

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 23 JUNE 2020

PRESENT

- Councillor Jones - The Mayor
 - Councillor Rushton - The Deputy Mayor
 - Councillor Davies
 - Councillor Garvey
 - Councillor Hawley
 - Councillor McLoughlin
 - Councillor Perkin
 - Councillor Redfern
 - Councillor Rogers
 - Councillor Salt
 - Councillor Smith
 - Councillor Swift
 - Councillor Yates
-
- Councillor Sheldon was also in attendance.

1.20 ELECTION OF A CHAIR AND DEPUTY CHAIR

The Mayor called for nominations for the Election of a Chair. Councillor Rogers nominated Councillor Hawley; he would continue to steer the Committee in the right direction. Seconded by Councillor Rushton; there were no other nominations. Agreed.

Councillor Hawley called for nomination for the Election of a Deputy Chair. Councillor Hawley noted that the existing Deputy Chair was experiencing a period of ill-health. Councillor Rogers nominated Councillor Garvey; his work around the Bovis Homes development had been very important. Councillor Jones seconded this nomination.

Councillor Rushton nominated Councillor Yates; seconded by Councillor Smith.

There was a vote; Councillor Garvey was elected as Deputy Chair.

2. APOLOGIES

Councillor Adams

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- a) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Dispensations: None.
- b) Other Interests: Councillor Davies noted that he is a member of the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC) and speaks very little at these meetings. Councillor Davies endeavours to reflect Biddulph views at SMDC meetings. Councillor Jones knows the applicant in HNT/2020/0004 and is part of the Biddulph Moor Village Hall Committee. Councillor Hawley also knows the applicant in HNT/2020/0004. Councillor Garvey is a member of the National Trust and knows the applicant in DOC/2020/0050. The Chief Officer noted that she knows the applicant in SMD/2020/0276.

4. MINUTES AND APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS

To **sign** the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 18 February 2020 (received at Town Council meeting on 10 March 2020).

Councillor Hawley read the Minutes aloud and would sign these at the first opportunity.

To **approve** the recommendations that were made to Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, sent for feedback to Planning Committee members via email.

Councillor Hawley read the list of applications. There were no additional comments; the recommendations were approved.

MAY

| | | | Recommendation |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| DOC/2020/0041 | Hurst Bank Farm Hurst Road | Discharge of conditions 3 and 8 in relation to SMD/2019/0085 | The documents are provided with details. Leave it to the inspector to ensure they meet the requirements to discharge the conditions. |
| SMD/2020/0126 | 7 Gilbern Drive | Proposed first floor side and rear extension | No adverse comments, subject to any neighbours valid planning concerns. |

| | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| SMD/2020/0224 | Brooks Barn Hurst Road | Conversion of existing barn into 1 detached dwelling with associated outbuildings, access and parking | Concern re the outbuilding, contravening the greenbelt as it appears to be a new building. Recommend refusal on the grounds of environmental health concerns and contravention of greenbelt. |
| SMD/2020/0234 | 75 Woodhouse Lane | Proposed lean to roof over existing garage, porch to front elevation and proposed single storey rear extension | Recommend approval subject to any neighbours valid planning concerns. |
| SMD/2020/0250 | 36 Carriage Drive | Demolition of rear extension and chimney. Erection of new rear extension. New materials to existing walls and windows | No problems with extension but do have concerns with the rendering as it appears out of character with rest of properties in the area. Therefore recommend refusal. |

APRIL

| | | | Recommendation |
|----------------------|---|--|---|
| HNT/2020/0004 | Lask Edge Farm Lask Edge Road | Prior approval for single storey rear extension measuring 8 metres beyond the original dwelling house, 3 metres maximum height and 3 metres to height of eaves | Recommend approval, as long as is within permitted rights and doesn't contravene the greenbelt. |
| SMD/2020/0145 | Land Opposite 11 Sprink View Under the Hill | Outline permission with details of access (all other matters reserved) for the construction of 1 dwelling | Recommend refusal on grounds of access and congestion, it's not infill, it is greenbelt and there are no special considerations to approve. |
| SMD/2020/0162 | Land to rear of 33 Halls Road | Proposed bungalow in rear garden of 33 Halls Rd previously approved SMD/2012/0073 | Recommend approval subject to any neighbours valid planning concerns, UU access to sewer and conditions imposed in previous application. |
| SMD/2020/0164 | 21 Grange Road | Proposed one and a half storey entrance porch extension, proposed two storey side and rear extension to provide additional living accommodation | Recommend refusal on ground of taking light from No 19 and overdevelopment. |

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|---|
| | | and elevational alterations | |
| SMD/2020/0189 | Ladymoor Gate Farm Sands Lane | Demolish 3 bed detached house and construct 3 bed detached dwelling | Given condition of existing building recommend approval, subject to greenbelt compliance. |
| DOC/2020/0033 | Prize Buildings Tunstall Road | Erection of 7 new dwellings on former Prize Buildings site Discharge of conditions 4,6,7,10 and partial discharge of condition 15 of SMD/2014/0753 | These appear to be planning/building conditions and as such we suggest that the planners/building inspectors make the necessary decisions. |
| SMD/2020/0143 | Lask Edge Methodist Church Cowallmoor Lane Lask Edge | Upper floor extension to existing single storey rear extension, a ground floor single storey is proposed and insertion of window to master bedroom | There were concerns raised about the original plans from relatives of those in the graveyard. We recommend approval subject to any valid planning concerns from neighbours or affected relatives and that changes to graveyard entrance do not affect any of the existing graves. |

MARCH

| | | |
|--|--------------------|---|
| SMD/2020/0004 | Biddulph Grange NT | Proposed installation of glass safety guarding to existing bandstand area. |
| No adverse comments. | | |
| SMD/2020/0011 | 32 Well Lane | Demolition of conservatory and erection of rear/side single storey extension. |
| Approved subject to no valid neighbour planning concerns. | | |

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| SMD/2020/0030 | 9 Moor Close | Proposed loft conversion to create two first floor bedrooms and bathroom. |
| Approved subject to no valid neighbour planning concerns. | | |
| SMD/2020/0052 | Coates Farm School Lane | Proposed erection of general-purpose agricultural building. |
| It was agreed that Biddulph Town Council has no further comment to make. | | |
| SMD/2020/0073 | Biddulph Moor Village Hall | Proposed two storage units replacing portal cabin. |
| No adverse comments. | | |
| SMD/2019/0780 No adverse comments, subject to STWA conditions. | | |
| SMD/2020/0049 It's a brown field site and will help in the Local Plan numbers. There are some comments; perhaps it should be only 3-4 units because of potential parking issues and there is concern that what has become a right of way through the car park to the crossing will be taken away. Town Councillors will be sorry to see it go as a pub, but it is keeping the building in place and since it is not viable as a pub we would support the application. | | |
| SMD/2020/0077 No adverse comments. | | |
| SMD/2020/0080 No problems with this; it is to remove an out of date condition. | | |
| SMD/2020/0085 The extension is at the rear overlooking the road and a field. No adverse comments. | | |
| SMD/2020/0090 It's an end of terrace next to the fields using pretty much the same footprint as the conservatory and car port. No objection, but subject to any neighbours valid planning concerns. | | |
| SMD/2020/0100 This is not overlooking anyone. No objections, subject to any greenbelt constraints. | | |
| SMD/2020/0131 This is increasing tourism accommodation, but is in the greenbelt. No objection but subject to any greenbelt constraints. | | |
| SMD/2020/0135 This is a resubmission to meet a previously refused application. They have had pre-app advice and believe changes are acceptable in principle. We originally said this was acceptable, subject to any neighbours valid planning concerns; the same still applies. | | |
| SMD/2020/0136 This seems to be well out of the way, no problems for neighbours. The extension is out from the rear of the house and a new footprint. Recommend as long as it doesn't contravene the greenbelt. | | |

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

Councillor Garvey updated members that there had been relatively little progress due to the current situation. There had been a resolution to the issues around the balancing pond; a child proof fence was now in place, but the pond remained accessible for wildlife.

The Planning Department were considering the issue of installation of bollards. Bovis are working on the sewers and landscaping. Trees have been replaced. The management of the woodland area with neighbouring properties is an issue and is being investigated.

Councillor Yates queried whether the properties were leasehold or freehold.

Councillor Garvey confirmed that leases were in place, but residents were withholding fees.

There was discussion about the endpoint for this intervention. Councillor Garvey hoped that the adoption of the roads would happen soon.

6. JUNE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Councillor Hawley summarized each application before discussion about it.

| | | |
|--|------------------|--|
| SMD/2020/0139 | 48 Tunstall Road | Outline permission with all matters reserved for 6 over 50's cottages with communal garden and 7 parking spaces. |
| <p>Councillor Yates noted that this application was in his ward. Councillor Yates has spoken to residents, but has no interest in the application personally.</p> <p>Councillor Hawley highlighted objections that had been raised in relation to the application; there was a consistency with these objections.</p> <p>Councillor Yates felt that development within the town was positive. Accommodation for older people is needed within the community. Councillor Yates felt that there were too many properties at this location; there are seven parking spaces for six properties.</p> <p>Councillor Yates believed there was a history of coalmining in this area; access via Tunstall Road is an issue.</p> | | |

Councillor Jones agreed with the points raised by Councillor Yates; this is a compressed site. Councillor Jones believed Highways would raise concerns. Councillor Jones felt this was over-development.

Councillor Redfern agreed that this appears to be over-development.

Councillor Rogers noted that there were issues previously about unstable land in this area.

Councillor Smith was concerned that there is no privacy for accommodation; there is a higher elevation on Tunstall Road.

Councillor Garvey was concerned that an area of mature woodland might be lost with this development.

Councillor Davies noted that there are no Tree Preservation Orders in this area.

It was agreed that this application would be **refused on the grounds of over-development and access concerns.**

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| SMD/2020/0259 | 187 Congleton Road | Proposed single storey rear extension. |
| Approval subject to no neighbour valid planning concerns. | | |
| SMD/2020/0263 | 2 Stile Close | Removal of existing boundary fence and construction of new retaining wall to boundary. |
| No adverse comments. | | |
| SMD/2020/0289 | 16 Crossways | Single storey rear and side extension. |
| <p>Councillor Hawley was concerned that the whole house should not be rendered.</p> <p>Councillor Garvey had concerns about possible over-development.</p> <p>Councillor Jones was also concerned about render; this would spoil the aesthetic of the street.</p> <p>Recommend approval subject to no neighbour valid planning concerns and to raise concerns about the render finish.</p> <p>Councillor Garvey abstained from the vote.</p> | | |
| NMA/2020/0018 | Manfield House Church Lane | Non-material amendment to SMD/2018/0621 to retain the existing |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | house roof and fit a new hipped roof over the new side extension to marry into the existing house roof. |
| Recommend approval. | | |
| DOC/2020/0050 | Trent Head Farm Barrage Road | DOC 5,6,16 & 19 of SMD/2019/0253 |
| Councillor Hawley proposed that this issue is left to the Planners to decide. This was agreed. No adverse comments. | | |
| SMD/2020/0292 | Long Edge House Pines Lane, Biddulph Park | Change of use of garage to holiday let accommodation. |
| Members believed that tourist accommodation was necessary within the town. Councillor Hawley recommended approval. Recommend approval subject to not contravening Green Belt Policy. | | |
| SMD/2020/0282 | The Old Engine House, Biddulph Road Mow Cop | Proposed re-instatement of south eastern wing. Re-submission following approval under SMD/2019/0523 and SMD/2019/0524. |
| Councillor Hawley recommended approval subject to advice provided by the Conservation Officer. Councillor Jones felt the development was good; we should not put obstacles in the way. Councillor Redfern agreed. Councillor Garvey felt this was a sympathetic restoration. Recommend approval subject to feedback from the Conservation Officer. | | |
| SMD/2020/0276 | 8 Oxhey Drive | Side extension to replace ground floor footprint of the garage and utility to provide sufficient structure to support a first floor to form additional bedroom and ensuite bathroom. A rear single-story extension as a family room. |
| Councillor Hawley wondered whether there were issues with the 45 degree slay. Recommend approval subject to no neighbour valid planning concerns. | | |

7. DECISIONS AND NOTICES RECEIVED FROM THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

| | | SMDC Decision | Town Council Decision |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|
| SMD/2019/0024 | Land rear of 15 Thames drive and Adjacent To 3, Palmerston Way, Biddulph, Staffordshire, Proposed new detached house and garage | Planning permission - approved | It was agreed that this application should be approved, subject to consideration of ground conditions and the management of mine shafts. |
| SMD/2020/0085 | 3, Marsh Green Close, Biddulph, Staffordshire, ST8 6TA Proposed rear split level extension | Planning permission - refused | The extension is at the rear overlooking the road and a field. No adverse comments. |
| SMD/2019/0644 | Woodhead Farm, Top Road, Biddulph Moor, Staffordshire, ST8 7LF Proposed conversion of garage to dwelling | Planning permission - refused | No adverse comments, subject to greenbelt restrictions. |
| SMD/2019/0623 | Woodhead Farm, Top Road, Biddulph Moor, Staffordshire, ST8 7LF | Planning permission - approved | No adverse comments, but subject to Highways conditions and it does not contravene greenbelt policy. |

| | | SMDC Decision | Town Council Decision |
|----------------------|--|--|---|
| | Conversion of barn to three holiday lets | | |
| SMD/2020/0080 | Meadowstile Farm, Tower Hill Road, Brown Lees, Staffordshire, ST8 6PA | Application to Vary a Section a S106 Planning Obligation in relation to SMD/2002/0158 / 02/00551/FUL | No problems with this; it is to remove an out of date condition. |
| NMA/2020/0014 | Meadow View, Well Lane, Gillow Heath, Staffordshire, ST8 6QU Non material amendment to SMD/2019/04 25 for proposed first floor window to north-east elevation | Non material amendment - approved | No consultation opportunity. |
| SMD/2020/0135 | 151, Tunstall Road, Knypersley, Staffordshire, ST8 7AE Proposed side and rear extensions to dwelling | Planning permission - approved | This is a resubmission to meet a previously refused application. They have had pre-app advice and believe changes are acceptable in principle. We originally said this was acceptable, subject to any neighbours valid planning concerns; the same still applies. |
| SMD/2020/0100 | Smithy Farm, Dial Lane, | Planning permission - refused | This is not overlooking anyone. No |

| | | SMDC Decision | Town Council Decision |
|----------------------|--|---|---|
| | Congleton, Staffordshire, CW12 3QN Proposed two storey and single storey rear elevation extension and replacement front elevation porch. | | objections, subject to any greenbelt constraints. |
| SMD/2019/0176 | Lea Forge | Approved | No adverse comments, subject to Highways considerations. |
| SMD/2019/0523 | The Old Engine House | Approved | No adverse comments |
| SMD/2019/0524 | The Old Engine House | LBC Approved | No adverse comments |
| SMD/2019/0750 | 14 York Close | Approved | Approved, subject to any valid neighbour planning concerns. |
| SMD/2019/0770 | 26 Mow Lane | LBC Approved | Recommend approval |
| SMD/2019/0771 | Akesmore Lane | Refused. The precise nature of the applicant's, or anybody else's, outdoor sport or recreation has not been clearly explained to enable a proper assessment of 'appropriateness' relevant to that. In any event, the development would fail to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and would also | Approved, subject to a Coal Mining Authority risk assessment. |

| | | SMDC Decision | Town Council Decision |
|--|--|--|------------------------------|
| | | <p>exacerbate countryside encroachment because of its size, height and location to the south east of an existing building on, and consuming, an open area of riding ménage. This would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Permission cannot be granted for the inappropriate development because there are no 'very special circumstances'.</p> <p>The development of this open and prominent site would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would fail to protect or enhance the local landscape.</p> <p>The applicant was unable to address fundamental 'in principle' concerns and were ultimately not proposing development that</p> | |

| | | SMDC Decision | Town Council Decision |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| | | would be sustainable. | |
| SMD/2019/0762 | 1 Lawton Street | Approved | Refused on the grounds that there is a non-permeable surface, drainage issues have not been addressed and a dropped kerb will be necessary. |
| SMD/2020/0030 | 9 Moor Close | Application withdrawn | Approved, subject to no valid neighbour planning concerns. |
| SMD/2020/0003 | 56 Geneva Way | Approved | Approved, subject to consideration of the boundary and any valid neighbour planning concerns. |
| SMD/2020/0011 | 32 Well Lane | Approved | Approved, subject to no valid neighbour planning concerns. |
| SMD/2020/0017 | 17 Lagonda Close | Approved | Approved, subject to Severn Trent comments. |
| SMD/2020/0052 | Coates Farm School Lane | Refused | It was agreed that Biddulph Town Council has no further comment to make. |
| SMD/2020/0073 | Village Hall Hot Lane | Approved | No adverse comments |

This was received by Councillors.

8. APPEAL

The Bungalow, Lask Edge (HNT/2020/0004)

See above, Town Council recommended approval.

Councillor Hawley noted that the height of the extension was an issue for the Planning Officer.

All agreed that the original Town Council comments would stand.

Councillors Garvey and Jones abstained.

The meeting closed at 6.58pm

Signature

Date