

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
<p><u>Item 7</u></p> <p><u>SMD/2021/0456</u></p>	<p><u>SMD/2021/0456 – Land at Ayr Road, Cheadle</u></p> <p><u>Cheadle Town Council</u></p> <p>05.11.24:</p> <p>“Cheadle Town Council had a large number of local residents attend its meeting of our Development Services Committee on Monday of this week, and it was apparent that this particular development has had a substantially negative impact on some members of the local Community. It was further apparent that other large developments in the local area are having a similar impact.</p> <p>These variations are listed as ‘minor amendments’, however they appear to be retrospective or part retrospective and therefore have already been carried out in some form. There appears to be nothing included in the variations that would provide assurances around the genuine measures and concerns raised by local residents in protection of their homes. As a Statutory Consultee, this does not provide Cheadle Town Council with much scope in terms of response.</p> <p>As a Town Council we have been made aware that the Ombudsman Service have recently found some of the processes relating to this Application to be inadequate, and we would respectfully ask the Planning Department to comment on these findings, and to provide some assurance that future development is both inclusive and regulated in accordance with policy.</p> <p>It is the duty of the Local Authority to manage planning and development effectively, and to administer processes that consider the impact that some developments may have on the wider community. Cheadle Town Council supports the assertion of local residents that these processes are not in place, and that larger developments are consistently using the opportunity to ‘vary conditions’ in order to mitigate circumstances which seek to extend the parameters for which the primary permission was granted.</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>There is an apparent lack of enforcement on many of the larger sites in Cheadle and its surrounding Parishes, and there seems to be very limited control on the various stages of development. Many of these developments have exceeded their approval and reneged on the local consultations held within the Community, despite many local residents being as supportive as possible towards the outline plans.</p> <p>Despite this, and in addition to findings that developers had indeed gone beyond the limitations of the approved plans, particularly in terms of height limits and boundary definitions, these variances have gone largely ignored by the local planning department and created extensive distress to those living nearby. It is noted that the Ombudsman Report indicates that negotiations that have taken place have been ineffective, and in some cases conflicting. As a Town Council we would expect those findings to be addressed, in full, before any further Applications were even considered, and only when those affected are satisfied by the outcome should these matters proceed.</p> <p>We appreciate that there are deadlines to meet, however for some these are life-changing decisions that can have a detrimental impact on peoples' quality of life.</p> <p>Essentially, approval of this Application will result in the removal of any liability on the part of the developer to rectify these matters, and it is noted from the Ombudsman Report that this Application seeks to 'regularise the breaches of Planning Control'. As a Town Council we could not support such wrongdoing given the impact this has had on our residents.</p> <p>There is a reasonable expectation within the Staffordshire Moorlands that the Local Authority will provide a facility for engagement in terms of concerns raised by residents affected by Planning Development and, at the very least, provide a channel of communication to address some of these concerns. Many e-mails and letters from residents have not been acknowledged, and assured consultation</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>with the developer following a deferral of this Application in March 2023 has not been adhered to with the exception of a futile meeting which remains unfulfilled. From the responses presented at our Committee meeting, these practices does not appear to be accessible, and the significant frustration felt by many is not being addressed. Hence, the residents come to us, and other Parsh Councils, as the forward-facing tier of Local Government in the Community.</p> <p>Cheadle Town Council makes every effort to support local people with a wide range of issues, however we are particularly limited in our ability to address the specific details of Planning matters, for which we receive very little information following initial consultation.</p> <p>The matters raised thus far are:-</p> <p>Matters affecting Residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirmation from the developer that those who have been affected by invasion of privacy, following the development of dwellings above the levels agreed in the original site plans, will be protected by the use of trees and acoustic boarding to mitigate intrusion.• Confirmation from the developer that those who have been affected by boundary changes in Donkey Lane, Cheadle, will have appropriate borders reinstated.• Confirmation that the designated Footpath between Donkey Lane and Tay Close is reinstated, having been inaccessible for two years.• Confirmation from the Developer and Planning Department that the retaining walls and earth banks utilised on site are adequate and will not result in subsidence or landslide.• A response from the Planning Department in respect of the findings of the Ombudsman Report, and assurances that larger developments will have some form of control on the various stages of development and enforcement.	


PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>Technical Matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Drawing ARCH/PS-03 has not been modified to indicate this Amendment and the dimensions between Persimmons Homes and residents housing remains incorrect. • The leading document in this proposal is missing from the pack Ref :ARCH/PL/PH1 Rev20 without which this application has no context. • There is no evidence that a qualified and independent Civil Engineer will be available to prove that the 80G Pa pressure wall test will be carried out. This is required for Ness Grove and Persimmon Homes house insurances and resale searches, and to prove that the proposed structure is safe (ref Tobermore Secura Grand Retaining wall). • For the purpose of the safety and wellbeing of residents, we require that the building inspector provide photographic evidence of land drain and back fill in Persimmon properties. • There is no evidence of a second inspection of calculation SK24-5839-F1-01, nor is this vital document available in the proposal pack. Without this, the construction drawing Sk24-5839-f1-01 is valueless. • Sk24-5839-f1-01 is a document issued for comment only. Therefore, it is not complete and could change. It is not professional to approve an application drawing at this early point in design. • The dispute with Persimmon Homes and the Gables property in Donkey Lane has not been resolved, without which the sound proof fence as indicated in this application cannot be constructed as it could be illegal in terms of boundary definition. <p>Cheadle Town Council will not support any Planning Application that does not align with the regulations that</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>govern it, and therefore we would look to the Local Authority and its Planning Applications Committee to address the increasing concerns, and the adverse impact, that development outside of regulation has on the health and wellbeing of local people.</p> <p>Therefore, we object to the Application on both the Personal and Technical Grounds listed above. We would ask that both compensation and consultation on individual cases is discussed with affected residents, and ask the Planning Department/Planning Applications Committee to consider a deferral whilst these matters are addressed.</p> <p>Should a referral not be appropriate in terms of time limitations, we would ask that both compensation and consultation with residents form part of any conditions attached to the Planning Application Committee decision”.</p> <p><u>(Town) Cllr Charlesworth</u></p> <p>Cllr Charlesworth has requested that the following photograph be brought to the attention of the committee.</p> 	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><u>SMDC Aboricultural Officer</u></p> <p>07.11.24</p> <p>Revisions in the Version 4 edition satisfactorily address the minor reference issues I previously raised.</p> <p>V4 LEMP can be approved with the S.73 application, also effectively discharging Condition 26 requirement of SMD/2018/0180.</p> <p>Please include the following condition on the decision notice, in the event of approval:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The TEP Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) version 4.0 dated November 2024 shall be implemented in full accordance with the maintenance and management operations, specifications and timescales including monitoring and review set out in the LEMP submitted as supporting details for the development hereby approved. <p><u>Staffordshire Wildlife Trust</u></p> <p>01.11.24:</p> <p>Following the receipt and review of the documents relating to Condition 26, we wish to discharge the conditions and have no further comments (LEMP: Landscape Ecological Management Plan).</p> <p>04.11.24:</p> <p>I am happy that the submitted information fulfils all of our previous concerns (CEMP: Construction Ecology Management Plan).</p> <p>10.10.24:</p> <p>Following the receipt and review of the documents relating to Condition 33 (Lighting), we wish to discharge the condition and have no further comments.</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><u>Applicant</u></p> <p>07.11.24:</p> <p>A table has been provided detailing Consultation Undertaken by Permission Homes Ltd (PHL), following deferral at the 9th March 2023 Planning Application Committee meeting. This is appended to this report.</p> <p>The following is a Summary of Neighbour Responses following consultation with them in relation to the proposed boundary treatment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 100 Froghall Road – Wish to liaise with the Council concerning proposals.• 108 Ness Grove - No response received (but believe it is rented).• 110 Ness Grove – Landlord wishes to engage on proposed boundary solution.• 112 Ness Grove – No response received from new owners.• 114 Ness Grove – Agreement to Tobermore / double sided fencing solution.• 116 Ness Grove - Agreement to Tobermore / double sided fencing solution.• 118 Ness Grove - Agreement to Tobermore / double sided fencing solution.• 5 Ayr Road – Continue to liaise with owner regarding outstanding works, which are expected to be completed shortly. <p>08.11.24:</p> <p>“I am writing to provide a formal response to the letter issued by Cheadle Town Council (‘CTC’) dated 24/10/2024, pursuant to S73 application ref. SMD/2021/0456 (‘the application’) which is on the agenda for the Planning Applications Committee meeting on Tuesday 12th November 2024. The CTC letter raises several points which Persimmon Homes seek to provide a response, which can then be included in the Late Representations Report to be presented to the Planning Applications Committee.</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>For ease of reference, I provide a response to each of the points in order below.</p> <p><i>Confirmation from the developer that those who have been affected by invasion of privacy, following the development of dwellings above the levels agreed in the original site plans, will be protected by the use of trees and acoustic boarding to mitigate intrusion.</i></p> <p>Persimmon Homes confirm that the ‘as-built’ finished floor levels of the dwellings have been constructed in accordance with the approved finished floor levels. These are as set out in the approved Adoptable Drainage Layout (Ref: 881287-40-01 Rev P2), which clearly shows finished floor levels for all plots, including Plots 59–70, and are in accordance with those that have now been constructed on site.</p> <p>In addition, the application is supported by Landscape Plans and Boundary Treatment details which clearly illustrate landscaping and boundary treatments proposed on site. For clarity, this shows that closed-boarded fencing is proposed in-between Plots 59–70 and existing dwellings on Ayr Road, Ness Grove, and Froghall Road. No tree planting is proposed to the rear of Plots 59–66, with existing hedgerows to the rear of No.100 Froghall Road being retained in situ.</p> <p><i>Confirmation from the developer that those who have been affected by boundary changes in Donkey Lane, Cheadle, will have appropriate borders reinstated.</i></p> <p>The submitted Boundary Treatment Plan (Ref: ARCH/BTP/PH9) illustrates the boundary treatments proposed across the site. These will be supplemented by planting proposed throughout which includes hedge planting along Donkey Lane.</p> <p><i>Confirmation that the designated Footpath between Donkey Lane and Tay Close is reinstated, having been inaccessible for two years.</i></p> <p>As illustrated on the submitted Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH1 Rev Z20) and accompanying Landscape Plans,</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>the public footpath from Donkey Lane will be reinstated through Phase 1 of the site on land owned by Persimmon Homes. The footpath within Phase 1 will be fully reopened by the end of March 2025.</p> <p><i>Confirmation from the Developer and Planning Department that the retaining walls and earth banks utilised on site are adequate and will not result in subsidence or landslide.</i></p> <p>Persimmon Homes confirms that the retaining walls and structures have been designed by a structural engineer or in accordance with industry-recognised details to ensure that they are adequate for their desired purpose.</p> <p><i>Drawing ARCH/PS-03 has not been modified to indicate this Amendment and the dimensions between Persimmons Homes and residents housing remains incorrect.</i></p> <p>Drawing Ref: ARCH/PS-03 relates to sections that were submitted with the S73 application as an indicative drawing to illustrate the interface distances between the approved dwellings and existing dwellings on Ayr Road and Ness Grove. This drawing was submitted for indicative purposes and not as a drawing for approval. The minor amendments to the S73 application submitted in October 2024 have not changed the as-built location of the approved dwellings and therefore, it was not necessary to update the sections as these interface distance relationships have not changed.</p> <p><i>The leading document in this proposal is missing from the pack Ref :ARCH/PL/PH1 Rev20 without which this application has no context.</i></p> <p>The Planning Layout (Ref: ARCH/PL/PH1 Rev Z20) was submitted to the LPA on 4th October 2024 and forms part of the S73 application pack to be presented to the Planning Applications Committee for determination.</p> <p><i>There is no evidence that a qualified and independent Civil Engineer will be available to prove that the 80G Pa pressure wall test will be carried out. This is required for Ness Grove and Persimmon Homes house insurances and</i></p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><i>resale searches, and to prove that the proposed structure is safe (ref Tobermore Secura Grand Retaining wall).</i></p> <p>Persimmon Homes confirm that a structural engineer will inspect the retaining wall and undertake the necessary testing during construction.</p> <p><i>For the purpose of the safety and wellbeing of residents, we require that the building inspector provide photographic evidence of land drain and back fill in Persimmon properties.</i></p> <p>As illustrated on the submitted Secura Grand Wall drawing (Ref: SK24-5839-F1-01 Rev C), a land drain is proposed between the existing gravel board and proposed Tobermore wall. If approved, the retaining wall will be built in accordance with this detail and photos of the 'as-built' land drain can be provided to the LPA if necessary.</p> <p><i>There is no evidence of a second inspection of calculation SK24-5839-F1-01, nor is this vital document available in the proposal pack. Without this, the construction drawing Sk24-5839-f1-01 is valueless.</i></p> <p>Please refer to attached Secura Grand Wall drawing and calculations (Ref: SK24-5839-F1-01 Rev C), which demonstrates that the Tobermore design and calculations have been checked and approved via a second inspection.</p> <p><i>Sk24-5839-f1-01 is a document issued for comment only. Therefore, it is not complete and could change. It is not professional to approve an application drawing at this early point in design.</i></p> <p>Drawing Ref: SK24-5839-F1-01 Rev C has been submitted to illustrate the engineering design and feasibility of the proposed Tobermore retaining wall. As shown on the drawing it is 'For Construction'. For Planning purposes, the retaining wall details have been reflected in the submitted External Works drawings and drawing Ref: PHNW-AF-02(02), which would be approved drawings for the purposes of the S73 application.</p> <p><i>The dispute with Persimmon Homes and the Gables</i></p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><i>property in Donkey Lane has not been resolved, without which the sound proof fence as indicated in this application cannot be constructed as it could be illegal in terms of boundary definition.</i></p> <p>I confirm that all of the works proposed adjacent to the Gables, including the footpath and fencing, can be undertaken on land under the ownership of Persimmon Homes”.</p> <p><u>Case Officer</u></p> <p>The applicant has submitted an updated iteration of the engineering drawing and calculations for the proposed boundary Tobermore wall, which is stated confirms that the design and calculations have been checked by way of second inspection. It is also confirmed that no changes have been undertaken in terms of the design or calculations previously submitted. This enclosure received on the 8th of November 2024 has been placed on the website at:</p> <p><u>http://publicaccess.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/AttachmentShowServlet?ImageName=364252</u></p> <p>Following comments from the Council’s Aboricultural Officer and Staffordshire Wildlife Trust, the following planning conditions can now be positively worded as follows: CEMP (Ecology), LEMP and Lighting.</p> <p>With regard to the Town Council’s comments, the technical points of objection specific to this application have been addressed by the applicant in their response set out above. With regard to other more general points which have been raised it would not be appropriate to comment on specific complaints from Members of the public which have been referred to the Local Government Ombudsman. The Council has and will comply with any recommendations by the Ombudsman. The application, however, must be dealt with on its planning merits, aside from any complaint relating to administration or processing.</p> <p>With regard to general concerns about the planning enforcement of larger residential sites and developers applying to make variations to permissions and conditions, Members will</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>be aware that developers are legally entitled to make such applications to amend permissions and that these applications can be lawfully made retrospectively. As with any application they must be judged on their own merits in accordance with both planning policy and material considerations.</p> <p>The Council will of course investigate any alleged breach of planning control and will take appropriate action where necessary and appropriate, which in some cases, may include securing retrospective or amended applications to regularise unauthorised development.</p> <p>Rather than “the removal of any liability on the part of the developer to rectify these matters” as the Town Council suggest, approval of this application would enable the developer to implement the amended scheme of boundary treatment, amongst other matters, which has been the subject of extensive consultation and has been agreed by a number of affected residents as highlighted above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: NO CHANGE (APPROVE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS)</p>	
<p>ITEM 8</p> <p>SMD 2024 0330</p>	<p>Wayfields Farm, Wetley Rocks</p> <p><u>Representations</u></p> <p>A further letter has been received from the objector as follows:</p> <p>“WITHOUT PREJUDICE</p> <p>This is one of 7 former MEGA SIZED agricultural barns built in Rownall on 5 farms all owned by the same family and all inside the GREEN BELT, all granted change of use!</p> <p>Namely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 at The Play Barn 3 x barns at Wayfields Farm 1 at Rownall Farm 1 at Ivy House Farm into 2 dwellings 1 at Wood End Farm Holiday rental <p>Each one of these barns built under agricultural allowance, had clearly appears to have had other future intended planned uses</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>and as such have been the subject of progressive facilitated change of use applications outside agricultural use all of which have received SMDC approval!</p> <p>On numerous occasions repeated building alterations have occurred at these barns without prior planning consent which even after neighbourhood reporting and SMDC written planning contravention confirmation, did not once result in planning enforcement.</p> <p>Now here we have another example of the progressive manipulation of planning regulation as a means to an end, likely targeted long ago. This former agricultural shed was first granted Industrial storage use, then a substantial part of the western most barn was sub let as a business HQ to a temporary building company and the frontage was rebuilt with a brick facade, double double glazed entrance doors were fitted, and internal mezzanine first floor and large double glazed office picture windows fitted to both the ground floor and first floor, all once again without planning permission. Again supported by a neighbourhood confirmed SMDC planning contravention!</p> <p>Now as expected this tactical retrospective application is received attempting to validate another serious disregard for regulation. Surely the Council should learn from these repeated serial planning contraventions and counter them by prompt enforcement?</p> <p>In this regard members of the Planning Committee should not forget nor overlook that there are still 3 running serious planning contraventions at the mega agricultural shed SMD/2024/0094 recently awarded a Certificate of Lawfulness based on 'opinion not fact,' and still no enforcement, there!</p> <p>Then only last week Re: SMD/2017/0702 and DOC/2023/0064 by House Farm Rownall the same applicant acted again to deviate from prior approved planning consent at a Grade 11 listed building and again the SMDC confirm this as yet another planning contravention, without enforcement. Where on earth is the control and the SMDC performance compliance? To turn a blind eye now and reward this repeated tactic only serves again as encouragement for this applicant to do it again and again without end. For this reason, particularly in</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>consideration of this applicant's history, <u>this application must be refused.</u></p> <p>Furthermore, the likelihood of granting consent would result in a full time employed workforce working out of these unapproved offices on this site immediately next to (50 yds) from the mega sized unit now marked as unit 8 which is now included without any declared usage intent in the BESS 400MW Battery Storage application SMD/2024/0055 which carries unimaginable fire and safety risks around this residential community which now has already considerable loss of neighbourhood amenities.”</p>	
<p>ITEM 9</p> <p>SMD/2024/0077</p>	<p>Basford Hall, Basford Green, Cheddleton</p> <p><u>10.11.2024 – from Damian Pearson response to Planning Officer Report</u></p> <p>I have read the report and feel extra detail needed. I have attached 8 photographs... [not included here]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yellow circled wood chipping facility at Bones Lane, Cheddleton <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Red line 1.5 miles through the estate - Green line 2.5 miles by road 2. present open store with ample space on the site of a previously demolished G2 listed barn. 3. Map of Churnet valley SSSI zones and proposed tree felling 4. Forestry commission search for felling licences 5. Map of relevant woods 6. Destruction - illegally felling an Ancient Woodland 7. Ariel view of 1878 woodland showing the scale-south of Lodge Farm. 8. 74m of protected hedgerow and mature trees. Please note the scale of the applicant's shed is twice the height, twice the length and 4.6m longer in width. A considerable and overbearing structure. <p>Re LPA phrase “bluff of land” - it's elevated agricultural land and very much a part of the open park land landscape</p> <p>22 dwellings make up the hamlet of Basford Green, 7 of which are grade 2 listed and protected</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>Definitely affected is another grade 2 listed building, the Sneyd Arms Farm “Closest to the site” are six G2 listed buildings within the settings of a historic parkland landscape and one G2 listed outside the estate</p> <p>This site is the open park land landscape of Basford Hall. The hall, its 6 listed buildings and its ever diminishing parkland. A number of enforcement issues (SMC/2024/00130) include the land grab of agricultural land for the extensions of holiday let curtilages.</p> <p>Proposed screen planting is uncharacteristic - Forestry commission has recommended the use of lime, sweet chestnut and oak trees on their Restockment Order elsewhere on the estate.</p> <p>3.4 Stock pile large quantities - why more than previous years? Swimming pools running 24/7 and all year around - may have something to do with it.</p> <p>Smaller loads have been arriving onto the estate recently - WHY?. The road to the 2017 biomass (retained) building is more enclosed now passing holiday lets and less of a service road- more like a recreational cul-de-sac.</p> <p>3.5 Applicant says he owns and manages over 300 acres of commercial woodland. Where is this? Consall woods is owned by Staffordshire CC- Consall Nature Reserve; RSPB - site within Consall woods; Consall Woods is a protected SSSI site and special licences are required from natural England</p> <p>Searches on the forestry commission site revealed no such licence exists and has never been issued since 2008. So has illegal felling by this estate for commercial use been operating for 16 years?</p> <p>A significant volume of wood chip can be produced just by good management of woodland – The amount of trees extracted for such a large volume of wood chip exceeds the legal requirements to manage a wood without a licence.</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>Anything above 5 cubic meters requires a licence.</p> <p>Felling trees in a SSSI woodland requires A supplementary Notice of operations within a Site of Scientific Interest.</p> <p>3.6 They say the cut wood will be stacked and later chipped in the woodland - Wood chipping in the sssi woods? Nature reserve woods? Or in the RSPB woods? No, the only woods that have been commercially harvested in the woods is a location North of Consall Woods. The woods are called Felthouse and Parkhouse woods. These are in “at risk zones” but still warrant protection from commercial felling, hence the legal requirement for such felling licences.</p> <p>Management of commercial forestry is regulated by the Forestry Commission and Natural England combined Yet the applicant implies they will acquired the necessary legal commercial licences. No such licences exist. The forestry commission have said they will comment on this, if asked to do so by the planning authority. Data on felling licences is available to the public on-line and this can be verified - Communication from the Forestry Commission stated (by email) that if asked they would be willing to offer information concerning the estates recent Restockment Order and lack of any licences in the area. Are the remaining wood stocks in that area not depleted enough? There is no guarantee of obtaining the relevant licences to justify the need. There is no necessity</p> <p>3.7 With regards to fire risk - The “open to the elements”, large area of wood chip storage could easily be modified to attain a roof and continue to be in a prime location to feed its neighbouring biomass boiler. This is the site of a demolished Grade 2 Listed Barn. (see Retrospective application to demolish). There is much concern regarding the moisture content but this must mean that the estate has been burning wood chip inefficiently for over 16years.</p> <p><u>From the agent 11.11.2024</u> Woodlands require active management to improve timber quality, wildlife, biodiversity and landscape and often if left unmanaged a decline in biodiversity occurs. The owners of Consall wood are in the process of compiling and submitting a</p>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>long-term management plan for the woodlands which will include detailed woodland operations for each compartment and crop. The Management plan will be in line with the UK Forestry Standard (UKFS) in which sustainable woodland management is a must. The plan will cover 10 years in detail with an eye on the next ten years.</p> <p>In order to meet the management planning and standard criteria any existing operations involving timber harvesting have been assessed against the sustainable yields to ensure they are sustainable; Forestry crop performance is measured by yield class which is directly related to increment growth per hectare per year. An average yield class for the woodlands would be between 6- 10 which means annual increment over the 85 hectares of 510-810 m³ per years which equates to 400-700 tonnes, which is 2000- 3500 tonnes over a five-year period.</p> <p>Sustainable management states that up to 70% of the increment can be harvested annually to remain sustainable allows the harvesting of an average of 280- 490 tonnes per year from the woodlands, At Basford we are harvesting an average of 200 tonnes per year so well within these constraints for sustainability and in fact we are leaving significant timber reserves on the ground.</p>	
<p>ITEM 10 SMD/2024/0227</p>	<p>Land at Heath House Lane, Lower Tean</p> <p>No updates to report.</p>	
<p>ITEM 11 SMD/2023/0543</p>	<p>Birchendale Farm, Hollington Fields, Hollington</p> <p>No updates to report.</p>	
<p>ITEM 12 SMD/2024/0411</p>	<p>33 Hillside Road, Cheddleton</p> <p>No updates to report.</p>	
<p>ITEM 13 SMD/2024/0403</p>	<p>Daisy's Cottage, Main Road, Hollington</p> <p><u>Highways</u></p>	<p>125 - 134</p>

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>Recommendation Summary: Acceptance Site Visit Conducted on: 23-Oct-2024</p> <p>Application is for COU holiday let to a dwelling. No internal or external alterations are proposed. Existing parking area is available. This will remain unaltered for the proposed COU. Existing access will remain in use. Visibility to the east is good. Visibility to the west is restricted by Daisy Cottage itself. However, this is the existing situation which will not be altered by the proposal. Current records show that there were no Personal Injury Collisions on Main Road within 50m either side of the property access in the previous five years.</p>	

APPENDIX

Table: Consultation Undertaken by Permission Homes Ltd (PHL), following deferral at the 9th March 2023 Planning Application Committee meeting

Correspondence Type	Date	From	To	Content	Response
Email	19/04/23	PHL	100 Froghall Road	Update letter sent to all properties.	
Letter	13/05/23	PHL	108 - 118 Ness Grove & 100 Froghall Road	Letter sent requesting individual on-site meetings with residents.	
Email	18/05/23	PHL	100 Froghall Road	Letter sent to owners regarding meeting.	
Letter	25/05/23	PHL	106 Froghall Road	Letter sent to residents to ask access to the rear of the property to demarcate the boundary.	
Meeting	05/06/23	PHL & SMDC	108 Ness Grove	PHL & SMDC met the owners.	
Meeting	05/06/23	PHL & SMDC	110 Ness Grove	PHL & SMDC met the owners.	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.		SITE AND DETAILS			PAGE NO.
Meeting	05/06/23	PHL & SMDC	116 & 118 Ness Grove	PHL & SMDC met the owners.	
Meeting	09/06/23	PHL & SMDC	112 Ness Grove	PHL & SMDC met the owners.	
Meeting	09/06/23	PHL & SMDC	100 Froghall Road	PHL & SMDC met the owners.	
Letter	13/06/23	PHL	100 Froghall Road	Follow-up letter pursuant to 9th June meeting.	
Letter	13/06/23	PHL	Councillor Charlesworth, Councillor Jackson and Councillor Upton	Follow-up letter pursuant to 9th June meeting.	
Letter	30/06/23	PHL	118 Ness Grove	Letter confirming that PHL wish to attend the property from 13:00 onwards and request access to the rear of the property to review the boundary treatment options.	
Letter	30/06/23		106 Froghall Road	Letter to inform the resident that an engineer would be visiting the rear of their property w/c 3rd July. The letter confirmed that would be a repeat visit to confirm the previously installed pin positions to the land inside and outside of the resident's ownership of the retaining wall built as part of the PHL development.	
Email	23/08/23	PHL	110 Ness Grove	The landlord confirmed she was trying to organise a date and time for PHL and SMDC to attend a meeting	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.		SITE AND DETAILS			PAGE NO.
				with herself at the property.	
Letter	30/08/23	PHL	108; 110; 112; 114; 116 & 118 Ness Grove	A letter was sent to the residents providing an update after the site visit to their properties during June 23. It confirmed that proposals were being discussed with engineering consultants with the aim of these proposals being presented to the LPA. Then once the LPA had provided acceptance in principle, details of the proposal were then to be provided to the residents.	
Email	08/09/23	PHL	Councillor Upton	PHL liaised with Councillor to confirm that Persimmon were liaising with residents aiming to agree a solution regarding the retaining wall.	
Letter	18/10/23	PHL	108; 110; 112; 114; 116 & 118 Ness Grove	A letter was sent to the residents to confirm that a finalised proposal for the works to be undertaken for the retaining wall. Within the letter, there were details of the retaining wall, the next steps and the possible timescales for installation dependent on the date of the Planning Applications Committee. The letter concludes by asking for agreement from the residents to the proposal by the 30th October 2023.	
Letter	27/10/23	PHL	116 & 118 Ness Grove	A letter was sent to 116 & 118 Ness Grove as they	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.		SITE AND DETAILS			PAGE NO.
				requested further information on the Kingpost retaining wall. The letter provided GEOMAN Durapost Kingpost Wall sections and elevational drawings, plus structural calculations with the letter. The letter concluded with an explanation of the next steps to install the retaining wall.	
Email	27/10/23	PHL	116 & 118 Ness Grove	As requested by the residents, the technical details for the proposed boundary retainer were emailed to the residents.	
Letter	14/05/24	PHL	108; 110; 112; 114; 116 & 118 Ness Grove	A letter was sent to these residents which updated them on the progress being made with the LPA on determining the appropriate retaining wall solutions. The letter provided three different options for the proposed Kingpost retaining wall. The residents were requested to confirm their choice by 31st May 2024.	
Email	21/05/24		116 & 118 Ness Grove	Emailed the residents who had requested an update that Persimmon were awaiting their neighbours response before proceeding forward.	
Letter	03/06/24	PHL	108; 110; 112; 114 Ness Grove	A follow-up letter was sent to these residents requesting them to confirm their preference of choice	As above 110 & 114 Ness Grove have responded. No response

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.		SITE AND DETAILS			PAGE NO.
				for the retaining wall.	from 108 & 112 Ness Grove.
Email	20/06/24	PHL	110 Ness Grove	Emailed the landlord the original letter dated 14/05/24, which was stated as not being received.	
Letter	02/07/24	PHL	108 & 114 Ness Grove	A final follow-up letter was sent to these residents requesting them to confirm their preference of choice for the retaining wall.	As above 114 Ness Grove have responded. No response from 108 Ness Grove.
Email	05/07/24	PHL	114 Ness Grove	Emailed the landlord the original letter dated 14/05/24, which was stated as not being received.	
Email	10/07/24	PHL	110 Ness Grove	Provided clarification to the landlord that Persimmon were proposing a new retaining wall solution.	
Email	31/07/24	PHL	114 Ness Grove	Landlord confirmed they would contact their tenant regarding their choice for their preferred choice of retaining wall.	
Email	31/07/24	PHL	114 Ness Grove	Landlord sought clarification as to whether nos. 116 & 118 Ness Grove had also requested trees and fencing in relation to the retaining wall solution.	
Email	31/07/24	PHL	116 & 118 Ness Grove	PHL confirmed to nos. 116 & 118 Ness Grove that not all residents had responded to the correspondence dated	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.		SITE AND DETAILS			PAGE NO.
				03/06/24 & 02/07/24. PHL confirmed to the residents that they would move ahead with those who had confirmed they wished for work to be undertaken.	
Letter	29/08/24	PHL	100 Froghall Road	<p>The letter outlined the challenges encountered following the consultation period with the Ness Grove residents. The letter asked for confirmation if the following works could be undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Double board the boundary fence to the rear of the property that backs onto yours Undertake additional planting in-between your boundary and to the retaining wall Plant-up the gap in your hedge to create a continuous boundary <p>The letter concludes asking for the residents' agreement to allow Persimmon to instruct the required contractors and in terms of item 3 ensuring the species matches with the existing.</p>	100 Froghall Road have confirmed they would wish to liaise directly with the Council.
Letter	04/09/24	PHL	108; 110; 112; 114; 116 & 118 Ness Grove	A letter was sent to these residents providing an update that not all of their neighbours had provided confirmation of preferred retaining wall. The residents were then asked to confirm if they supported	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Late Representations – 12th November 2024

FILE REF.		SITE AND DETAILS			PAGE NO.
				the new retaining wall solution which could be installed in sections, unlike the Kingpost wall. The letter also included images of the Tobermore wall and the cross- sections.	
Email	06/09/24	PHL	Ben Haywood, SMDC	PHL confirmed that property no. 100 Froghall Road would wish to liaise directly with the Council.	
Email	06/09/24	PHL	114 Ness Grove	Email included attachment of correspondence, Tobermore retaining wall image and cross-section which was sent to the lettings company on the 5 th September.	
Email	05/09/24	PHL	110 Ness Grove	Landlord confirmed she wished to discuss the retaining wall at a later date.	PHL acknowledged the email.
Email	05/09/24	PHL	114 Ness Grove	Landlord confirmed they are satisfied with the proposal.	
Email	15/09/24	PHL	116 & 118 Ness Grove	Properties confirmed they are satisfied with the approved Tobermore retaining wall.	
Letter	23/09/24	PHL	112 Ness Grove	The new occupier(s) of the property were sent the letter dated 04/09/24 regarding the details of the Tobermore retaining wall.	No response received.