From: Biddulph Town Council <biddulph@staffordshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 May 2018 17:01
To: Planning (SMDC)
Subject: Biddulph Town Council comments

Good afternoon,

Please find below the comments from the Biddulph Town Council Planning Committee.

If you have any queries, please let me know.

Very best wishes, Sarah.

SMD/2018/0157	Former bank 63 High Street	Change of use from bank to restaurant with take-out facilities.

Councillor Nicosia thought there were enough takeaways in Biddulph and was concerned about this application.

Councillor Court noted that there were 54 covers, meaning it was predominantly a restaurant, and not a standard takeaway. Councillors Court felt that Biddulph needs a good quality restaurant, but wondered whether parking would be an issue.

Councillor Harper wondered whether there had been any inspections or considerations from the Fire Service.

Councillor Rogers was disappointed this was a food outlet, but didn't want to see empty shops. A Councillor had once said to him that 'takeaways and hairdressers had saved this town'. He could see now that this was because they had filled empty units.

Councillor McGuinness was disappointed; this was a beautiful building. However, there were no grounds to object.

Councillor Redfern echoed what other Councillors had said, but the development of a restaurant was not a material planning consideration. He would prefer to see this as a higher-class restaurant.

Councillor Whilding noted that the development of a Natwest building in Barmouth had been very tasteful. A high quality restaurant was needed.

Councillor Court queried whether there was information about the opening hours; Councillor Nicosia noted that this was just an application for change of use.

There was a vote: one against, all others in favour of approval.

SMD/2018/0197	97-99 High Street	Existing ground floor unit to be split back into two retail units, including refurbishment of the ancillary accommodation. Change of use of the first floor currently used as office, storage and ancillary accommodation to one, one bed flat and one two bed apartment with separate access.

Councillor Rogers felt that the High Street needed retail units.

Councillor McGuinness felt that this was currently an eyesore, and a revamp was long overdue.

Councillor Court was pleased that there would be additional accommodation in the town centre.

All in favour of approval.

SMD/2018/0236	Meadow View	Single storey rear extension to existing lounge. Alteration to Well Lane existing roof to raise ridge height. New vehicular access point from Well Lane.

Councillor Rogers noted that this applicant had submitted variations on this application many times. The issue was around the roof height; SMDC had previously stated that this should not be raised.

Councillor Nicosia noted that the application noted that all the issues had been addressed.

It was agreed to approve this application, subject to previous concerns being addressed.

SMD/2018/0237	69 Cloud House	Construction of single detached garage and store Rudyard Road.

Councillor Court queried whether there had been any Highways considerations.

Councillor Harper noted that this appeared to be a sympathetic construction.

Approved, subject to no concerns from Highways.

SMD/2018/0239	198 Park Lane	Rear and side extensions with alterations to roof.

Approved, subject to no valid neighbour concerns.

SMD/2018/0242	6 Minerva Close	Rear single storey extension and internal alterations.

Councillor Nicosia noted that there was neighbour involvement in relation to this application, but they did not appear to be material planning considerations.

Councillor Rogers had been asked to speak on this application and noted that it was 'not neighbourly'. There was a disabled person living next door and this extension would be overbearing; this was over-development.

Councillor Nicosia noted that there was no space down the side of the house, even for a wheelie bin, and queried whether Councillors wished to refuse this application on the basis that it was overbearing and over-development of the site. All agreed.

Refused

SMD/2018/0261	2 Dorset Drive	Two storey side extension. Front porch extension.

No adverse comments

SMD/2018/0262	Bentley House Newtown Road	Proposed conversion of barn to form ancillary living accommodation

Councillor Lawson queried whether the size of the property would remain the same; Councillor Nicosia noted that it was the conversion of an existing building into accommodation.

Councillor Salt felt that the timber frames should be retained.

Councillor Redfern wondered whether there was a further process to go through before conversion; previously this would have had to be advertised as commercial premises.

Councillor Harper agreed with Councillor Salt in relation to retaining the timber window frames.

It was agreed that this should be approved with a recommendation to retain the timber framed windows.

SMD/2018/0266	37 Portland Drive	Two storey extension (approved under

		SMD/2018/0031) plus single storey rear extension.

Councillor Salt felt that, as this Council had used the services of the applicant, it was inappropriate to comment on this application.

There was a vote and it was agreed that the Town Council would not comment on this application.

Sarah Haydon

Chief Officer
Biddulph Town Council
Town Hall, High Street, Biddulph, Staffordshire Moorlands ST8 6AR

Tel: 01782 297845
www.biddulph.co.uk

Staffordshire County Council

A Connected Staffordshire where everyone can prosper and be healthy and happy

Find out more by visiting the Staffordshire County Council website.

Sign up for free alerts and newsletters straight to your email or mobile phone to receive county council news and information on topics important to you.

Save time and download MyStaffs mobile app available on Android and iOS

Follow the county council on Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn and YouTube

---

Disclaimer

This e-mail (including any attachments) is only for the person or organisation it is addressed to. If you are not the intended recipient you must let me know immediately and then delete this e-mail. If you use this e-mail without permission, or if you allow anyone else to see, copy or distribute the e-mail, or if you do, or don't do something because you have read this e-mail, you may be breaking the law.

Liability cannot be accepted for any loss or damage arising from this e-mail (or any attachments) or from incompatible scripts or any virus transmitted.

E-mails and attachments sent to or received from staff and elected Members may be monitored and read and the right is reserved to reject or return or delete any which are considered to be inappropriate or unsuitable.

Do you really need to print this email? It will use paper, add to your waste disposal costs and harm the environment.