

# Public Document Pack

**Date of meeting** Tuesday, 5th January, 2016  
**Time** 7.00 pm  
**Venue** Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Merrial Street,  
Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire, ST5 2AG  
**Contact** Julia Cleary



Civic Offices  
Merrial Street  
Newcastle-under-Lyme  
Staffordshire  
ST5 2AG

## Planning Committee

### THIRD SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

#### PART 1– OPEN AGENDA

- 4b Application for Major Development - Tadgedale Quarry, (Pages 3 - 4)  
Eccleshall Road, Loggerheads. Renew Land Developments Ltd.  
15/00015/OUT
- 5b Application for Major Development - Land South of West (Pages 5 - 6)  
Avenue, West of Church Street and Congleton Road and  
North of Linley Road, Butt Lane. Taylor Wimpey (North  
Midlands). 15/00441/DOA
- 6b Application for Major Development - The Hawthorns and Keele (Pages 7 - 8)  
Campus, University of Keele. Keele Seddon Ltd. 15/01004/FUL  
& 15/1009/FUL
- 8a Application for Minor Development - Former Blue Bell Inn, New (Pages 9 - 10)  
Road, Wrinehill. J Littleton & Co Ltd. 15/00759/FUL
- 14b Application for Other Development - Former St Giles and St (Pages 11 - 12)  
Georges Primary School, Barracks Road, Newcastle.  
Staffordshire County Council. 15 /01077/FUL

**Members:** Councillors Braithwaite, Cooper, Fear, Hambleton, Heesom, Mancey, Northcott, Owen, Proctor, Reddish (Vice-Chair), Simpson, Snell (Chair), Turner, Welsh, Williams and Williams

**Members of the Council: If you identify any personal training / development requirements from the**

**Contacting the Council:**  
Switchboard 01782 717717 · Fax 01782 711032 · DX 20959 · Text 07800 140048  
E-mail [webmaster@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](mailto:webmaster@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk) · [www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](http://www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)

**Britain in Bloom:**  
National Winner 2005  
Silver Gilt Medal 2009  
Regional Winner  
2003, 2004, 2008,  
2009, 2010  
Gold Award Winner  
2002 - 2010

items included in this agenda or through issues raised during the meeting, please bring them to the attention of the Committee Clerk at the close of the meeting'

**FIELD\_TITLE**

## Supplementary Information

The following information will be reported to the Planning Committee at its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2016

### **Agenda Item 4**

**Application No. 15/00015/OUT**

### **Tadgedale Quarry, Eccleshall Road, Loggerheads**

Officers have been copied into an e-mail from the **Environment Agency (EA)** to Loggerheads Parish Council. The **EA** state that having reviewed the Phase II Site Investigation Report, representations made on the application including that by Taywaste Consultancy, and the comments of the Council's Contaminated Land Officer, their original response remains unchanged; that is that the site could potentially be made suitable for development and their previously recommended conditions still remain. They state that the Phase II Report is inadequate and therefore a new desk study and a new site investigation are required should planning permission be granted. They also comment that any importation of waste material for achievement of desired levels is likely to require an Environmental Permit issued by the Environment Agency. To achieve such a permit a formal application would be required demonstrating how the environmental impact of the proposed filling activity will be controlled satisfactorily and in line with published standards and guidance.

The Supplementary Report circulated to Members on 24<sup>th</sup> December referred to a suggestion by the applicant's agent regarding the making of a financial contribution towards highway improvements in Loggerheads as an alternative to the provision of a crossing to the west of the double mini-roundabout junction in the centre of Loggerheads. Such a financial contribution would need to be secured via a Section 106 planning obligation which must be necessary, directly related to the development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, and lawful. Whilst both the Highway Authority and your Officer have accepted that a crossing as proposed would provide some benefit including to other residents of Loggerheads, the Highway Authority has not advised that any highway related financial contributions are necessary to make the development acceptable. On this basis it is not considered that a financial contribution towards highway improvements in Loggerheads is an appropriate alternative to the proposed crossing.

Members' attention is drawn to the publication today of the agenda for the 13<sup>th</sup> January Planning Policy Planning Committee which includes a report on a mid-year Update to the 5 year housing land supply Statement, and the Statement itself. The report notes that the Statement concludes as follows:-

- That there is an indicative land supply in the Borough of 3.97 years at the lower end of what is termed the housing need range, and 1.90 years at the upper end of the housing need range;
- That the Council's housing supply policies cannot be considered up to date;
- That this means housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and with respect to such sustainable development granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts from doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted; and

- That in undertaking this weighing up exercise an even greater weight will at least for the immediate future have to be given to the contribution a site makes to housing land supply

The update Statement is a further consideration in support of a grant of planning permission in this case.

**The recommendation remains to PERMIT subject to the conditions indicated in the main agenda report with the additional condition referred to in the Supplementary Report published on the 24<sup>th</sup> December.**

## Supplementary Information

The following information was verbally reported to the Planning Committee at its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2016

### **Agenda Item 5**

**Application No. 15/00441/DOAHR**

**Land South of West Avenue, West of Church Street and Congleton Road, and North of Linley Road, Butt Lane**

The District Valuer, appointed by the Borough Council, has been unable to complete his appraisal of the viability of the development, having been engaged in extensive correspondence with the applicant's Cost consultants prior to the holiday period. No appraisal has accordingly been received by your officer. There is no suggestion that the appraisal would not be available in good time before the 2<sup>nd</sup> February Committee meeting.

Your officer has no alternative but to now recommend to the Committee that a decision on this application be deferred. The decision is for the Committee to make but for the Committee to decide otherwise and refuse the application your officers having delayed bringing this application forward for decision so that the advice of the District Valuer could be considered would almost certainly constitute unreasonable behaviour by the Planning Authority and be likely to lead to an award of costs against the Council. Alternatively to determine the application positively without waiting for such advice would be contrary to all guidance on the consideration of such applications.

**Recommendation – That a decision on the application be deferred to await the views of the District Valuer**

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Supplementary Information

The following information was verbally reported to the Planning Committee at its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2016

**Agenda Item 6  
15/01009/FUL**

**Application Nos. 15/01004/FUL and**

**The Hawthorns, Keele and Keele Campus, University of Keele.**

Members' attention is drawn to the publication today of the agenda for the 13th January Planning Policy Planning Committee which includes a report on a mid-year Update to the 5 year housing land supply Statement, and the Statement itself. The report notes that the Statement concludes as follows:-

- That there is an indicative land supply in the Borough of 3.97 years at the lower end of what is termed the housing need range, and 1.90 years at the upper end of the housing need range;
- That the Council's housing supply policies cannot be considered up to date;
- That this means housing applications should continue to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and with respect to such sustainable development granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts from doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted; and
- That in undertaking this weighing up exercise an even greater weight will at least for the immediate future have to be given to the contribution a site makes to housing land supply

The update Statement is a further consideration in support of a grant of planning permission in this case.

**The recommendation remains as indicated in the Supplementary report published on the 24<sup>th</sup> December**

**This page is intentionally left blank**



**SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**  
**TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**5<sup>th</sup> January 2016**

**Agenda item 8**

**Application ref. 15/00759/FUL**

**Former Blue Blue Inn, New Road, Wrinehill, New Road,**

Since the preparation of the main agenda report the applicant has submitted revised plans which amend the layout and house types for all plots. These amendments are considered minor in nature and it is the opinion of your officer that the proposed development remains acceptable. However, the local planning authority is required, by legislation, to give the Parish Council the opportunity to comment on amended plans (other than where the alteration is trivial) and as such they have been reconsulted.

The Parish Council have not commented and such comments are not due until 13<sup>th</sup> January. In such circumstances the Planning Committee, as decision maker, cannot lawfully reach a decision on this application.

**The RECOMMENDATION is therefore that the decision on the application should be deferred until the comments of the Parish Council have been received or the date by which their comments are due has passed.**

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**  
**TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**5<sup>th</sup> January 2016**

**Agenda item 14**

**Application ref. 15/01077/FUL**

**Former St Giles and St Georges Primary School, Barracks Road, Newcastle**

Since the preparation of the main agenda report and the publication of a supplementary report on 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2015 a further 4 representations have been received, objecting to demolition of the former school. The objections also raise concerns about the scale and appearance of the building to replace the former school on this site. Such latter concerns are not relevant to the determination of this application as the application does not include such proposals.

The **Conservation Advisory Working Party (CAWP)** objects to the demolition of the former school, built in the 1890's by North Staffs architect, Chapman. The building is capable of reuse and modification. It is historically significant and it reflects the character of the town centre and most importantly makes a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area and setting of the public gardens.

**Your officer's comments**

An application of the replacement building has been received today. It is not yet known whether this is a valid application, however.

The concerns expressed by CAWP and in the additional representations have been addressed within the main agenda report.

It has been noted that there is an error in the wording of the summary of the final recommended condition – the condition that is being recommended would read as follows :-  
*“The demolition of the existing building on the site shall not commence until a contract has been entered into for the construction of a replacement building on the site as shall have been granted planning permission and such construction works shall have commenced within six months of the demolition of the building”*

**The RECOMMENDATION remains as set out in the main agenda (taking into account the above correction), with additional conditions as suggested by the Environmental Health Division as set out in the previously published supplementary report relating to hours of demolition the submission, approval and implementation of an Environmental Management Plan/Method Statement, steps to be taken to prevent mud and debris getting onto the Highway, dust mitigation measures, etc.**

**This page is intentionally left blank**