

# Public Document Pack

**Date** Tuesday, 23rd June, 2015  
**Time** 6.30 pm  
**Venue** Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Merrial Street,  
Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire, ST5 2AG  
**Contact** Julia Cleary

## **Planning Committee Supplementary Agenda**

### **PART 1- OPEN AGENDA**

- 6 Application for Major Development - 7 Park Avenue, (Pages 3 - 4)  
Wolstanton; M&H Property Developments / The General  
Architecture Company; 15/00174/FUL
- 7 Application for Major Development - Site of Former Oxford (Pages 5 - 6)  
Arms, Moreton Parade; DEO Property Developments / A-Z  
Designs; 15/00421/FUL
- 10 Application for Minor Development - Former Garage Site, (Pages 7 - 8)  
Queensway; Aspire Housing; 15/00308/FUL
- 11 Application for Minor Development - Land Adjacent to Halcyon, (Pages 9 - 10)  
Tower Road, Ashley; Miss Stanier / Peter Richards & Co;  
15/00353/FUL

This page is intentionally left blank

**ADVANCE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**  
**TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**23<sup>rd</sup> June 2015**

**Agenda item 6**

**Application number 15/00174/FUL**

**7 Park Avenue, Wolstanton**

Since the agenda report was prepared one additional letter of objection to the application has been received, together with further comments from the Landscape Development Section about additional information that they have received from the applicant's agent.

With respect to the former the concerns raised are to the density of the development and to the resultant traffic movements – these issues have already been considered within the main agenda report.

The Landscape Development Section advise that the additional information goes some way to addressing some of their concerns with regard to the trees however the proposals do not comply with BS5837:2012 and all of the information the Section have asked for has not been provided. The submitted plans show proposed surfacing in root protection areas in excess of the BS guidelines which would not be acceptable, particularly in view of the proximity of the boundary walls which will be affecting root distribution. Their concern remains that the scheme would result in an unacceptable loss of important trees.

**Your officers' recommendation remains unaltered**

This page is intentionally left blank

**ADVANCE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**  
**TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**18<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

**Agenda item 7**

**Application ref. 15/00421/FUL**

**Oxford Arms, Moreton Parade, May Bank**

Since the preparation of the agenda report the comments of the **Landscape Development Section** have been received. They raise no objections subject to the submission, approval and implementation of a suitable landscaping scheme, tree protection to BS5837: 2012 and the securing of an appropriate developer contribution for off-site Public Open Space of £2,943 per dwelling which will be used for improvements to facilities at the nearby Wolstanton Park.

**The RECOMMENDATION remains as set out in the main agenda report.**

This page is intentionally left blank

**ADVANCE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**  
**TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**18<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

**Agenda item 10**

**Application ref. 15/00308/FUL**

**Former Garage Site, Queensway, Westlands**

Since the preparation of the agenda report a further statement from the applicant's agent in relation to justifying the design credentials of the proposal has been received. This is in light of objections regarding the appearance of the development.

In the main the argument made is that the two sets of semi-detached dwellings proposed provides a symmetrical arrangement within the site, comparable with the layout presented by the larger semi-detached dwelling groupings along The Plaisance to the north and Kingsway East to the south. The applicant's view is that whilst there are examples of larger detached dwellings in the surrounding area, these are situated in larger plots thus maintaining the consistent scale of built development within the wider Westlands area.

They also advise that to redesign the layout to provide a pair of semi-detached dwellings and a single modest detached house would not follow the predominant scale and layout exhibited elsewhere, and also a small detached dwelling (positioned in the context of the wider application site) would increase the costs of construction and thus is likely to increase the purchase price of the property to a level that would position the property outside the budget of the typical purchaser. This would effectively result in the cost of all three properties increasing in order to cover these costs, thus potentially taking these properties out of reach of their target market.

Officer comments

The size of the plots for the proposed dwellings is considerably smaller than the dwellings in the surrounding area and would detract from the established structure and layout of the area which is relatively uniform. In addition the design and appearance of the proposed dwellings does not reflect the character of the area and is considered harmful.

**The recommendation remains unaltered.**

This page is intentionally left blank



**ADVANCE SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**  
**TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**18<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

**Agenda item 11**

**Application ref. 15/00353/FUL**

**Halcyon, Tower Road, Ashley Heath**

Since the preparation of the agenda report the comments of the **Landscape Development Section** and **Loggerheads Parish Council** have been received.

The **Landscape Development Section** express concern that 7 of the 12 trees on Tower Road are shown to be removed, including 3 BS 5837 Category 'B' trees. This is a high proportion and a significant tree loss. It is requested that the layout is amended so as to reposition the drive entrances to avoid the important trees and allow their retention. It is also considered that there is no reason to remove tree T22 on the frontage with Eccleshall Road.

**Loggerheads Parish Council** objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The Planning Committee considered an update on the five year housing supply on 3<sup>rd</sup> June which confirmed that the Borough has a 5 year supply of housing land in this area so existing policies and the CSS will apply to this application.
- The application is outside the Village Envelope in Loggerheads.
- Part of the Inspector's decision letter in dismissing an appeal against refusal of 14/00053/OUT was that allowing a development in this area would set a precedent for the construction of dwellings in large gardens and would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area.
- The surrounding properties are individually designed detached houses and a high proportion of bungalows in generous sized landscaped gardens. This development of four houses all of similar design in small plots would urbanise the area and completely change the appearance of it.
- The plots are small in comparison to other properties in the area and the footprints of the dwellings would involve the development of a significant proportion of the site.
- Three of the proposed houses would directly overlook bungalows.
- The land is extremely wet and buildings and hard surfacing of driveways will exacerbate this problem.

Three letters of representation have been received. Objection is made on very similar grounds to those of Loggerheads Parish Council listed above. In addition, concern is expressed that the infrastructure cannot cope with these developments with the roads, school, and doctors already to capacity.

Officer comments

The issues raised by Loggerheads Parish Council and residents are largely already addressed in the agenda report. Reference has been made to an appeal against the refusal of planning permission for a dwelling behind No. 5 Pinewood Drive, Ashley Heath (Ref. 14/00053/OUT). In that case, the Inspector dismissed the appeal on the grounds that the proposal would enclose an area of open land and result in the loss of a landscaped gap which would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and set a precedent for similar developments on other sites. That site differs from the application site in that it was a smaller area of land that currently provides a visual break between the adjacent residential properties. Due to the irregular shape of the land, the proposed development would have involved the development of a significant proportion of the plot. The application site is a larger site that is at the end of Tower Road. This particular part and north-west side of Tower Road comprises more ad-hoc development with space between some of the properties. As such your Officer's view is that it does not provide the same visual break between development

that the appeal site does. It is not considered therefore that the development of this site would have any significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

Your Officer agrees with the concerns of the Landscape Development Section regarding tree loss but it is considered likely that with amendments to the position of the driveways, an acceptable development can be achieved. Therefore, it is considered that the appropriate step for the Committee would be to defer a decision on the application to allow the submission and consideration of amended plans.

**Accordingly your Officer is now recommending that a decision on the application be deferred for the above reason.**