From: Biddulph Town Council <biddulph@staffordshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 June 2019 12:48
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Biddulph Town Council comments

Good afternoon,

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

If you have any queries, please let me know.

Sarah.

SMD/2018/0038	High Bent The Hollands	Conversion of existing timber stables to Dwelling
Councillor Hawley noted that this was an appeal, but hadn't been received by the Town Council previously, meaning Councillors had not had the opportunity to comment. Councillor Hawley did not feel this was a suitable residential dwelling. Councillor Jones supported the District Council; it does not fit with other dwellings in the area. Councillor Salt felt this should be refused, based on the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC) report. Councillor Rogers felt this should be **refused**; all agreed.		
SMD/2019/0124	12 Holywell Close	Proposed single storey rear extension. Removal of section of shared double garage and construction of two storey side extension
Councillor Jones felt this looked like a neat job; there are already two windows overlooking the neighbouring dwelling. Councillor Salt proposed this should be **approved, subject to no valid neighbour planning concerns.** Agreed.		
SMD/2019/0128	88 Brown Lees Road	Two storey rear extension
Councillor Hawley felt that the boundary issues should be resolved, and the application submitted again. Councillor Swift noted that this seemed to have had an extension before. Councillor Garvey stated that this seems to be a disproportionate extension. Councillor McLoughlin noted this seemed to be the same depth as the neighbouring property. Councillor Garvey noted that the adjacent property must have been granted planning permission at some		

point.

Councillor Hawley queried whether this should be **refused until boundary issues are resolved**. All agreed.

SMD/2019/0158	Biddulph Grange NT Grange Road	Internal alterations to toilet areas to extend kitchen area and additional catering facilities within Camelia House Room
Councillor Hawley would not vote on this application. Proposed by Councillor Jones; seconded by Councillor Rogers- **no adverse comments**. Agreed.		
SMD/2019/0139	The Whitehouse Akesmore Lane	Proposed repointing of chimney stack and installation of double wall flue lining to inside of chimney. Replacement of rotten softwood windows with oak framed casements to same measurements as existing window frame
Councillor Hawley proposed that there were **no objections, providing the application met conservation criteria**. Agreed.		
SMD/2019/0191	Coates Farm School Lane	Erection of general purposes agricultural building
Councillor Jones felt this was a very large shed, but there is no legitimate agricultural requirement. Councillor McLoughlin felt this was a gross over-development. Councillor Salt recommended that this should be **refused on the grounds of over-development**; seconded by Councillor Adams and agreed. Councillors Rogers, Jones and Hawley abstained.		
SMD/2019/0199	65 Tower Hill Road	Proposed dormer windows to front of roof
Councillor Perkin felt that there is already a precedent on the street. Councillor Rogers agreed. **No adverse comments**.		
SMD/2019/0207	2 Lyneside Road	Garage conversion to habitable room
No adverse comments.		
SMD/2019/0209	30 Meadowside	Demolish single storey rear extension and erection and erection of double storey rear extension and single storey side extension
Councillor Hawley felt this application would be acceptable, subject to no valid neighbour		

planning concerns.

Councillor Swift had some concerns about the public footpath and noted that the yard appeared to be very narrow at the back.

All agreed that this should be **approved subject to no valid neighbour planning concerns and clarification that this does not affect the public footpath**.

SMD/2019/0225	24 Wedgwood Lane	First floor extension and two storey wrap around extension

Councillor Hawley had concerns about the size of the development.

Councillor Salt felt this was overdevelopment.

Councillor Hawley noted that this seemed to be out of character.

Councillor Rogers was surprised that there had been no pre-application advice.

Councillor Yates felt this was a similar development to the wider area.

Councillor Perkin agreed; properties around this are extended in different ways.

Councillor Jones felt this would improve the look of the existing building. Councillor Garvey agreed.

Councillor Perkin recommended 'no adverse comments'; seconded by Councillor Jones.

Councillor Salt felt this was overdevelopment; this type of property was needed within Biddulph.

There was a vote; it was agreed that there were **No adverse comments**.

SMD/2019/0239	255 Congleton Road	Single storey entrance area and rendering of existing building (resubmission of SMD/2018/0676 -Town Council comment -No Adverse Comments)

No adverse comments.

SMD/2019/0242	Mount Pleasant Farm Folley Lane	Alterations to existing garage to form office

No adverse comments.

SMD/2019/0244	The Orchards Overton Road	Application for removal or variation of condition 2 of SM.1910 (30.12.75) and condition 1 SM.3460 (25.02.77)

No adverse comments.

SMD/2019/0251	Corner House	Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of new two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Rendering the whole property to match the new

	Under The Hill	extension
No adverse comments.		
SMD/2019/0252	2 Potters End	Proposed detached garage and timber panel fence
2 letters of objection had been received against the above application SMD/2019/0252 and were attached for Councillors to consider. Councillor Jones felt that this would have a serious visual impact; the estate should be open plan. Councillor Yates wondered whether there had been a covenant on houses when they were built; this should be investigated. Councillor Salt proposed that this application should be **refused on the grounds that it negatively impacts the appearance of the area**. Councillor Rogers noted that there was already a precedent; an application of this type had been removed previously. Councillor Rushton seconded the proposal; all in favour.		
SMD/2019/0260	8 Greenway Road	Single storey rear extension
It was noted that there are other similar extensions in the area. **No adverse comments**.		
SMD/2019/0265	162 Congleton Road	Single storey rear extension, conversion of garage into utility and hobby room and detached garage
No adverse comments.		
SMD/2019/0266	46b Station Road	Application for variation of Condition 2 in regard to SMD/2018/0482 The toughened glass screen shall have a sand blasted surface to create a frosted translucent effect and appearance. At no time during the life of the development shall any part of this glass screen be removed or replaced with clear transparent glass.
Councillor Hawley felt that Planners should decide if this screen was acceptable. Councillor Rogers felt that transparency is not the issue; this is not structurally strong. Councillor Yates noted that this overlooks another property, and residents can look into the garden of this home. Councillor Yates agreed that this was not structurally sound.		

Councillor Hawley noted that the structural integrity should be considered. Councillor Redfern recommended that this should be **returned to Planners noting the concerns about the structural integrity and the neighbour concerns**.		
HNT/2019/0005	163 Park Lane	Single storey rear extension to existing dwelling (orangery) extending beyond the rear wall of the dwelling measured externally 4m, maximum height measured from natural ground level 3.6m and maximum height at eaves measured from natural ground level 2.4m.
No adverse comments.		

Sarah Haydon

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

Tel: 01782 297845
www.biddulph.co.uk

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.