Public Document Pack

Date of Wednesday, 4th January, 2017 meeting

Time 6.30 pm

VenueCouncil Chamber, Civic Offices, Merrial Street, Newcastle-under-
Lyme, Staffordshire, ST5 2AGContactGeoff Durham



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

Planning Committee

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART 1 - OPEN AGENDA

| 4a Application for Major Development | t - 2-4 Marsh Parade, | (Pages 3 - 4) |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Newcastle. Westland Estates Ltd. | 16/00630/FUL | |

- 6a Application for Major Development Marks and Spencer, (Pages 5 6) Wolstanton Retail Park, Wolstanton. Marks and Spencer PLC. 16/00958/FUL
- 9a Application for Minor Development 5 Boggs Cottages, Keele (Pages 7 8) Road, Keele. Mr Thomas. 16/00969/FUL

Members: Councillors Burgess, Fear, S Hambleton (Vice-Chair), Heesom, Mancey, Northcott, Panter, Pickup, 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.

<u>Meeting Quorums :-</u> 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

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

Agenda Item 4a

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

4th January 2017

Agenda item 4

Application ref. 16/00630/FUL

2-4 Marsh Parade, Newcastle

Since the preparation of the main agenda report the **Environmental Health Division (EHD)** has provided further advice on acoustic information that had been submitted.

The amended acoustic assessment sets out that side windows will be removed (and replaced with brickwork) to reduce noise 'break in'. The EHD have indicated that this would address that concern but they still have concerns about the specification of the glazing and use of doors on the front elevation of the building on the ground, first and second floors. Therefore EHD still object to the application on the grounds that the applicant has still failed to satisfy their concerns about the impact of neighbouring noise sources on the residential amenity levels of future occupiers of the proposed flats.

The **applicant** has requested that a decision on this application be deferred to the next meeting. They say that this would allow further additional information to be submitted to address concerns about the impact and potential loss of trees and to provide updated information requested regarding acoustic details.

Your Officer's comments

Whilst it is acknowledged that the applicant's acoustic consultant has indicated that no windows will be proposed in the side elevations (gables) of the four storey building to address noise concerns no amended plans have been submitted showing this. The plans submitted for consideration, and determination, show a number of windows in all four storeys within each of the two gables which add interest and variety to the gables. For the avoidance of doubt your officers would not encourage four storey blank gables, particularly on the elevation that faces north because this gable would have prominent views from key vantage points, namely from Hassell Street and George Street, which would have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Your Officer consider that a condition could be imposed requiring all windows (and where appropriate doors) to meet a certain level of glazing specification and ventilation. EHD have advised that they will outline what this would be prior to the meeting and this information will be provided in a further supplementary.

With respect to the tree issue, the applicant has suggested that they could make further amendments to the scheme that they consider may mean that the Landscape Development Section may feel able to withdraw their objection. No such amendments have been received has been received from the applicant although they have written to the LDS and are awaiting a response. The applicant's request for a deferral would allow for further information to be submitted and considered by the LDS. These amendments have not yet been set out in a plan but they are likely to result in the three car parking spaces at the front of the site being removed, along with a dwarf wall. This would leave the development with a maximum of 7 off street car parking spaces (10 rather than the reported 11 spaces being currently shown on the site plan). Your Officer's view is that given the length of time that the application has been with the authority, that the views of the LDS on the scheme have been known for a long time during which the applicant has had sufficient opportunity to address them, and that the views of others (such as the Highway Authority and third parties upon such a change) have not been sought (and should be were such a proposal to be considered), the application should now be determined on the basis of what is currently before the Authority.

If the applicant does not wish the current scheme to be considered, they can withdraw it.

The RECOMMENDATION remains as per the main agenda report

Agenda Item 6a

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

4th January 2017

Agenda item 6

Application ref. 16/00958/FUL

Marks and Spencer, Wolstanton Retail Park, Wolstanton

Since the preparation of the main agenda report a further submission has been received from the **applicant's agent** in response to the consultation response from Stoke City Council. The response is summarised as follows:

- The amount of sales floorspace would remain unchanged from that permitted and there is therefore no policy requirement to apply a sequential or impact assessment to the proposal.
- The convenience floorspace would total 1,496 sqm which is significantly below the nationally set threshold of 2,500sqm. Furthermore there is no locally set threshold. Therefore it is clear that a retail impact assessment is not required.
- The inclusion Newcastle Town Centre health check which forms part of the application went above and beyond any policy requirement to do so and was to demonstrate the overall health of the Town Centre can be considered to have improved since permission was granted for the store.

Your Officer's comments

As the applicant's agent indicates, and as set out in the report, there is no policy requirement that an impact assessment of the proposal is undertaken and as such the absence of such an assessment in respect of the impact on Hanley Centre is not a ground upon which the proposal can be challenged.

The recommendation remains as set out in the main agenda report.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9a

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

4th January 2017

Agenda item 9

Application ref. 16/00969/FUL

5 Boggs Cottages, Keele Road, Keele

Since the preparation of the main agenda report the response of **Keele Parish Council** has been received. They object to the application on the grounds of inconsistency with current planning policy and also the previous appeal decision. Furthermore, since the owner (as referred to in N21248) no longer resides on the site, the enforcement notice should be implemented forthwith.

Your Officer's comments

The main agenda report addresses the matters raised by the Parish Council and there is nothing further to add. The Enforcement Notice that has been served, and is referred to by the Parish Council, requires the removal of the mobile home and associated paraphernalia by 13th January.

This page is intentionally left blank