

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 23rd May 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
<p>SMD/2023/0594 (Item 7)</p>	<p><u>Land at Blythe House Farm</u></p> <p>Points of Clarification</p> <p>1) Paragraph 7.9 – with regard to considerations set out in Policy SD2 states:</p> <p>“how social and economic <i>benefits</i> of the scheme have been minimised” This should read “how social and economic <i>impacts</i> of the scheme have been minimised”</p> <p>2) Page 56 – the layout plan contained at Page 56 of the Agenda Pack is a superseded plan. The correct amended layout (Ref: BF/613/01 Rev M) for consideration is contained below at the end of this update.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> As confirmed at paragraph 3.9, 7.121 and 7.122 the scheme was amended to remove operational development from Flood Zones 2 and 3. The amended layout reflects this and the report and assessment has been prepared against this amended layout.</p> <p><u>Checkley Neighbourhood Plan</u> Paragraph 7.3 confirmed that adoption of the Checkley Neighbourhood Plan (the CNP) was supported at referendum on 2nd May but, at the time of writing the report, was not formally “made”. At the Annual Meeting of the Council, on 15th May 2024, a decision was made to accept the results of the referendum and to formally “make” the CNP. The CNP is now formally made.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> As the CNP has now been formally made it forms part of the Development Plan for the area and full weight can be attached to its policies in the determination of this application. Given the very advanced stage of preparation, great weight was attached to the policies in the Committee report (confirmed at paragraph 7.3) therefore, the adoption of the CNP has not altered the overall assessment.</p> <p><u>Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) by Claire Coutinho MP – Solar and protecting our Food Security and Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land (15/05/24)</u> Since the Committee Report was produced the above WMS has been produced and is a material consideration in the determination of the application. A full transcript of the WMS is contained in Appendix 2 of this update.</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 23rd May 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><u>Officer Comment</u></p> <p>The WMS emphasises the requirement to minimise the effect of BMV land (unless demonstrated otherwise), as required by National Policy Statements (NPS), and the NPPF. The Committee Report has been considered in the context of the NPS, NPPF and the Development Plan, all of which are consistent on this point of minimising the use of BMV land. The effect on BMV has been considered within the Committee Report (Paragraphs 7.34 – 7.41), which highlights the limited use of BMV land (limited to 4.5ha or 15% of the site). For clarity, this includes land where no operational development is proposed within Field 7 and within the landscaped buffer adjacent to the railway. Although there is a small encroachment of BMV in field 5 and 6.</p> <p>With regards to cumulative effects, the operational development at Lower Newton Farm resulted in a 1ha loss of BMV (4% of site); the approved development at Upper Newton Farm would result in the loss of 6ha of BMV (14%); and the Totmonslow approval a loss of 2.1ha (7%). It is considered that cumulatively, the operational development, the extant approvals, along with the application proposed do not result in a significant loss of BMV.</p> <p>Therefore, the WMS does not alter the conclusions contained within the Committee Report, and is considered not to have a detrimental effect on BMV, or food security.</p> <p>Additional Representations</p> <p>One further representation has been received. Stating that:</p> <p><i>The above application is a cross boundary application where the largest was designed to go on land where the planning authority is East Staffordshire Borough Council. They have recently refused their portion of the planned works under planning application - P/2023/00217 - for the reasons given below, which I am sure will equally apply to the portion that is to be considered this Thursday.</i></p> <p><i>Refusal Reasons Page for Planning Application - P/2023/00217 Site Address Proposed Solar Farm North of Bramble Cottage Greensmiths Lane Upper Leigh Staffordshire ST10 4NY Details Application Number P/2023/00217 Site Address Proposed Solar Farm North of Bramble Cottage Greensmiths Lane Upper Leigh Staffordshire ST10 4NY</i></p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 23rd May 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><i>Property Address Bramble Cottage, Greensmiths Lane, Upper Leigh, Staffordshire, ST10 4NU</i></p> <p><i>Reasons 1</i> <i>The proposed development by virtue of the scale, form, materials and siting, would significantly harm the character of the landscape individually and cumulatively and it is not considered that the benefits of the proposals outweigh this harm. The proposed is therefore considered to conflict with Policies SP1, SP8, SP24 and SP30 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan, the East Staffordshire Design Guide and the NPPF.</i></p> <p><i>Reasons 2</i> <i>The proposed development by virtue of the scale, form, materials and siting would be within close proximity and therefore visually intrusive to the occupants of nearby residential properties and would harm their residential amenities. The proposal is therefore considered to conflict with Policies SP1, SP8, SP24 and DP1 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan, the East Staffordshire Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework.</i></p> <p><i>Reasons 3</i> <i>The size of vehicles and number of vehicle trips required to implement, operated and decommission the proposed development would result in excessive traffic within the rural highway network to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal is therefore considered to conflict with policies SP1 and SP35 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.</i></p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> It is clear that the representation relates to SMD/2023/0059 which is the corresponding cross-boundary development for a solar farm further to the east of the site. This was considered, and refused, at Committee on 28th March. Officers have responded to the objector direct and clarified that a decision has been made on that application.</p> <p><u>Amended Layout Plan</u> Please see Plan at the end of this report</p>	
SMD/2022/0438	<p><u>Stonehouse Farm, Ashbank Rd, Werrington</u></p> <p><u>Correction to para 7.4 of the report</u></p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 23rd May 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>7.4 Although the site appears to be part of the built-up area of Werrington and surrounded by both existing and new housing being constructed, it is a small redundant farm and the west part of the site, where the buildings and hard-standings are located, remains within the Green Belt. The Development Boundary for Werrington formerly was along Ash Bank Road separating the main built-up part of the village to the north from the Green Belt land to the south. However, since the release of land from the Green Belt for housing, the Development Boundary now cuts through the site separating the east part of the site (which now forms part of the Housing Allocation) from the west part which remains in the Green Belt. The west part is also therefore deemed to be in the “Countryside” for the purposes of the Local Plan as well as the Green Belt and east part is now deemed to be part of the “Large Village” within the Development Boundary for the purposes of the Green Belt. The open grassland east part of the site has been removed from the Green Belt to become part of a wider housing allocation in the Local Plan and housing development is under construction on the neighbouring land to the east. The west part of the site has, unusually, become a small island of open Green Belt land detached from the wider open Green Belt land further to the south, by existing housing on Salters Close.</p> <p><u>Letter from the agent to clarify parking provision</u></p> <p>“I note within the committee report reference to the parking standards and requirement for 18 spaces, however this may have been applied to the net floorspace rather than gross. Our view was the parking standards require 27 spaces (1 per 14sqm based on 383 sqm GIA). Either way, our proposed provision is fully supported by evidence including an assessment of trip rates at other similar co-op stores, and also the highly localised function and location of the store meaning a significant proportion will travel on foot. Further, the standards provide a one size fits all standard for all food retail regardless of scale, and our application is for a modest convenience store. For this reason, the standards include the caveat that proposals will be assessed on case-by-case basis in consultation with SCC highways, who have confirmed the proposals are acceptable.”</p> <p><u>Response from Case Officer</u></p> <p>I confirm that the Council parking standards in respect of Food Retail Units are applied to <u>gross</u> floorspace and therefore there is a requirement for 27 spaces in accordance with the standards.</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 23rd May 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><u>Representations</u></p> <p>A letter of objection was received on 20th May 2024 from a local resident raising concerns relating to traffic and highway safety due to the location of the store so close to the traffic light junction.</p> <p><u>Conditions Changes</u></p> <p>Condition 2 has been amended to refer to the latest elevations drawing which shows the substituted brick and the roof plan and sectional drawing have also been added. The condition should now read:</p> <p>2. The development hereby permitted, including the building materials specified, shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the following amended approved plans:</p> <p>Site Location Plan - Drawing Reference GP2235 Zz_50_10_70 - 0001 Rev P04 Proposed Site Plan – Drawing Reference Zz_70_60_00 - 0003 Rev P15 Proposed Floor Plan – Drawing Reference Zz_70_60_00 -0004 Rev P06 Proposed Roof Plan – Drawing Reference Zz_70_80_00-0002 Rev P02 Proposed Elevations – Drawing Reference Zz_70_30_00 0001 P07 Proposed Sections – Drawing Reference Zz_70_80_00-0001 Rev P05 Proposed Landscape Plan - Drawing Reference Fig L1 Landscape Design Proposed Highway Works - T651_10</p> <p>Reason:- To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for clarity and the avoidance of doubt.</p>	
<p>SMD/2024/0067</p>	<p><u>The Tawny Hotel, Consall</u></p> <p><u>*ITEM DEFERRED*</u></p> <p>At the request of the applicant to address late comments received from the Fire Authority.</p>	
<p>SMD/2024/0012</p>	<p><u>Land at Park Lane, Cheadle</u></p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 23rd May 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	ITEM DEFERRED for consultation with the Town Council	
SMD/2020/0679	<p><u>Alton Forest Lodge, Dimmingsdale, Alton</u></p> <p><u>Representations</u></p> <p>A further letter of objection has been received (on 16th May 2024) from a previous objector which states the following:</p> <p>“On reviewing the revised plans of the proposed site of the cabins I note that the partially constructed stone and timber circular structure and the hard standing with integrated utilities on which a single decker bus is standing are not included, neither is the more long standing storage shed. These structures stand in the area to the north of the existing office and parking/manouvering area. The area in which the bus stands has been grassed over and decking placed in front of the bus. The structures are immediately adjacent to the public footpath. The intended functions of these are not evident. Whilst not part of this planning application I do feel that the siting of the above further adds to the build-up of an unsightly conglomeration of buildings. The placing of the proposed cabins should be considered in conjunction with these unmapped developments and should be rejected as inappropriate for the situation.”</p> <p><u>Officer Comment in Response</u></p> <p>This is a separate matter which will be looked into and has no bearing on the planning application.</p> <p><u>Further Representation</u></p> <p>An email was received from a previous objector on 21st May 2024 with an “attached a link to a video of mountain biking activity in woods owned and managed by the owners of Alton Forrest Lodge.”</p> <p>The email also states the following:</p> <p><u>“It is an event organised and hosted by the owners of the lodge and shows the destruction of vast areas of woodland that they have a duty to manage and care for. This video shows that they are doing the exact opposite. the area is unrecognisable from what was previously a beautiful, tranquil area of woodland with a narrow footpath winding through it.</u></p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 23rd May 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>It is hard to see how many people are there, but definitely more than 30. I think this shows that the damage to the woodland will only be increased by additional people staying at the lodge. It also shows that 6 parking spaces are totally inadequate.”</p>	

