

These Applications are for full planning permission for the demolition of the Management Centre buildings at the Hawthorns, Keele and for the construction of student accommodation at Keele University Campus and residential development at The Hawthorns in the village of Keele.

The development on the campus would comprise 453 units of student accommodation in two blocks at Barnes Hall to the north-east of the campus. A total of 147 car parking spaces are proposed at two sites on the campus in the vicinity of the existing and proposed student accommodation at Barnes.

The existing student accommodation blocks and the University's Management Centre at the Hawthorns site would be demolished to allow for 83 dwellings (76 new dwellings and 7 units as a result of conversion of the buildings to be retained on the site). A school drop-off point and a local shop are also proposed.

The proposed student accommodation lies within an area which on the Local Development Framework Proposals Map is excluded from the Green Belt, part of Policy area E8 (on development at Keele University and Keele Science Park), and lies within an Area of Landscape Maintenance.

The Hawthorns site is washed over by the Green Belt, although it lies within an area where "infilling", as defined in the Local Plan glossary, is permitted according to Policy S3. Saved Policy C14 on extensions of the Hawthorns Conference Centre affects part of the Hawthorns site.

The sites of the student accommodation lie within the Grade II Registered Parkland and Garden of Special Historic Interest at Keele Hall while the south-eastern part of the Hawthorns site is within the Keele Village Conservation Area.

Certain trees on the Hawthorns site and one tree adjacent to one of the proposed accommodation blocks at Barnes are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).

Station Road is a C classified road whereas Quarry Bank Road is unclassified and the roads within the University campus are private roads.

The 8 week period for the determination of the application for demolition expires on the 5th January 2016 and the 13 week period for the determination of the application for the construction of the student accommodation on the Campus and the residential development at The Hawthorns expires on 9th February 2016.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. With respect to the application for the construction of student accommodation at Keele University Campus and residential development at The Hawthorns (Ref. 15/01004/FUL)

(A). Subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 obligation by 8th February 2016, or 5th March 2016 if the applicant agrees to similarly extend to that date the statutory period for this application and application 15/01009/FUL, to require:-

1. Affordable housing provision of 25%
2. A financial contribution of £326,094 (or a revised figure to reflect the reduction in the number of dwellings proposed) towards education places at Madeley High School and St. Johns' Primary School, Keele

or such provision/amounts, and such reappraisal requirements, as your Officer may recommend in a supplementary report following the expected receipt of the views of the District Valuer

PERMIT subject to conditions relating to the following matters:-

Campus

- Development to commence within 18 months
- Approved plans
- Landscaping scheme
- Arboricultural method statement
- Tree protection
- Details of all facing and surfacing materials
- Construction Method Statement
- Development in accordance with details of Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)
- Details of surface water and foul sewage drainage

Hawthorns

- Development to commence within 2 years
- Approved plans
- Prior to occupation of the dwellings on the Hawthorns development, the Barnes development to be completed
- Provision of accesses
- Closure of existing accesses
- Relocation of dragons teeth and 3mph roundels on Station Road
- Provision of visibility splays
- Length, gradient and surfacing of private drives
- Garages retained for parking
- Landscaping scheme
- Recommendations of Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement
- Details of on site open space and play provision, including a timetable for provision
- Boundary treatments
- Removal of permitted development rights
- Submission and approval of a scheme of investigation and Implementation of Archaeological works
- Historic building recording
- Details of treatment of any newly exposed elevations of The Hawthorns
- Contaminated land
- Construction method statement
- Development in accordance with details of FRA
- Details of surface water and foul sewage drainage

- **Mitigation measures for protected species**
- **Timing of requirement to provide the shop building and the drop off facility for the school**
- **Details of all facing and surfacing materials**
- **Levels details**

(B) Failing the securing of the above obligations by the date indicated above, that the Head of Planning be authorised to refuse the application on the grounds that in the absence of such obligations the proposal fails to provide an appropriate level of affordable housing which is required to provide a balanced and well-functioning housing market and fails to secure the provision/maintenance of off-site public open space; or if he considers it appropriate, to extend the period of time within which the obligation can be secured.

2. With respect to the application for the demolition of the Management Centre buildings at The Hawthorns (Ref. 15/01009/FUL)

Subject to the issuing first of planning permission for the development referred to in application 15/01004/FUL

Permit subject to conditions relating to the following matters:

- **Letting of contract for redevelopment prior to demolition of the building and commencement of demolition within six months of the demolition of the building**
- **Details of the treatment of the cleared site following demolition**

Reason for Recommendation

In this revised scheme, the concerns of the Inspector regarding the impact on heritage assets have been addressed and it is no longer considered that an objection could be sustained on such grounds. It is considered therefore that the adverse impacts would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. Accordingly the proposal accords with the requirements of paragraph 14 of the NPPF as well as the overarching aims and objectives of the NPPF. On this basis planning permission should be granted subject to conditions and planning obligations, the details of which it is expected the Committee will be able to be advised of.

The draft report of the District Valuer setting out his appraisal of the development's viability is awaited and a further report will be brought to Members on this issue.

Statement as to how the Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner in dealing with the planning application

This is considered to be a sustainable form of development and complies with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Key Issues

1.1 Planning permission was refused in December 2013 for the construction of 453 units of student accommodation at Keele University Campus and for the erection of 92 dwellings at The Hawthorns, Keele (Ref. 13/00424/FUL). The reasons for refusal can be summarised as follows:

- i. Overdevelopment of the site
- ii. Poor design quality and layout
- iii. Adverse impact on the Conservation Area by reason of encroachment of development into a key open space and the loss of trees
- iv. Adverse impact on trees
- v. Failure to make an appropriate contribution towards education provision
- vi. By virtue of its height and location on a ridge, the impact of the student accommodation on the character of the wider landscape

1.2 Conservation Area Consent was also refused for the demolition of the Management Centre buildings at The Hawthorns (Ref. 13/00425/CON) on the grounds that in the absence of approved and acceptable plans for the redevelopment of the site, there would be harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

1.3 In July 2015 appeals against both applications were dismissed by the Secretary of State.

1.4 Planning permission is now sought for the demolition of the Management Centre buildings at the Hawthorns (Ref. 15/01009/FUL) and for a revised scheme for the construction of student accommodation with car parking at Keele University Campus and residential development of 83 dwellings at The Hawthorns (Ref. 15/01004/FUL).

2. 15/01009/FUL – Demolition of the Management Centre buildings at The Hawthorns

2.1 Since October 2013, Conservation Area Consent is no longer required for demolition of unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas. Instead, works of relevant demolition of an unlisted building in a Conservation Area require planning permission and therefore, full planning permission is now sought for the demolition of the Management Centre buildings at The Hawthorns. The key issues for consideration in the determination of such an application are whether the principle of the demolition of the buildings is acceptable in terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and whether the detailed plans for redevelopment are acceptable.

2.2 The NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. The Conservation Area is to be viewed as an asset.

2.3 The NPPF recognises that not all elements of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area should be treated either as 'substantial harm' or 'less than substantial harm', as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area.

2.4 NLP Policy B11, a policy that broadly accords with the NPPF approach, states that consent to demolish a building in a Conservation Area will not be granted unless it can be shown that each of the following is satisfied:-

- i. The building is wholly beyond repair, incapable of reasonably beneficial use, of inappropriate design, or where its removal or replacement would benefit the appearance or character of the area.
- ii. Detailed plans for redevelopment are approved where appropriate.
- iii. An enforceable agreement or contract exists to ensure the construction of the replacement building where appropriate.

2.5 The buildings to be demolished are of no architectural merit and do not make any positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In considering the appeals, the Inspector stated that the buildings detract from the Conservation Area and furthermore, their proximity diminishes the open character and setting of The Villa and Hawthorns House. She concluded that the removal of these buildings from within the Conservation Area would undoubtedly be a benefit in terms of the significance of the designated assets (which include Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) and the undesignated heritage assets (those buildings included within the Register of locally important buildings). It is not considered therefore, that an objection could be sustained to the loss of the buildings on the grounds of impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

2.6 Regarding the appropriateness of the plans for redevelopment, the Inspector concluded that although the buildings to be demolished are detractors, if the appeal relating to the redevelopment of the Hawthorns site was dismissed there would be no satisfactory replacement scheme. She went on to state that in the circumstances, the demolition works would be contrary to saved Policy B11 of the Local Plan and that in such circumstances it would not be appropriate for consent to be granted. The determination of the demolition application therefore turns upon that of the other application. If the

scheme for the redevelopment of the Hawthorns site is considered acceptable, then a condition would be required to ensure the construction of the replacement scheme in a timely manner.

3. 15/01004/FUL - Construction of student accommodation at Keele University Campus and residential development at The Hawthorns

3.1 As previously, the applicant has submitted one planning application which seeks approval for both the Campus and the Hawthorns elements. The report will first consider the acceptability of the proposed student accommodation at the campus, and it will then consider the proposed development at the Hawthorns site.

4. The Campus

4.1 A total of 453 units of student accommodation are proposed in two blocks at the existing Barnes development to the north-east of the campus. A total of 147 car parking spaces are proposed at two sites in the vicinity of the existing and proposed student accommodation. This part of the scheme is identical to in the previous application (Ref. 13/00424/FUL). In consideration of that scheme, the principle of student accommodation was considered acceptable by the Council but there was concern that the accommodation, by virtue of its height and location on a ridge, would fail to protect rural vistas and would have an adverse impact upon the distinctive character of the wider landscape.

4.2 The Council subsequently chose not to defend that particular reason for refusal at appeal but in her consideration of the appeal, the Inspector stated that while the new blocks would be substantial buildings, both would take advantage of the sloping nature of the site and would not dominate the skyline in the wider view. She concluded that in terms of scale and design they would integrate successfully with their surroundings. Given the conclusions of the Inspector on this matter and the Council's position at the appeal, it is not considered that it would be reasonable to object to this proposal on the grounds of its impact on the landscape.

4.3 The Council's Landscape Development Section (LDS) initially raised concerns regarding the loss of trees from the site stating that although many of the trees are not of high quality and a substantial proportion are relatively young, many are now beginning to develop enough to provide a more meaningful amenity contribution. In response to this concern, a Tree Replacement Strategy has been submitted which provides an assessment of the application site and wider Barnes Hall's capacity to accommodate new trees, provides an indicative plan identifying on and off-site planting locations and lists appropriate tree planting species. Further to consideration of this additional information, the LDS raises no objections subject to the imposition of conditions, and the issue raised is considered to have been satisfactorily addressed.

5. The Hawthorns

5.1 The site lies within the North Staffordshire Green Belt and an Area of Landscape Maintenance as designated on the Local Development Framework Proposals Map. The south-eastern part of the site (the Management Centre, its ancillary buildings and car parking) is within Keele Conservation Area. There is a Grade II Listed Building on the opposite southern side of Station Road and the former Villa and Hawthorns House are included within the Register of locally important buildings. Given the policy context, it is considered that the main issues for consideration in the determination of this element of the application are:

- Is the proposal appropriate or inappropriate development in Green Belt terms?
- Is this an appropriate location for residential development in terms of current housing policy and guidance on sustainability?
- Does the proposed development have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the setting of any Listed Buildings or any locally listed buildings?
- Does the proposed development have any significant adverse impact on the trees on the site?
- Would the proposed development have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the village or the wider landscape?
- Will appropriate provision of open space be made?

- Would the proposed development have any impact upon highway safety and would it provide appropriate pedestrian access to village facilities?
- Would there be any significant impact upon any protected species?
- Would there be any issues of flood risk?, and,
- What planning obligations are considered necessary, directly related to the development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, and lawful?
- Would some lesser or nil contributions towards the cost of addressing the above issues be justified given issues of viability?
- Do the adverse impacts of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole?
- Conditions

6. Is the proposal appropriate or inappropriate development in Green Belt terms?

6.1 The site is located within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. According to the NPPF the construction of new buildings inside a Green Belt is inappropriate unless it is for one of a number of exceptions including the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

6.2 This scheme comprises the complete redevelopment of a previously developed site that is in continuing use and therefore whether the development comprises appropriate development or not, is dependent upon whether it would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it than the existing development.

6.3 In refusing the previous applications and in consideration of the appeals, the Council accepted that the proposal was appropriate development in the Green Belt. The Inspector stated that when considering openness there are both quantitative and qualitative measures but the most useful quantitative measure in a consideration of openness seems to relate to the footprint and volume of the buildings themselves. She considered that there would be a significant reduction. The number of buildings would increase but they would occupy less space and would be smaller and lower than what exists at present. There would be buildings on parts of the site where none currently exists but there would be no impression of a material loss of openness or detrimental change in character. There would be a greater spread of development across the site but from many viewpoints the existing spaces between blocks are not apparent and the impression is of a mass of three and four storey development.

6.4 The Inspector considered that in relation to openness, in quantitative terms the open character of the site would be preserved and whilst in qualitative terms there is greater subjectivity, openness would not be materially diminished. She concluded that the appeal scheme would not comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

6.5 The applicant has undertaken a revised quantitative assessment for this scheme and given that the amount of development proposed is less than in the appeal proposal, the floorspace and volume reductions are greater when compared to the existing development on the site. On that basis, given that the Inspector concluded that the appeal scheme would not comprise inappropriate development, the same conclusion must be reached now. In summary it is concluded that the proposed development represents appropriate development in Green Belt terms and therefore there is no need for the applicant to demonstrate "very special circumstances".

7. Is this an appropriate location for residential development in terms of current housing policy and guidance on sustainability?

7.1 In relation to the appeal, the Inspector concluded that the redevelopment of the Hawthorns would contribute to the short term land supply deficit and that this represented an important benefit that weighed in favour of the scheme.

7.2 The Local Planning Authority (the LPA), by reason of the NPPF, is required to identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of housing against its housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where, as in the Borough, there has been a record of persistent underdelivery of housing, the LPA is required to increase the buffer to 20%. The LPA, in the opinion of your Officer, is currently unable to robustly demonstrate a five year supply of specific, deliverable housing sites (plus an additional buffer of 20%) as required by paragraph 47 of the Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), because it does not have a full, objective assessment of housing need, and its 5 year housing land supply statement is only based on household projections (to which little weight can be given).

7.3 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It also states that relevant policies for the supply of housing cannot be considered up-to-date if the LPA cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (as defined in paragraph 47). Paragraph 14 of the NPPF details that at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that this means, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF at a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

7.4 In consideration of the previous scheme for this site, the Council considered that the village represents a relatively sustainable location. It has a particularly high frequency bus service into the centre of the conurbation and a primary school, public house and a church within walking distance of the Hawthorns site. The occupiers of the proposed dwellings would be able to access certain services and facilities within walking distance and would also have a choice of modes of transport. The proximity of employment and leisure opportunities at the University would also potentially reduce reliance on the private car.

7.5 Given that the Council remains unable to robustly demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land, the principle of residential development on this relatively sustainable rural site continues to be acceptable. It follows that only if any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits (of the development), when assessed against the policies in the Framework, should consent be withheld.

8. Does the proposed development have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the setting of any Listed Buildings or any locally listed buildings?

8.1 The Inspector raised a number of concerns regarding the impact of the appeal proposal on the heritage assets. In relation to the impact on the setting of Hawthorns House, she was particularly concerned that the size of the open space in front of Hawthorns House would be substantially reduced through the erection of the 3 pairs of semi-detached houses facing towards The Village. Roadways would run along the northern and eastern edges of the open space and the proximity of the roadway and houses to the eastern elevation (of Hawthorn House) would be a serious disadvantage. She stated that the remaining open space would retain little functional relationship with Hawthorns House and its significance in terms of providing a setting for this undesignated heritage asset would be largely lost. She went on to state that this would also diminish the contribution of Hawthorns House and its setting to the significance of the Conservation Area. Whilst a treed open space would remain, its reduction in size and functionality would result in a serious loss of significance to the designated heritage asset.

8.2 The Inspector also had concerns regarding the loss of trees within the Conservation Area. She considered that sufficient trees would be lost to have a substantial adverse impact on the character of the visually important landscaped open space.

8.3 The revised application has sought to address the concerns of the Inspector with the removal of the 3 pairs of semi-detached dwellings from the greenspace between Hawthorns House and the road, the retention of more trees and the restoration of the historic setting for Hawthorns House. The impact of the revised scheme on trees is considered below.

8.4 The changes retain more of the open landscape and therefore the setting of Hawthorns House, its former parkland and of the Conservation Area. The proposal has removed roadways from around Hawthorns House and reinstated its setting by way of a garden and public open space. The revised scheme as submitted originally proposed two dwellings to the west of The Villa which were to encroach into the open space. Whilst the Inspector did not express any particular concerns about development in this area, these properties have now been omitted from the scheme enabling views from the road across the open space to Hawthorns House.

8.5 It is considered that the revised scheme successfully addresses the principal concerns of the Inspector in relation to the impact on the heritage assets and therefore, it is considered that an objection could no longer be sustained on such grounds.

9. Does the proposed development have any significant adverse impact on the trees on the site?

9.1 There are a significant number of mature trees on the site, many of which are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (No. 140). A number of the trees covered by the TPO are within the Conservation Area.

9.2 NLP Policy N12 states that the Council will resist development that would involve the removal of any visually significant tree, shrub or hedge, whether mature or not, unless the need for the development is sufficient to warrant the tree loss and the loss cannot be avoided by appropriate siting or design. Where, exceptionally, permission can be given and trees are to be lost through development, replacement planting will be required on an appropriate scale and in accordance with a landscaping scheme.

9.3 In relation to the appeal scheme the Inspector stated that the most important tree losses would be those occurring within the Conservation Area itself. She made particular reference to the loss of the mature Horse Chestnut trees that form the visually impressive avenue flanking the current access road as well as the trees to be lost to the front of the site which she felt would have a substantial adverse impact on the character of the visually important landscaped open space. She concluded that overall the number of new trees would be significantly less than those to be lost and that the mature sylvan setting would be substantially and harmfully eroded even in the long term.

9.4 In the appeal scheme 161 of the trees on the site were to be felled. In this revised scheme, 138 trees are proposed for removal but importantly a significantly greater number of high quality trees will be retained. Due to layout changes to the proposed access and within the open space at the front of the site, the trees that the Inspector made particular reference to would be retained. A total of 230 replacement trees are proposed including 53 in the Conservation Area.

9.5 The Landscape Development Section has no objections to the revised scheme and considers that it has comprehensively addressed the concerns relating to the appeal scheme.

9.6 It is considered that the mature sylvan setting that the Inspector referred to would be retained and subject to conditions it is not considered that an objection could be sustained on the grounds of impact on trees.

10. Would the proposed development have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the village or the wider landscape?

10.1 CSS Policy CSP1 states that new development should be well designed to respect the character, identity and context of Newcastle and Stoke-on-Trent's unique townscape and landscape and in particular, the built heritage, its historic environment, its rural setting and the settlement pattern created by the hierarchy of centres. It states that new development should protect important and longer distance views of historic landmarks and rural vistas and contribute positively to an area's identity and heritage (both natural and built) in terms of scale, density, layout, use of appropriate vernacular materials for buildings and surfaces and access. This policy is considered to be consistent with the NPPF.

10.2 In relation to landscape impact, the Inspector stated that there was no doubt that the appeal scheme would be viewed as an estate development and would undoubtedly be large in scale and

add considerably to the existing modest sized village. She went on to state that this would however, be countered by the removal of the incongruous and imposing accommodation blocks.

10.3 With respect to the design and layout of the development, she highlighted that one of the main criticisms of the appeal scheme was that it would be an inward looking suburban form of development which would be poorly integrated with the village. The Inspector stated that to some degree she agreed in that the layout would be mainly from a single access with houses grouped along cul-de-sacs. However, she went on to state that it is a sizeable site and it could not be expected to necessarily mirror the spatial characteristics of the host environment which has grown organically over many centuries. In addition, she pointed out a number of constraints including the shape and complex topography of the site and the abundance of trees. She felt that there would be a good range of house types which would provide an interesting and attractive townscape and a sense of place and that detailing has been taken from the local vernacular. She states that there is little harmony between the existing campus development and the remainder of the village in terms of scale, appearance and layout. Taking the appeal proposal in the round she concluded that the design and layout of the development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.

10.4 Although the Inspector made no adverse comment regarding landscape impact, the scheme has been revised to reposition garages that were previously proposed adjacent to the north-west boundary of the site. Buildings are no longer proposed on this boundary.

10.5 A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been submitted which concludes that the removal of the buildings proposed for demolition would have a 'minor beneficial' impact on the character of the site and the village. It adds that the development of the site would retain a good proportion of open space and mature trees and concludes that the impact of the development on views would range between 'minor adverse', 'neutral' and 'minor beneficial'.

10.6 Given the conclusions of the Inspector and the LVIA, it is not considered that an objection could be sustained on the grounds of impact on the character and appearance of the village or on the wider landscape.

11. Will appropriate provision of open space be made?

11.1 NLP Policy C4 states that appropriate amounts of publicly accessible open space must be provided in areas of new housing, and its maintenance must be secured.

11.2 In relation to the appeal proposal, the Inspector was satisfied that overall there would be a reasonable provision of amenity space, including around The Bowl. It would be publicly accessible, unlike now, and the provision of a children's play area would be a benefit in a village where none currently exists.

11.3 The current proposal provides a greater amount of public open space and now includes details of the play area. High quality timber equipment is proposed appropriate to the character of the site and its surroundings and the Landscape Development Section is satisfied with the play equipment proposed. The applicant has confirmed that the open space would be maintained by a management company as in the appeal proposal and this would be secured via a Section 106 Agreement.

11.4 Concerns have been raised in representations regarding contamination of The Bowl area. 'Phase I' and 'Phase II' Reports have been submitted for the site along with a covering letter. The Phase II Report (a more comprehensive one) states that given the likely extent of contamination in The Bowl, it would not be suitable for use as a domestic garden (due to plant uptake and digestion) without specific mitigation measures, but given that it is to be used as a play area, further testing is recommended and any necessary remediation works carried out accordingly. It goes on to state that the level of contamination does not give rise to concern and that any necessary works could easily be incorporated into the development scheme. The Environmental Health Division has no objections subject to the imposition of conditions requiring additional site investigations and on this basis it is not considered that an objection could be sustained on the grounds of land contamination concerns.

12. Would the proposed development have any impact upon highway safety and would it provide appropriate pedestrian access to village facilities?

12.1 The site would be accessed, as at present, from both Station Road and Quarry Bank Road, however the majority of the proposed development would be accessed via Station Road. There would be no vehicular link between the accesses. Provision is made within the scheme for a drop-off facility for St John's Primary School.

12.2 The current scheme proposes a slightly repositioned access from Station Road in order to retain important trees and 15 dwellings would be served off Quarry Bank Road compared to 13 in the appeal proposal.

12.3 The application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) which states that the development will be accessed by a safe and efficient vehicular access arrangement, the proposed development can be accommodated on the local highway network and the traffic impact will have a minimal impact on the junctions in the area. Information has been received from the Highway Consultant confirming that the two additional dwellings to be served off Quarry Bank Road would result in one additional vehicle movement during peak periods when compared to the previous scheme which would have negligible impact on the Keele Road/The Village/Three Mile Lane/Quarry Bank Road junction. Overall, the TA concludes that the development will provide a sustainable development in transport terms and planning permission should be granted in accordance with the Framework.

12.4 The Highway Authority has no objections to the application subject to the imposition of conditions including the requirement for visibility splays. Your Officer is satisfied that the visibility splays would not have any adverse impact on the trees.

12.5 In relation to the appeal proposal, the Inspector did not consider that the evidence indicated that the scheme would cause unacceptable risk to highway safety. Although the position of the Station Road access has moved slightly to the north in this revised scheme, given the conclusions of the TA and the fact that the Highway Authority has no objections, it is not considered that an objection on highway safety grounds could be sustained now.

12.6 In relation to the appeal, the Inspector stated that in terms of accessibility for non-car modes, the site is well located. There is no reason to reach a different conclusion now.

13. Would there be any significant impact upon any protected species?

13.1 An Ecological Survey and Impact Assessment has been undertaken and earlier surveys have now been supported by new survey work carried out in September 2015. The Surveys state that other than the presence of bats, there is no conclusive evidence of any specifically protected species regularly occurring on the site which would be negatively affected by the site development. In relation to bats, the Report proposes specific mitigation measures in the form of new roosts, boxes and tubes. There is no indication that the proposals would have an unacceptably adverse impact on protected species, including bats.

13.2 No comments have been received from Natural England but in relation to the appeal proposal the Inspector stated that in any event a licence would have to be applied for in due course for works that would affect bats. She stated that there is no reason why such a licence should not be approved and in any event a bat mitigation and monitoring strategy could be the subject of a planning condition. She concluded that in the circumstances there would be no harm to the protected species and the Habitats Regulations would not be offended. Given the conclusions of the Inspector and the more recent surveys that have been carried out, it is not considered that an objection could be sustained on the grounds of impact on protected species.

14. Would there be any issues of flood risk?

14.1 A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for the Hawthorns site states that the site is within Flood Zone 1 where flood risk is very low. The FRA concludes that the most likely form of flooding for the site is pluvial flooding, resulting from a sudden intense summer downpour, and any flooding is likely to be

concentrated to the south of the site within the low lying open space. A number of recommendations are made to counter the effect of any increase in surface water run-off from drained areas, and the anticipated effects of climate change. A Drainage Assessment has also been submitted to be considered in conjunction with the FRA.

14.2 In relation to the previous scheme, the Environment Agency had no objections to the proposal subject to conditions including a requirement to carry out the development in accordance with the FRA and the mitigation measures included within the FRA. Since April 2015 the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has become a statutory consultee on planning applications for major development in relation to surface water drainage. The LLFA has requested further information including proposed discharge rates and calculations to demonstrate that there is sufficient space for the required attenuation volume and the applicant is currently producing an addendum to the FRA. The LLFA has advised that with the additional details, it is likely that they will have no objections to the proposals subject to conditions.

14.3 Notwithstanding this, it is the case that in considering the appeal scheme, the Inspector was satisfied that planning conditions could require full details of the drainage scheme and also details of future maintenance and management. There has been no material change in planning policy since the appeal decision and therefore it is not considered that it would be reasonable to raise any objection to this revised proposal on flood risk grounds.

15. What planning obligations are considered necessary, directly related to the development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, and lawful?

15.1 Certain contributions are required to make the development acceptable. These are, in no particular order, the provision of 25% affordable housing (or a financial contribution towards off-site provision) and a contribution of £326,094 towards education provision (a revised figure has been requested from the Education Authority to reflect the reduction in the number of dwellings now proposed). These contributions are ones which make the development policy compliant and 'sustainable'. They are considered to meet the requirements of Section 122 of the CIL Regulations being necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

15.2 However, it is also necessary to consider whether the financial contributions comply with Regulation 123 of the CIL Regulations, which came into force on 5th April 2015. Regulation 123 stipulates that a planning obligation may not constitute a reason for granting planning permission if it is in respect of a specific infrastructure project or a type of infrastructure and five or more obligations providing for the funding for that project or type of infrastructure have already been entered into since 6 April 2010.

15.3 Staffordshire County Council has requested an education contribution towards the provision of spaces at St John's Primary School, Keele and Madeley High School. There has been just one planning obligation entered into since April 2010, relating to planning permissions granted for development, providing for a contribution towards St John's Primary School but more than 5 such obligations have already been entered into providing for a contribution to Madeley High School. The first five obligations that have been entered into since April 2010 in which an education contribution has been secured for Madeley High School, will be utilised towards a project to provide 2 additional classrooms, which will be attached to the dining room, which will also need to be expanded. Any subsequent planning obligations, including the one now being sought, will be for a different project or projects than mentioned above. On this basis, it is considered that the contributions comply with CIL Regulation 123.

16. Would some lesser or nil contributions towards the cost of addressing the above issues be justified given issues of viability?

16.1 The previous application for this site was accompanied by a viability assessment that was updated at appeal stage. The viability work was reviewed by the District Valuer and the conclusion was that the scheme would not be viable with contributions towards affordable housing or education. Notwithstanding the viability issue, the applicant agreed to make a payment towards secondary

education through a Section 106 Agreement and the same is being offered in relation to the revised scheme.

16.2 Your officers have agreed that a further viability appraisal is not required to accompany this revised application. Rather, the District Valuer has been instructed to undertake a revised viability assessment. The report of the District Valuer has not yet been received. A further report will be given to Members on this matter.

17. Do the adverse impacts of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole?

17.1 In her assessment of the planning balance, the Inspector concluded that the appeal scheme would have a number of benefits. These were a significant contribution towards addressing the undersupply of housing in the Borough, the removal of the unattractive buildings from the Conservation Area, the refurbishment and re-use of the historic buildings on the site, the provision of publicly accessible open space, a dedicated drop off parking facility for the primary school and a new permanent population to support existing facilities in the village. However, she considered that the adverse impacts of the proposal, namely the irreversible and serious damage to the Conservation Area, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

17.2 In this revised scheme, the concerns of the Inspector regarding the impact on heritage assets have been addressed and it is no longer considered that an objection could be sustained on such grounds. It is considered therefore that the adverse impacts would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. Accordingly the proposal accords with the requirements of paragraph 14 of the NPPF as well as the overarching aims and objectives of the NPPF. On this basis planning permission should be granted subject to conditions and a planning obligation, the details of which the Committee will be advised.

18. Conditions

18.1 Keele Parish Council has requested conditions withdrawing permitted development rights for change of use from C3 to C4 and requiring that if no commercial partner can be found for the shop, the building be designated for community use. In relation to the appeal, the Inspector considered a number of conditions that had been recommended by the various parties and stated that given that C4 (Houses of Multiple Occupation) is a separate use class to a dwelling house, planning permission would be required for such a change. She concluded that a condition would thus be unnecessary. Your Officer does not consider there is in this case the exceptional circumstances required to justify such a condition. Regarding the use of the shop, there is no evidence of a need for a building for community use and it is not considered that a condition requiring the use of the building for such a use is either necessary or reasonable.

APPENDIX

Policies and Proposals in the approved Development Plan relevant to the decision on the application (15/01009/FUL) for demolition:-

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026 (adopted 2009) (CSS)

Policy CSP2: Historic Environment

Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan 2011 (NLP)

Policy B9: Prevention of Harm to Conservation Areas

Policy B11: Demolition in Conservation Areas

Policies and Proposals in the approved Development Plan relevant to the decision on the application (15/01004/FUL) for the construction of the student accommodation on the Campus and the residential development at The Hawthorns:-

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026 (adopted 2009) (CSS)

Policy SP1: Spatial Principles of Targeted Regeneration
Policy SP2: Spatial Principles of Economic Development
Policy SP3: Spatial Principles of Movement and Access
Policy ASP6: Rural Area Spatial Policy
Policy CSP1: Design Quality
Policy CSP2: Historic Environment
Policy CSP3: Sustainability and Climate Change
Policy CSP4: Natural Assets
Policy CSP5: Open Space/Sport/Recreation
Policy CSP6: Affordable Housing
Policy CSP10: Planning Obligations

Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan 2011 (NLP)

Policy S3: Development in the Green Belt
Policy H1: Residential Development: Sustainable Location and Protection of the Countryside
Policy H9: Conversion of Rural Buildings for Living Accommodation
Policy E8: Keele University and Keele Science Park
Policy T16: Development - General Parking Requirements
Policy T18: Development – Servicing Requirements
Policy C4: Open Space in New Housing Areas
Policy C14: Extension of the Keele Conference Centre at The Hawthorns
Policy C22: Protection of Community Facilities
Policy N3: Development and Nature Conservation – Protection and Enhancement Measures
Policy N4: Development and Nature Conservation – Use of Local Species
Policy N12: Development and the Protection of Trees
Policy N13: Felling and Pruning of Trees
Policy N17: Landscape Character – General Considerations
Policy N19: Area of Landscape Maintenance
Policy B3: Other Archaeological Sites
Policy B5: Control of Development Affecting the Setting of a Listed Building
Policy B8: Other Buildings of Historic or Architectural Interest
Policy B9: Prevention of Harm to Conservation Areas
Policy B10: The Requirement to Preserve or Enhance the Character or Appearance of a Conservation Area
Policy B11: Demolition in Conservation Areas
Policy B13: Design and Development in Conservation Areas
Policy B14: Development in or Adjoining the Boundary of Conservation Areas
Policy B15: Trees and Landscape in Conservation Areas

Other material considerations include:

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (2014)

Circular 06/2005 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their impact within the Planning System

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010)

Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) as amended and related statutory guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance SPD

Space Around Dwellings (SAD) (July 2004)

Developer Contributions SPD (September 2007)

Affordable Housing SPD (2009)

Planning for Landscape Change – SPG to the former Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan

Waste Management and Recycling Planning Practice Guidance Note (January 2011)

Staffordshire County Council Education Planning Obligations Policy approved in 2003 and updated in 2008/09

Relevant Planning History

10/00531/FUL Construction of student accommodation blocks at Keele University Campus and residential development and an older persons care village at The Hawthorns - withdrawn on 7th March 2011

13/00424/FUL Proposed student accommodation with car parking at Keele Campus and residential development of 92 dwellings with school drop off point, shop and linked area of green space at The Hawthorns – Refused and dismissed at appeal in July 2015

13/00425/CON Demolition of existing buildings at The Hawthorns – Refused and dismissed at appeal in July 2015

Views of Consultees

Historic England states that in view of the observations made by the Planning Inspector in her report of July 2015 regarding the previous proposals for this site, they have no comments regarding the principle of development. They note that the applicant appears to have addressed many of the Inspector's previous concerns. The Inspector made reference to the local importance of Hawthorns House, The Villa and its associated Barn and their contribution to the significance of the Keele Conservation Area. Therefore, it is recommended that careful consideration is given to their renovation and conversion and in particular the opportunity to retain as much original fabric as possible. Given the presence of the Keele Conservation area and the Keele Hall Registered Historic park and Garden, careful consideration should be given to all materials, architectural details and finishes of the new development.

Regarding application 15/01009/FUL, the **Conservation Advisory Working Party** has no objections to the proposed demolition and partial demolition of the buildings within the Conservation Area. It is however concerned about the possibility of the demolition leaving an untidy and derelict site over a

long period of time and would like this permission to be linked to 15/01004/FUL and time limited via a condition. Regarding 15/01004/FUL, the Working Party approves of the attempts made to improve the setting of Hawthorn House and to improve permeability across the site. It also recognises the attempt to reflect the 'character' of houses within the existing village but members see the proposal as a missed opportunity for more innovative design with a 'greener' focus. The Working Party has concerns over the scheme and resulting increase in traffic within the village and sees the amount of houses as overdevelopment. The Working Party objects to the visual impact that plots 77 and 78 will have at the front of the site on the setting of Hawthorn House.

The **Urban Design and Conservation Officer** states that the building attached to the management centre does not have any special character that would harm the Conservation Area if it were removed. It is generally out of scale against the Villa and it will be beneficial to the area if it is demolished. The accommodation blocks do not add any positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area so it will be beneficial if they are removed. The extensions to Hawthorns House whilst historic, have been considerably altered in the mid-1950s and are not important enough to retain. Their contribution to the overall setting of Hawthorns House is not positive anymore and the proposals to take the building back to its historic footprint of the late 19th century is a beneficial change in terms of the character and significance of Hawthorns House which in turn is beneficial to the Conservation Area.

The Inspector highlighted the harm caused by the 3 pairs of semi-detached houses facing towards The Village, the associated parking and road and the impact of the proximity of the road close to the side elevation of Hawthorns House on the significance of the house and its views of the church. The amended application removes these 6 houses along the frontage and reduces the overall number of properties within the whole scheme but especially around Hawthorns House. These changes retain more of the open landscape and therefore the significance of the setting of Hawthorns House, its former parkland and of the Conservation Area.

There is (she writes prior to the amendment of the proposal) currently some contention over the two properties at plots 77 & 78 as they do impact on that part of the Conservation Area and open space fronting the village. It should be noted that in the previous appeal proposal 3 detached properties were proposed in this location in very regular plots, indeed the roadway was very suburban in this location. The current proposal has removed roadways from around Hawthorns House and given it room to breathe. There are some proposed informal pathway networks which will allow access around this open space and allow for some views of Hawthorns House. Development has been pushed back away from this part of the site and whilst plot 77 & 78 are at the front of the site, they are less formal in their orientation and could have a positive connection with the open space. Views are currently limited from the front of the site of Hawthorns House due to trees and shrubs. The current scheme will open up some of those views and allow greater access into the former parkland. There is concern that given the proposed style and positioning of the properties at plots 77 & 78, which are large detached mock Victorian houses, that they might compete with the villa. Most new build houses never mimic to the same degree in terms of quality of design, which may be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

It is noted that the tree issues have been dealt with to a greater degree and more trees are now being retained, specifically within the Conservation Area and those of a higher category. This will help to maintain the important landscape character which contributes to the special character of the area.

Staffordshire County Council Archaeologist states that taking into account the demonstrable archaeological potential of the area as set out in the desk based assessment it is considered that the development has the potential to impact upon below ground remains of medieval and later date. Consequently, it is advised that an archaeological evaluation be undertaken to include geophysical survey followed by targeted trial trenching, the results of which should inform the need for and scale of further archaeological investigations. The evaluation would only take place once demolition is complete and any grubbing out of foundations carried out as part of the demolition process. A programme of historic building recording should also be carried out prior to any works to The Hawthorns and its associated outbuildings and The Villa and its barn. This would most appropriately be secured via a condition.

Urban Vision Design Review Panel considered this scheme at pre-application stage and made a number of recommendations. A revised scheme was then considered and a summary of the main points made by the Panel is as follows:

- The applicants have made a positive response to the points raised by the Inspector to many of the points raised by the Panel previously.
- The Inspector was concerned regarding the loss of an important area of greenspace to the front of Hawthorns House. The now minimal loss, the removal of units from the refused scheme, the reorientation of two units and the relocation of the access road are all significant improvements.
- The revised scheme now shows fewer trees to be lost from the Conservation Area and the Arboricultural Impact Assessment considers that this new provision is adequate and appropriate.
- The amendments satisfactorily address previous concerns regarding harm to the setting of Hawthorns House and a weakening of its contribution to the Conservation Area. The revised scheme would in fact strengthen the presence and longevity of Hawthorns House, improve its look and create a safer more attractive place in the Conservation Area.
- The conversions seem to be an improvement on the existing.
- The loss of open space proposed will be minimal, the overall layout plan works well with good use of the 'Bowl' and with the setting and space in front of the Hawthorns being well handled.
- The overall layout plan integrates well with the retained trees and hedgerows.
- The introduction of extra heavy standard trees will provide limited short term impact and the management plan should ensure that these new trees are protected and replaced if damaged or destroyed.
- The area of adoptable highway around the Bowl has been reduced as suggested by the Panel. The road layout has an improved and acceptable variety of widths and surface materials and the adoptable highway is not a dominant factor. However an alternative material to 'black top' should be used in the site access road to provide a more distinctive and sensitive character.
- A range of house types has been developed with a good variety of size and form and good use of windows to prevent blank gable walls. However, the design approach is rather conservative and perhaps too sensitive to the setting and context of the development. The opportunity is being missed to add quality and local distinctiveness by contrasting new and contemporary bespoke designs with the historic character of the retained buildings. More variety in elevational materials with some contrasting brickwork or more render in places would lighten the approach.
- The shop is welcomed but the elevation is scarcely different from the houses. A different window and door configuration should be used.
- Category B trees can still be trees of considerable merit and category and should not automatically be considered lower quality.
- Overall, the layout, tree and hedgerow retention, open space and highway issues have all been tackled in a manner which is to be welcomed. However, the proposed house types will now be the weak link in what otherwise promises to be a well-considered development. Further work is recommended to introduce an element of high quality 21st Century design which enhances the character of the conservation area whilst not compromising the quality of the external materials used.

The **Crime Prevention Design Advisor** states that the Design and Access Statement for the student residences clearly demonstrates that crime prevention has been considered as part of the design process. Well-lit routes around the blocks will be provided and there will be overlooking of the paths and landscaped areas.

Although the Design and Access Statement for The Hawthorns development is less explicit about crime prevention matters, the site plan clearly demonstrates that crime prevention has been considered and crime prevention features incorporated. There are many positive crime prevention elements. Elements of concern include the number of footpath cut-throughs to Quarry Bank Road and that some boundaries need to be more robust.

The **Landscape Development Section** has no objections to the current scheme for the Hawthorns which is considered to have comprehensively addressed the concerns with the previous application. Comments are made regarding the excessive height of some boundary walls, the lack of overlooking to the public open space to the rear of Plots 31 and 32 and the need for more robust plant species around the proposed play area. Conditions are recommended requiring all the recommendations of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement to be carried out and requiring the provision of management proposals for the public spaces and play area.

Regarding the campus development there are concerns that it is proposed to remove almost all of the existing trees. With only minor layout amendments more trees in groups G1 and G9 could be retained. Larger growing species would be better suited to the site and the number of trees should be increased. Further information is required to demonstrate that the trees adjacent to Barnes Hall Road would not be affected by the proposed parking provision. Protection measures should be extended to protect the protected beech tree, T2. Conditions are recommended requiring a detailed Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement based on the recommendations of the Arboricultural Impact assessment and Method Statement, and a detailed landscaping scheme.

The **Highway Authority** has no objections to the proposed development. With respect to the Hawthorns development, conditions are recommended regarding provision of access and internal road layout, provision of visibility splays, relocation of dragons teeth road markings and 30mph signs on Station Road, provision of parking and turning areas, closure of existing access on Station Road, gradient, length and surfacing of private drives, provision of drainage interceptors, retention of garages for parking and submission of a Construction Method Statement. In relation to the Campus development, conditions are recommended regarding the provision of the access, parking and turning areas and details of secure weatherproof cycle parking.

The **Education Authority** states that the development falls within the catchments of St. John's CE (C) Primary School and Madeley High School. The development could add 16 Primary School aged pupils and 11 High School aged pupils. Madeley High School is projected to have insufficient places available to accommodate all of the likely demand from pupils generated by the development and is projected to have limited places available in one year group only. St. John's Primary School is also projected to have insufficient places available to accommodate all of the likely demand and is projected to be full in all cohorts in addition to any pupils from this development. An education contribution for 16 primary school places (16 x £11,031 = £176,496) and 9 high school places (9 x £16,622 = £149,598). This gives a total request of £326,094. A revised figure has been requested from the Education Authority to reflect the reduction in the number of dwellings now proposed.

The **Environment Agency** has no comments to make regarding the application.

The **Environmental Health Division** has no objections subject to conditions regarding noise levels, hours of construction, construction method statement, protection of highway from mud and debris, dust mitigation during construction, waste storage and collection arrangements and contaminated land.

Staffordshire County Council as **Minerals and Waste Planning Authority** has no objection.

Keele Parish Council state that this application is a significant improvement on the previous application as the Inspector's comments on the importance of the Conservation Area and the mature trees have resulted in a more balanced design with 10 fewer new dwellings. The proposals for Hawthorns House are welcome and The Barn conversion is an imaginative addition to the whole site. The Parish Council is also pleased that the revised layout has taken considerably more notice of the mature trees on the site and has made efforts to retain them and incorporate them into the development.

However, the Parish Council objects to plots 77 and 78 in the application. Both plots are in Keele Conservation Area in an area that was a principal focus of the appeal and represent a considerable intrusion into the open space. By projecting far into the open space these structures restrict openness and obscure views of Hawthorns House and so deprive it of context. The houses do not follow the boundaries of either The Villa and its original garden or the Conference Centre main building. The proposals at this point represent unacceptable degradation of the setting of a heritage asset. The

Conservation Area was designed to incorporate the whole of the green space which preserves the eighteenth century setting of Hawthorns House. The integrity of the entire area was fully recognised in the appeal decision. The only justification provided by the applicant for the intrusion of plots 77 and 78 is that by overlooking the green space the properties ensure 'good natural surveillance' but that can be maintained by other plots should plots 77 and 78 be removed from the plan.

A former planning application to develop in the garden of No. 28 The Village which is almost directly opposite the proposed plot 77 was also refused on appeal in March 2005 on the grounds that it would reduce the open aspect of the site and undermine existing views across the Conservation Area.

Two Planning Inspectors have now determined that development in this area would have an adverse effect on the Conservation Area and it is considered that these two dwellings should not be built. If these plots were to be withdrawn then Keele Parish Council would withdraw its objection.

All the conditions listed in Annex 3 and Annex 4 of the Inspector's report should be included in any planning permission granted with additional conditions requiring that if no commercial partner can be found for the shop, the building be designated for community use, withdrawing permitted development rights for change of category from C3 to C4, tree protection measures, and stipulating the use of hedges for boundaries. The Section 106 contribution agreed at the Public Inquiry should also be a requirement.

The development on the Barnes Hall site is welcomed.

Additional concerns raised by local residents are traffic problems, inadequate drop-off provision for the school, density of the development, closure of the pub, provision for bat colonies, absence of any major contribution to social facilities, contamination of the 'Bowl' and mitigation for bats.

No comments have been received from **Natural England**, **Severn Trent Water**, **Staffordshire Wildlife Trust**, the **Garden History Society**, the **Lead Local Flood Authority**, the **Waste Management Section** and the **Housing Strategy Section**. Given that the period for comments has ended it should be assumed that they have no comments to make upon the proposals.

Representations

Nine letters of objection have been received. Objection is made on the following grounds:

- The latest application does not address the issues highlighted by the Planning Inspector
- The quantity of student accommodation will go down and the average cost on campus will rise leading to more students commuting to campus and living in private rented accommodation.
- Highway safety concerns
- Impact of plots 77 and 78 encroaching into the Conservation Area green space obscuring the view of Hawthorns House
- Safety concerns of a children's play area over land that is known to be contaminated with chemicals
- All of the conditions agreed at the Public Inquiry should be part of any planning consent and should include the withdrawal of permitted development rights for change from C3 to C4
- Hedges should be used for boundaries
- The number of trees to be removed remains unacceptable
- Impact on bat roosts
- Keele University should consider the provision of affordable accommodation within the Barnes site

Four letters of support have been received. The following comments are made:

- The revised plan meets many of the earlier objections.
- The University needs more and newer accommodation and this development is part of the means of funding that.
- Having a residential development would enhance the village feel.

Applicant's/Agent's submission

The applications are accompanied by the following documents:

- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statements
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Site Investigation Reports
- Flood Risk Assessments
- Drainage Assessment
- Ecological Surveys and Impact Assessment
- Delivery Information Report (Bats)
- Tree Survey Reports
- Arboricultural Impact Assessments
- Transport Assessment including Travel Plan Framework
- Archaeological Report
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments
- Sustainability Statement

These documents are available for inspection at the Guildhall and searching under the application reference number 15/01004/FUL on the website page that can be accessed by following this link <http://publicaccess.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/online-applications/>

Background papers

Planning files referred to
Planning Documents referred to

Date report prepared

15th December 2015