From: Biddulph Town Council <biddulph@staffordshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 November 2019 11:43
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Biddulph Town Council Planning Committee recommendations

Categories: Blue Category

Good morning,

Please find below the recent recommendations from the Biddulph Town Council Planning Committee. Any questions, please let me know.

SMD/2019/0523	The Old Engine House Biddulph Road Mow Cop	Proposed reinstatement of south eastern wing to the Old Engine House
No adverse comments.		
SMD/2019/0574	Drinking Troughs Overton Road	Repair works, reinstatement and replacement of missing finials, proposed new drinking trough adjacent to remaining trough
This is a Biddulph Town Council application; **no comment will be made.**		
SMD/2019/0575	322 New Street	First floor side and rear single storey extension
No adverse comments.		
SMD/2019/0595	13 Rudyard Road	Proposed construction of single storey side extension
Recommend approval, subject to valid neighbour planning concerns.		
SMD/2019/0603	67 High Street	Proposed refurbishment of the premise's frontage
Councillor Rogers noted that this goes against the emerging Neighbourhood Development Order. Councillor Hawley wondered whether the idea of 'active frontages' should be highlighted within the response. The document from AECOM had considered the need for more visibility into shop windows to create a different feel on the High Street. Councillor Davies felt that the Town Council probably could not object, as things stand. Councillor Smith felt it was encouraging that the business was investing in the town. Councillor Hawley proposed that **the Committee makes a comment regarding the Neighbourhood Development Order and active frontages but does not object**. Agreed. Councillor Salt abstained from the vote. Councillor Perkin stated that **the response should state what the Town Council is trying to do**.		
SMD/2019/0612	12 Moorland Heights	Proposed two storey rear extension
There was consideration of the additional window; Councillor Smith noted that this was not overlooking neighbours. **No adverse comments.**		
HNT/2019/0018	43 Newpool Road	Single storey rear extension
No adverse comments.		

There was discussion about permitted development.

DET/2019/0035	The Oaklands Dam Lane	Prior notification for a proposed steel framed agricultural building

No adverse comments.

SMD/2019/0554	14 Smithy Lane	Proposed two storey side extension to existing dwelling

Recommend approval, subject to valid neighbour planning concerns.

SMD/2019/0564	The Homestead John Street	Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 9 new dwellings with associated access, parking and private amenity space

Councillor Rogers felt this is an iconic building in the town. However, this development seems to create a 'little community'.

Councillor Hawley confirmed that this is not a listed building.

Councillor Yates felt this was not the best use of the land; the application should be considering energy usage and modern standards of insulation, etc. There should be an emphasis on renewables; there is no mention of solar panels. Councillor Yates noted that there was concern about access onto Gunn Street; could Doctors Close be widened?

Councillor Davies had concerns about the elevation. This is, or was, one of the better buildings in the town centre. It is necessary to protect the view up King Street; the development must be acceptable visually from the town centre. The frontages appear to face the spur road in the middle of the development.

Councillor Hawley noted that access was an issue and should be reviewed.

Councillor Salt stated that she has to look at this building every morning; she has seen the building deteriorate. That is the fault of the current owner; roof tiles were purposely taken out. The site had not been properly maintained. It is a 'crying shame' if the building is demolished; it has iconic features. It is not architecturally insignificant. The developer should be forced to use the house.

Councillor Smith agreed that this is a stunning building; this application appears to be proposing a minimum standard.

Councillor Salt felt that the community can prove it has significant value. It is over-development of the site.

Councillor Yates felt that the development was disrespectful to residents.

It was agreed to recommend refusal on the following grounds:

1. **Access concerns onto Gunn Street.**
2. **This is an iconic building in the town.**
3. **The street-scene will be ruined if altered.**
4. **It is overdevelopment of the site.**
5. **There are possible ecological concerns on the site.**

There was a vote; all agreed.

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.