENT**

Councillor Davies  
Councillor Garvey  
Councillor Hawley  
Councillor Jones  
Councillor McLoughlin  
Councillor Perkin  
Councillor Rogers  
Councillor Rushton  
Councillor Salt  
Councillor Smith  
Councillor Swift

Councillor Harper was also in attendance.

### **50. APOLOGIES**

Councillor Adams  
Councillor Redfern

### **51. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- a) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Dispensations: Councillor Jones is a member of the Biddulph Moor Village Hall Management Committee.
- b) Other Interests: Councillor Hawley's wife is a volunteer at the National Trust and he has an involvement with the Biddulph Moor Village Hall. Councillors Hawley, Jones, Davies, Rogers, Harper and Smith know the applicant at Coates Farm. Councillors Harper, Davies, Garvey, Swift and Smith are members of the National Trust. Councillor Smith knows the applicant on Well Lane.

### **52. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 21 January 2020 were signed.

### **53. BIDDULPH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

A verbal update on progress with the Neighbourhood Plan and Neighbourhood Development Order was received.

Councillor Hawley noted that formatting changes were being made and the hope was that this document would be submitted for Regulation 16 consultation soon.

Councillor Hawley noted that he, the Mayor and Chief Officer had represented the Town Council at the recent meetings with the Planning Inspector in relation to the Local Plan. It was not possible to tell what the outcome would be, but it was important to attend, to 'wave the flag' for Biddulph.

The Chief Officer noted that there had been some interesting caselaw regarding the relationship between Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans; the Town Council should press-on with this.

**54. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON UPLANDS MILL DEVELOPMENTS (STANDING ITEM)**

Councillor Garvey updated members that it appeared progress had been made; he would send the list of works to the Chief Officer. Road and footpaths had been re-surfaces; drainage would be considered this week. Bovis would then move on to the snagging list. The compound had now been cleared and the area re-seeded; areas would be re-planted and landscaping completed.

Councillor Garvey queried whether Councillors had a preference about the ranch fencing. Councillor Hawley noted that the District Council Planning Department would probably have a view on this. Councillor Garvey noted that the balancing pond was currently very full.

Councillor Jones felt that Councillor Garvey had done a 'cracking job'.

Councillor Garvey felt that access roads were still an issue; it was now a rat-run. Bollards could be considered to prevent usage; he would consult with residents. Councillor Salt wondered whether this might be important access for the emergency services. Councillor Garvey noted that this was meant to be a paved area on the initial plans.

Councillor McLoughlin agreed; this was never designed to be a through-route.

Councillor Davies stated that Councillor Garvey had done a tremendous job; he proposed that Councillor Garvey contact the Planning Officer for advice. A softer scheme could be developed with trees instead of bollards.

Councillor Hawley thanked Councillor Garvey for his work to-date.

**55. TO CONSIDER AND PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE SECTION 53 APPLICATION TO ADD A BRIDLEWAY FROM WEDGEWOOD LANE TO HILL LANE, GILLOW HEATH.**

***Please note,** the covering letter and report are attached to this agenda. There is a significant amount of evidence accompanying this application, which is available to view at the Town Council offices.*

Councillor Hawley noted that there were 24 members of the public that supported this proposal; there appears to be no challenge. Staffordshire County Council consider that the use is sufficient. Councillor Hawley recommended approval.

Councillor Rogers agreed; there are no adverse comments. This has been a bridleway for as long as he can remember.

Councillor Jones agreed; there appear to be no neighbour objections.

All agreed to recommend that this application is accepted.

## 56. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

**Councillor Hawley summarised each application prior to discussion.**

SMD/2020/0004	Biddulph Grange NT	Proposed installation of glass safety guarding to existing Bandstand area
<b>No adverse comments.</b>		
SMD/2020/0011	32 Well Lane	Demolition of conservatory and erection of rear/side single storey extension
<b>Approved subject to no valid neighbour planning concerns.</b>		
SMD/2020/0030	9 Moor Close	Proposed loft conversion to create two first floor bedrooms and bathroom
Councillor Hawley noted that there is a precedent of this type of conversion.		
<b>Approved subject to no valid neighbour planning concerns.</b>		
SMD/2020/0052	Coates Farm School Lane	Proposed erection of general-purpose agricultural building
Councillor Hawley noted that this is a re-submission. The Town Council refused this last time. The application had been re-submitted with a new statement.		
Councillor Jones noted that this is not a farm; the District Council should address this issue.		
<b>It was agreed that Biddulph Town Council has no further comment to make.</b> This will be referred back to the District Council.		
SMD/2020/0073	Biddulph Moor Village Hall	Proposed two storage units replacing portal cabin
Councillor Harper noted that this was an improvement.		
Councillor Jones felt this would match existing containers on the site.		
<b>No adverse comments.</b>		

## APPEAL

SMD/2019/0467/A 138 Congleton Road outline permission for erection of a single dwelling

**It was agreed that Biddulph Town Council has no further comment to make.**

## 57. DECISIONS AND NOTICES RECEIVED FROM THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

		<b>SMDC Decision</b>	<b>Town Council Decision</b>
SMD/2019/0595	13 Rudyard Road	Approved	Recommend approval, subject to valid neighbour planning concerns
SMD/2019/0674	71 High Street	Approved	No adverse comments
SMD/2019/0705	Land at Baileys Bank	Refused The proposed building would be materially larger than the stables which it would replace and by virtue of its form, height and massing, would therefore have a harmful impact on the openness of the Green Belt	No adverse comments, subject to no contravention of Greenbelt policy
SMD/2019/0696	7 Gilbern Drive	Refused The proposed extension, by virtue of its size, scale and design would result in an extension which would unbalance the existing semi-detached dwellings and have a dominate and adverse impact on the visual character of the street scene.	Approved, subject to any valid neighbour planning concerns
SMD/2019/0674	71 High Street	Approved	No adverse comments
SMD/2019/0740	7 Woodhouse Lane	Approved	No adverse comments
SMD/2019/0729	13 Woodhouse Lane	Approved	Approved, subject to any valid neighbour planning concerns
SMD/2019/0750	14 York Close	Approved	Approved, subject to any valid neighbour planning concerns

These decisions were received.

Councillor McLoughlin noted that there appeared to be a number of applications that were contravening the Green Belt.

There was a discussion about whether training was needed for Councillors and/ or Planning Officers when the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan were approved.

Councillor Rogers noted that Ben Haywood had offered training; the Chief Officer would investigate this.

Councillor Jones cautioned that Town Councillors can not be planning experts; we have local knowledge.

All were encouraged to read the NPPF.

The meeting closed at 6.28pm

Signature .....

Date .....