

The application seeks full planning permission for a residential development of up to 32 dwellings

The application site lies on the western side of New Road which is a C classified road, outside the village envelope of Madeley and within the open countryside and on land designated as an Area of Landscape Enhancement, as indicated on the Local Development Framework Proposals Map. The site however does not lie within the North Staffordshire Green Belt. The site area is approximately 1.1 hectares.

Trees bordering the site are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

The statutory 13 week determination period for this application expires on the 19<sup>th</sup> April 2019 but the applicant has agreed an extension to the statutory determination period to the 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2019.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**A. Subject to the applicant first entering into a Section 106 agreement by the 31<sup>st</sup> May 2019 securing a financial contribution of £178,528 (index linked) towards the maintenance and improvement of public open space at College Gardens Play Area, a contribution of £66,488 towards school spaces at Madeley High School and 25% onsite affordable housing), PERMIT the application subject to conditions relating to the following matters:-**

- 1. Standard time limit for commencement of development**
- 2. Approved plans**
- 3. Materials**
- 4. Boundary treatments**
- 5. Finished ground levels and floor levels**
- 6. Submission and approval of SuDS scheme/ layout and proposed maintenance regime**
- 7. Foul and surface water to be drained on separate systems**
- 8. Detailed hard and soft landscaping proposals**
- 9. Dimensioned Tree Protection Plan (to include retained trees and proposals for protection of hedgerows)**
- 10. Arboricultural Method Statement (detailed) for all works within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of retained trees including for construction of the acoustic fence/barrier.**
- 11. Alignment of utility apparatus**
- 12. Schedule of works to retained trees**
- 13. Submission and approval of a Construction Environmental Management Plan,**
- 14. Design measures to control internal and external noise levels,**
- 15. Noise assessment**
- 16. Electric Vehicle Charging Provision**
- 17. Visibility splays**
- 18. Access road being completed prior to occupation**
- 19. Internal roads, private drives and parking areas being provided prior to occupation**
- 20. Off-site highway works - construction of an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing on New Road**
- 21. The access road at the junction with New Road shall have a maximum gradient of 1:15**
- 22. Submission and approval of surfacing, surface water drainage and delineation of car parking spaces**
- 23. The upgrade of two bus stops on New Road**
- 24. Private drives shall have a minimum length of 6m**
- 25. Submission and approval of a construction management plan**
- 26. Biodiversity recommendations**
- 27. Waste Management details, as per submission**

### **Reason for recommendations**

The design of the scheme, the impact on highway safety and the impact on neighbouring residential amenity levels are considered acceptable and whilst the site is located beyond the village envelope of Madeley it is considered that it represents a sustainable rural location. The adverse impacts of the development - principally arising from the extension of the village into the countryside – do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development, which is sustainable being on the edge of the village of Madeley with its facilities (a recognised Rural Service Centre), and accordingly permission should be granted, provided the financial contributions and affordable housing indicated in the recommendation are secured. Conditions to minimise the harm are also considered appropriate. Contributions are however required to make the development policy compliant.

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

The Authority has requested additional information during the consideration of the planning application to address specific concerns.

### **KEY ISSUES**

1.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a residential development of up to 32 dwellings.

1.2 The application site lies on the western side of New Road which is a C classified road, outside the village envelope of Madeley and within the open countryside and on land designated as an Area of Landscape Enhancement as indicated on the Local Development Framework Proposals Map. The site however does not lie within the North Staffordshire Green Belt. The site area is approximately 1.1 hectares.

1.3 Trees bordering the site are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

1.4 Members may recall that an application (18/00225/REM) on the site was determined by the Planning Committee on the 14<sup>th</sup> August 2018. That application was a reserved matters application following the granting of an outline planning permission in April 2015 for residential development of up to 32 dwellings (14/00930/OUT). The reserved matters application, following a site visit, was refused on the grounds that the proposed scale, size and massing of plots 7-12 (the flatted development) located within the southwest corner of the development constituted inappropriate overdevelopment which would not be in keeping with, and would be detrimental to, the character and appearance of the area and quality of the landscape by virtue of its edge of village location.

1.5 The applicant has submitted an appeal against that decision which the Planning Inspectorate has confirmed that is a valid appeal.

1.6 The application is for full planning permission, it no longer being possible to make a further application for approval of the reserved matters of the above outline planning permission. Since the outline planning permission was granted, which accepted the principle of residential development on the site, the revised National Planning Policy Framework has been published. The main issues for consideration in the determination of this full planning application are:-

- Is the principle of residential development on the site acceptable?,
- Is the proposal acceptable in terms of its design and impact on the form and character of the area, including impact on protected trees within and adjoining the site?
- Would there be any material adverse impact on residential amenity?
- Would the proposed development have any material adverse impact upon highway safety?
- Does the proposed development meet sustainable development objectives?
- What, if any, planning obligations are necessary to make the development policy compliant?
- 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?

### **2.0 Is the principle of residential development on the site acceptable?**

2.1 The site lies outside of the village envelope of Madeley, in the open countryside.

2.2 Core Spatial Strategy (CSS) Policy SP1 states that new housing will be primarily directed towards sites within Newcastle Town Centre, neighbourhoods with General Renewal Areas and Areas of Major Intervention, and within the identified significant urban centres. It goes on to say that new development will be prioritised in favour of previously developed land where it can support sustainable patterns of development and provides access to services and service centres by foot, public transport and cycling.

2.3 CSS Policy ASP6 states that in the Rural Area there will be a maximum of 900 net additional dwellings of high design quality primarily located on sustainable brownfield land within the village envelopes of the key Rural Service Centres, namely Loggerheads, Madeley and the villages of Audley Parish, to meet identified local requirements, in particular, the need for affordable housing.

2.4 Furthermore, Policy H1 of the Newcastle Local Plan (NLP) indicates that planning permission for residential development will only be given in certain circumstances – one of which is that the site is within one of the village envelopes.

2.5 Although the site is outside of the village development boundary it is immediately adjacent to it. Madeley is identified within the CSS as being one of the three largest rural service centres which are detailed as providing the most comprehensive provision of essential local services. Madeley has a primary school (Sir John Offley School) and a secondary school (Madeley High School, a specialist technology academy), with another primary school (the Meadows) in Madeley Heath, a village community centre (the Madeley Centre), public house, doctor's surgery, and a number of shops. It also has good road links to the conurbation, whilst also having links to cross border centres such as Crewe for employment and high level rail services.

2.6 Paragraph 11 of the revised NPPF states that Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

(Para 11(d))

2.7 The principle of residential development on this site was considered acceptable when outline planning permission was granted in 2015, reference 14/00930/OUT. However, the Council at that time was not able to demonstrate a five year supply of specific deliverable housing sites, whereas it now can with a supply of 5.45 years (including the appropriate buffer).

2.8 The Inspector in the Gravel Bank appeal decision noted that the village envelopes referred to in both NLP Policy H1 and CSS Policy ASP6 were defined in the context of a Local Plan that was not intended to meet housing needs beyond 2011, and furthermore the limit of 900 dwellings in policy ASP6 is not based on any up to date assessment of housing needs and is at odds with the Framework that reflects the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. He noted that a similar conclusion was reached in the appeal decision for Tadgedale Quarry. Therefore policies H1 and ASP6 should only be afforded limited weight and paragraph 11(d) of the Framework should be engaged. Applying this to the case in hand here planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the Framework policies taken as a whole – the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance (and listed in a footnote) not providing a clear reason for refusal.

3.0 Is the proposal acceptable in terms of its design and impact on the form and character of the area, including impact on protected trees within and adjoining the site?

3.1 Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Furthermore, paragraph 127 of the Framework lists 6 criterion, a) – f) with which planning policies and decisions should accord and details, amongst other things, that developments should be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

3.2 The scheme proposed is similar, in terms of its layout and the house type design, to the recently refused reserved matters application. However, this application now seeks to address the reason for refusal, which focused on the unacceptable nature of the scale, size and massing of plots 7-12 (the flatted development). This was the only reason for refusal and was specific to plots 7-12. Therefore the issue of whether the wider design of the scheme is acceptable or not should not be reopened for discussion.

3.3 The design and layout of plots 7-12 have been orientated by 90 degrees so that the rear elevations now face towards the western boundary rather than the southern boundary as it previously did. They have also been staggered in height to follow the slope of the land, which rises from the south to the north, and are two storey in form.

3.4 The change in design is considered to address the previous reason for refusal and your officers consider that this represents an improvement to the design and layout of the scheme.

3.5 In all other respects the scheme remains similar to the design and layout proposed as part of the previous reserved matters application and is considered acceptable despite concerns raised by objectors to the proposal which consider the proposal to be contrary to the guidance and requirements of the NPPF.

3.6 The Landscape Development Section (LDS) have been re-consulted on a revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and their further comments are awaited. However, it has to be acknowledged that LDS raised no objections to the scheme presented during the previous reserved matters submission. Therefore, appropriately worded conditions could ensure that protected and visually significant trees are not adversely affected by the proposed development. Existing TPO trees and natural hedgerows on the northern and western boundaries of the site can be retained and supplemented with additional soft landscaping, where possible. Additional planting on the southern boundary has also now been proposed.

3.7 Overall the design of the proposed scheme is further improved and the development would enhance the site and the character and amenity of the area in accordance with design principles set out in the Council's Urban Design Guidance SPD and the revised Framework.

#### 4.0 Would there be any material adverse impact on residential amenity?

4.1 Paragraph 127 of the NPPF lists a set of core land-use planning principles that should underpin decision-taking, one of which states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

4.2 The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) - Space Around Dwelling provides more detailed guidance on privacy and daylight standards including separation distances between proposed dwellings and new development in relation to existing dwellings.

4.3 Objections regarding the relationship of certain plots with existing properties on Woodside have been raised. However, the relationship between plots 1-6 and existing properties on Woodside remains similar to the scheme proposed in the recent reserved matters application and separation distances of 21 to 25 metres are achieved, as they were previously. These separation distances were previously considered acceptable despite the difference in grounds levels because there were no principal windows proposed above the second storey on each of the rear elevations of the proposed dwellings. Cross sections showing the relationship were also submitted previously and are again submitted. Therefore, it is again accepted that the resultant relationship would not be so severe that the living conditions and residential amenity levels, in terms of privacy, loss of light or overbearing

impact, to properties on Woodside would be significantly harmed to the extent that a reason for refusal could be justified. Therefore the issue of whether the layout and scale of the proposed dwellings is acceptable or not should not be reopened for discussion.

4.4 In respect of the block of six flats (plots 7-12) this building has been orientated by 90 degrees so that the rear elevations now face towards the western boundary rather than the southern boundary. The building also has a staggered height and the relationship with neighbouring properties is improved and raises no concerns.

4.5 Suitable boundary treatments and landscaping could be secured by conditions which would help to further reduce any harm to neighbouring residential amenity levels.

4.6 The Environmental Health Division (EHD) has raised concerns about possible odour and noise concerns from farming activities at Windy Arbour Farm and traffic noise from New Road. The impact of odour from the neighbouring farm was not raised as a significant concern during the consideration of the previous outline planning permission and it is not considered that a reason for refusal can now be progressed. Any mitigation measures to address noise concerns can be secured by imposing a suitably worded condition.

4.7 In conclusion, it is considered that a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings can be achieved and maintained, as required by the NPPF, and subject to suitably worded conditions.

#### 5.0 Would the proposed development have any material adverse impact upon highway safety?

5.1 Paragraph 108 of the NPPF states that safe and suitable access to a site shall be achieved for all users and paragraph 109 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts of development would be severe.

5.2 The previous outline planning permission for up to 32 dwellings also approved the proposed access arrangements onto New Road. The access arrangements remain the same to those previously approved and the layout, aside from the 6 apartments, is fundamentally the same also. On this basis HA raises no objections to the access and level of car parking, subject to conditions. These include the upgrade of two bus stops on New Road and provision of pedestrian links from the development onto New Road.

5.3 It remains, as it did on the previous application that the preference is for a footpath link to be proposed on the western side of New Road, which could link to the existing footway near to Woodside. This has been raised within the submitted Road Safety Audit and HA have requested the link also. However, trees and ground levels/ gradients have made this problematic and the only proposed pedestrian link would be the one outside of plots 29 and 30 which is accepted, as it was previously. This would provide a link from the development to the footpath on the east side of New Road, which would provide connectivity to the village centre.

5.4 Although concerns have been raised by other parties about the location of the crossing outside of plots 29 and 30, the Highway Authority do not share such concerns. The link should be provided before plots 20, 21, 22, 23, 28, 29 and 30 are occupied and this can be secured via condition.

5.5 Subject to the above conditions the proposed development is unlikely to lead to significant highway safety implications and an acceptable level of off street car parking is proposed. The development would therefore meet the guidance and requirements of the NPPF.

#### 6.0 Does the proposed development meet sustainable development objectives?

6.1 Policy CSP3 of the CSS indicates that development which positively addresses the impacts of climate change and delivers a sustainable approach will be encouraged.

6.2 Paragraph 148 of the revised NPPF also recognises that "Planning plays a key role in helping shape places to secure radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimising vulnerability and

providing resilience to the impacts of climate change, and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. This is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development”.

6.3 The application has been accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and a sustainable urban drainage strategy scheme (SuDS). However, this is only a draft proposal and a condition which requires the submission and approval of the final SuDS design will be necessary. The LLFA have not commented on the details but they did not raise significant concerns on the previous outline application and the principles of the scheme remain the same.

6.4 Environmental Health encourage the provision of facilities within the development for the charging of electric vehicles for each plot and shared parking areas. EHD indicate that this can easily be achieved by installing appropriate cabling and ducting during the build process. This will help facilitate the installation of EV charging facilities by the future occupiers. The applicant has confirmed previously that they will provide the necessary infrastructure and this is to be encouraged and can be secured by condition.

6.5 The provision of SuDS, electric vehicle charging and the pedestrian link to the development are positive sustainable development features to be taken into account.

#### 7.0 Planning obligation considerations

7.1 Certain contributions are required to make the development acceptable. These are, in no particular order, the provision of 25% affordable housing, a contribution of £66,488 towards education provision and a contribution of £178,528 towards public open space.

7.2 Staffordshire County Council when calculating the education contribution have excluded the 6 apartments. They also indicate, as they did on the previous outline planning permission for up to 32 dwellings on this site, that only secondary education places are required with the two primary schools having sufficient space to accommodate the demand arising from the proposed development. The requested £66,488 would be allocated to Madeley High School, which has had a number of previous S106 obligations allocated to it.

7.3 The Council's Landscape Development Section has requested a contribution towards the nearby College Gardens Play Area, as they did during the determination of the previous outline planning permission but the total now requested is higher than it was in April 2015 following the adoption of the Open Space Strategy in 2017.

7.4 The 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.

7.5 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.

7.6 Staffordshire County Council has requested the education contribution goes towards the provision of spaces at Madeley High School. More than 5 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 specific project to provide an extension to the dining area together with additional ancillary facilities, infrastructure upgrades and external works. Any subsequent planning obligations will be for a different project or projects than mentioned above. On this basis, it is considered that the contribution complies with CIL Regulation 123.

7.7 The request for a financial contribution towards College Gardens Play Area would also comply with CIL Regulation 123.

7.8 The applicant has agreed to secure the requested obligations via the completion of a S106 agreement.

8.0 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?

8.1 The NPPF refers to three objectives of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental. It also seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas and states that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of local communities.

8.2 The proposed development is for the provision of 32 new homes adjacent to the village development boundary of Madeley, which is considered to represent a sustainable location for new development. The site is approximately 500 metres from the village centre of Madeley and it is on a bus route into the village centre with the nearest bus stop being within 100 metres. Bus stops within the village centre offer good public transport links (no.85 bus) to Newcastle town centre, Hanley city centre, Crewe, Keele University and other rural locations. The national recommended distance for a suitable walking distance from a property to a bus stop is 400m. The catchment for a play facility is considered to extend to at least 400m and it is generally recognised in village locations that play facilities may have to be at greater distances. The College Gardens play area is approximately 455 metres, by foot from the centre of the site, via an attractive and safe route. This relationship is an acceptable one.

8.3 Whilst there would be some encroachment of the development into the open countryside, the benefits of the proposed development would clearly outweigh any harm with the main benefits being the sustainable form of development and provision of new housing in the rural area, including 8 affordable homes. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with the requirements of paragraph 11 of the NPPF as well as the overarching aims and objectives of the NPPF. On this basis planning permission should be granted provided the required contributions are obtained to address infrastructure requirements and appropriate conditions are used, as recommended.

## **APPENDIX**

### **Policies and Proposals in the approved Development Plan relevant to this decision:-**

#### [Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy \(CSS\) 2006-2026](#)

Policy SP1	Spatial Principles of Targeted Regeneration
Policy SP3	Spatial Principles of Movement and Access
Policy ASP6	Rural Area Spatial Policy
Policy CSP1	Design Quality
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 \(NLP\) 2011](#)

Policy H1	Residential Development: Sustainable Location and Protection of the Countryside
Policy T16	Development – General Parking Requirements
Policy N12:	Development and the Protection of Trees
Policy N17:	Landscape Character – General Considerations
Policy N20:	Areas of Landscape Enhancement
Policy C4	Open Space in New Housing Areas
Policy IM1:	Provision of Essential supporting Infrastructure

#### **Other material considerations include:**

#### [National Planning Policy Framework \(2019\)](#)

#### [Planning Practice Guidance \(March 2014, as updated\)](#)

#### [Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations \(2010\) as amended and related statutory guidance](#)

#### Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

#### [Developer contributions SPD \(September 2007\)](#)

#### [Affordable Housing SPD \(2009\)](#)

#### [Newcastle-under-Lyme Open Space Strategy](#) – adopted March 2017

#### [Space Around Dwellings SPG \(SAD\) \(July 2004\)](#)

#### [Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document \(2010\)](#)

#### [Waste Management and Recycling Planning Practice Guidance Note](#) approved in 2003 and last updated in February 2016

#### Relevant Planning History

14/00930/OUT Outline planning application for the erection of up to 32 dwellings (including details of access) Permit

18/00225/REM Approval of reserved matters relating to internal access arrangements, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping in respect of a residential development of 32 dwellings Refused, and now subject of appeal

#### Views of Consultees



**Madeley Parish Council** advises that they welcome the changes made to the original application. However, it still has major concerns about the access and egress to the site due to its proximity to the junction of New Road and Heighley Castle Way. The road is a "rat run" and the anticipated increase in vehicle movement will only aggravate the problems in this area. They also object to the scale and massing of properties that back on to Woodside and the associated lack of privacy the residents of Woodside would experience.

The **Education Authority** states that the proposed development falls within the catchments of Sir John Offley CE (VC) Primary School/The Meadows Primary School and Madeley High School. The development is scheduled to provide 32 dwellings. Excluding the 6 apartments, a development of 26 houses could add 5 Primary School aged children and 4 Secondary School aged children. They advise that Sir John Offley CE (VC) Primary School and The Meadows Primary School are projected to have sufficient space to accommodate the likely demand from pupils generated by the development. However, Madeley High School is projected to be full for the foreseeable future. They therefore seek an Education Contribution for 4 High School places only (4 x £16,622 = £66,488).

The **Highway Authority** now raises no objections following the submission of additional and amended information to address initial concerns regarding the car parking provision, adequate visibility and the footpath link. Conditions which secure the following are now advised;

- Visibility splays,
- Access road being completed prior to occupation,
- Internal roads, private drives and parking areas being provided prior to occupation,
- Off-site highway works - construction of an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing on New Road and provision of a 2m wide footway on New Road from the site access linking south to Woodside (which would require the removal of a tree covered by a TPO),
- The access road at the junction with New Road shall have a maximum gradient of 1:15,
- Submission and approval of surfacing, surface water drainage and delineation of car parking spaces,
- The upgrade of two bus stops on New Road,
- Private drives shall have a minimum length of 6m, and
- Submission and approval of a construction management plan.

The **Environmental Health Division** has raised concerns about farming activities at Windy Harbour Farm and the impact of odour on future occupiers of the proposed development. They have therefore requested further information on animal housing or slurry storage at the farm. Subject to this matter being satisfactorily addressed they recommend conditions related to the following matters;

- Submission and approval of a Construction Environmental Management Plan,
- Design measures to control internal and external noise levels,
- Noise assessment, and
- Electric Vehicle Charging Provision

The **Landscape Development Section** raise a number of concerns with the information submitted, particularly regarding the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment and the construction methods within root protection areas of TPO trees. Conditions are sought to secure a dimensioned tree protection plan; an arboricultural method statement (for all works within the Root Protection Area of retained trees including construction of the acoustic fence/barriers proposed for certain plots detail and sewer pipe installation); tree protection measures; hard and soft landscaping details, a plan to show the alignment of utility apparatus; and a schedule of works (to retained trees).

They also request a financial contribution for capital development/improvement of offsite open space of £4,427 in addition to £1,152 (per dwelling) for 60% of maintenance costs for 10 years. Total contribution £5,579 (per dwelling). The money to be used for improvements at the College Gardens play area, which is approximately 455m away.

**Housing Strategy** raises no objections and advises that 25% affordable housing is proposed and that this will be provided in the form of 6 no. 2 bedroom flats, and 2 no. 3 bedroom houses. 5 (60%) of the

8 affordable dwellings will be provided as social rented units and 3 (40%) as shared ownership units. The location of the AH units is also acknowledged.

The **Mineral and Waste Planning Authority** raises no objections.

The **Staffordshire Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor (SPCPDA)** advises that the layout is well conceived and there should be some inherent crime prevention benefits. They recommend that some boundary hedgerows to rear gardens are reinforced and thickened up with additional hedgerow planting which will provide secure areas. It is also advised that additional planting is proposed and a number of recommendations are advised, in particular securing the car port for plot 1.

The **Waste Management Section** raises no objections following the submission of further information and changes proposed which include a footpath from the bin store to the car park area for plots 7-12.

**Natural England** indicates that they have no comments to make on the application.

The **Environment Agency** indicated that the development is of a low environmental risk and so they have no comments to make.

**United Utilities** recommend conditions that secure foul and surface water to be drained on separate systems and the submission and approval of a surface water drainage scheme, along with a future management and maintenance plan.

Comments were also invited from **Staffordshire County Council Flood Risk Team** (LLFA) and **Staffordshire Wildlife Trust** and in the absence of any comments from them by the due date it must be assumed that they have no observations to make upon the application.

#### Representations

Nine letters of representation, including from Councillor **Gary White**, have been received raising objections on the following grounds;

- Loss of a greenfield,
- Lack of facilities within the village,
- The proposal would detract from the village environment,
- Safety of access and egress,
- Increased volume of traffic on surrounding road network,
- There is no access to the proposed zebra crossing,
- New Road is dangerous and will be hazardous for new residents to cross safely,
- Loss of light and privacy to neighbouring properties,
- The scale of the dwellings will be overbearing and contrary to development plan policies and the NPPF,
- The design would be contrary to the NPPF which sets out that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve, and that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.
- Additional tree planting on the southern boundary should be secured,
- Overdevelopment of the site and vertical stacking,
- There no mention of the archaeological remains in the top left of the field,
- Flooding and drainage concerns,

#### Applicant/agent's submission

All of the application documents can be viewed on the Council's website using the following link.

<http://publicaccess.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/online-applications/PLAN/19/00036/FUL>

#### Background Papers

Planning File

Development Plan

Date report prepared

10<sup>th</sup> April 2019