

Public Document Pack

Date of meeting Tuesday, 8th November, 2016
Time 6.30 pm
Venue Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Merrial Street, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire, ST5 2AG
Contact Geoff Durham



Planning Committee

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART 1 – OPEN AGENDA

- 5A Application for major development - New Look Pit Head Close, Newcastle. New Look. 16/00712/FUL (Pages 3 - 4)
- 6A Application for Minor Development - The Offley Arms, Poolside, Madeley. London and Edinburgh Pension Scheme LLP. 16/00594/FUL (Pages 5 - 6)
- 7A Application for Minor Development - Land Adjacent to Sheet Anchor, Newcastle Road, Whitmore. G Donlon. 16/00609/FUL (Pages 7 - 8)
- 9A Application for Minor Development -The Coppice School, Abbots Way, Westlands. Shaw Education Trust. 16/00626/FUL (Pages 9 - 10)

Members: Councillors Burgess, Fear, S Hambleton, Heesom, Mancey, Northcott, Panter, Pickup (Vice-Chair), Proctor (Chair), Reddish, Simpson, Snell, Sweeney, Turner, G Williams and J Williams

PLEASE NOTE: The Council Chamber and Committee Room 1 are fitted with a loop system. In addition, there is a volume button on the base of the microphones. A portable loop system is available for all other rooms. Should you require this service, please contact Member Services during the afternoon prior to the meeting.

Members of the Council: If you identify any personal training/development requirements from any of the items included in this agenda or through issues raised during the meeting, please bring them to the attention of the Democratic Services Officer at the close of the meeting.

Meeting Quorums :- 16+= 5 Members; 10-15=4 Members; 5-9=3 Members; 5 or less = 2 Members.

FIELD_TITLE



Working to be a co-operative council

Contacting the Council:

Switchboard 01782 717717 . Fax 01782 711032 DX 20959 . Text 07800 140048
Email webmaster@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk

Officers will be in attendance prior to the meeting for informal discussions on agenda items.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

8th November 2016

Agenda item 5

Application ref. 16/00712/FUL

New Look, Pit Head Close, Newcastle

Since the preparation of the main agenda report the applicant has submitted further drainage details and a draft Unilateral Undertaking (UU) for the Travel Plan Monitoring Sum.

The drainage details have been forwarded on to the County Council Flood Risk Team for comment and any comments received prior to the committee will be reported. If no comments are received then the drainage condition advised in the main agenda report remains necessary.

Consideration is being given to the acceptability of the UU and further information will be provided in this regard.

The RECOMMENDATION remains as per the main agenda report

This page is intentionally left blank

FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

8th November 2016

Agenda item 6

Application ref. 16/00594/FUL

The Offley Arms, Poolside, Madeley

Since the preparation of the main agenda report both **Madeley Parish Council** and the **Environmental Health Division** (EHD) have provided further comments following the submission of amended and additional information.

The **Parish Council** advises that they maintain their objection and that the amendments do not address the access issues to and from the car park and houses which is restricted to 1 cars width. Additionally the number of car parking spaces is 24 and this is below the planning guidelines of 30 for the size of public house. This reduction could impact on the long-term viability of The Offley Arms public house.

EHD raise no objections subject to a condition that the glazing and ventilation systems indicated in the noise assessment should be installed and maintained. They also advise that a condition regarding the prior approval of any mechanical ventilation system, or passive input ventilation system is necessary.

One further **objection** letter has been received contesting the validity of the car parking survey which does not take into account previous events (fun days, birthday parties and funerals) when car parking is a significant problem. It is stated that local plan car parking standards should be maintained.

Your Officer's comments

As stated within the main agenda report the applicant has submitted a car parking survey which indicates that the existing car park for the public house is under used, with only 9 spaces in use at the weekends. Therefore whilst 11 spaces would be lost as a result of the proposed development the remaining 24 spaces for the public house would be sufficient and appropriate for this sustainable rural location.

It is noted and accepted that at certain times, primarily special events, car parking demand would be high however it would not be appropriate to require that the level of parking provided for the public house should be sufficient to accommodate the level of parking for such infrequent events. It is appropriate, however, to assess whether the proposal against Policy T16 of the Local Plan and whether the level of parking is significantly less than the maximum and whether this will create or aggravate a local on-street parking or traffic problem. In this case, based upon the floorspace of the public house, a maximum of 30 spaces are required and given the evidence from the survey this is sufficient for most of the year. As such the proposal complies with Policy T16.

The Highways Authority has raised no issues with the existing access width and it is not considered that a refusal could be sustained on these grounds.

The most up to date planning advice on highway safety matters is contained within the NPPF. The NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of the development are severe.

The view of your officers is that the applicant has demonstrated that an acceptable level of off street car parking would be provided and that the proposed development could not be said to cause severe highway safety implications.

The RECOMMENDATION remains as per the main agenda report but with an additional condition to secure the prior approval of any mechanical ventilation system, or passive input ventilation system to the dwellings.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
8th November 2016

Agenda item 7

Application ref. 16/00609/FUL

Land adjacent Sheet Anchor, Baldwins Gate

Since the main agenda report as draft viability assessment has been received from the **District Valuer (DV)**.

The advice of the DV relates to:

- the level of commuted sum required for two affordable housing social rented units, as required by policy, off-site of broadly equivalent value to the provision of such houses on-site, and
- an assessment of the viability of the development taking into account off-site affordable housing and public open space contributions.

The commuted sum figure is calculated as the difference between:

1. the residual land value of the proposed scheme with no on-site affordable housing taking into account any financial contributions as required by policy (which in this case is a public open space contribution of £20,601), and which the DV has assessed to be £376,446; and
2. the residual land value of the development which includes the policy requirement of 2 social rented affordable housing units on site again taking into consideration financial contributions required by policy, and which the DV has assessed to be £156,651;

This equates to a financial contribution of **£219,795** to provide affordable houses off-site.

The DV has gone on to advise, having taken into account the public open space contribution (£20,601) and affordable housing requirement, that the residual land value of the scheme is significantly lower than the site value (£450,000). The conclusion is therefore that the proposed scheme is unviable.

Notwithstanding the conclusion of the DV that the scheme is not viable, the assessment recommends that the £40,000 payment offered by the application should be accepted.

Your Officer's comments

The draft report from the DV has very recently been received and consideration is still being given to the site value and special assumptions that are included by the DV to establish whether any further questions need to be put to the DV or amendments sought to the assessment undertaken. If that proves necessary the conclusions of the DV may change. In addition, assuming the conclusion remains that the proposed scheme is unviable, further consideration is required as to whether the £40,000 contribution offered by the developer should be accepted and what that money should be spent on.

As such a further supplementary report will therefore be necessary to report any additional advice that may be received from the District Valuer and, dependent upon that advice, reach a recommendation as to whether the application should be permitted without part or all of the policy compliant contributions.

This page is intentionally left blank

FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
8th November 2016

Agenda item 9

Application ref. 16/00626/FUL

The Coppice, Abbots Way, Westlands

Since the main agenda report 2 further letters of representation have been received raising concerns in relation to:-

- The objection to the height remains and the use of dark or light grey cladding would be inappropriate. If compromise can be reached on the height and a wood effect cladding used, an acceptable solution can be attained.
- A screening fence within the site should be erected to give residents and children privacy.
- There is not sufficient screening of the development particularly when the deciduous trees have lost their leaves. Such a strident and incongruous building should not be placed in this parkland setting.

Your officers advice

Consideration is given, in the main agenda report, to the acceptability of the proposed cladding and your officer's opinion remains that either a light or a dark metal cladding would be appropriate.

It would not be reasonable to require the erection of a screen fence as the issue of privacy that has been raised relates to the existing use of the school sports field which will not be fundamentally change as a result of the development. Such a requirement does not relate to the development and therefore would not meet the tests for the imposition of conditions.

The RECOMMENDATION remains as per the main agenda.

This page is intentionally left blank