
From: Biddulph Town Council <biddulph@staffordshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 July 2020 16:57
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Biddulph Town Council - Planning recommendations

Good afternoon,

Please see below the June recommendations from Biddulph Town Council:

SMD/2020/0139

Councillor Yates noted that this application was in his ward. Councillor Yates has spoken to residents, but has no interest in the application personally.

Councillor Hawley highlighted objections that had been raised in relation to the application; there was a consistency with these objections.

Councillor Yates felt that development within the town was positive. Accommodation for older people is needed within the community. Councillor Yates felt that there were too many properties at this location; there are seven parking spaces for six properties.

Councillor Yates believed there was a history of coalmining in this area; access via Tunstall Road is an issue.

Councillor Jones agreed with the points raised by Councillor Yates; this is a compressed site. Councillor Jones believed Highways would raise concerns. Councillor Jones felt this was over-development.

Councillor Redfern agreed that this appears to be over-development.

Councillor Rogers noted that there were issues previously about unstable land in this area.

Councillor Smith was concerned that there is no privacy for accommodation; there is a higher elevation on Tunstall Road.

Councillor Garvey was concerned that an area of mature woodland might be lost with this development. Councillor Davies noted that there are no Tree Preservation Orders in this area.

It was agreed that this application would be refused on the grounds of over-development and access concerns.

SMD/2020/0259

Approval subject to no neighbour valid planning concerns.

SMD/2020/0263

No adverse comments.

SMD/2020/0289

Councillor Hawley was concerned that the whole house should not be rendered.

Councillor Garvey had concerns about possible over-development.

Councillor Jones was also concerned about render; this would spoil the aesthetic of the street.

Recommend approval subject to no neighbour valid planning concerns and to raise concerns about the render finish.

Councillor Garvey abstained from the vote.

NMA/2020/0018

Church Lane Non-material amendment to SMD/2018/0621 to retain the existing house roof and fit a new hipped roof over the new side extension to marry into the existing house roof

Recommend approval.

DOC/2020/0050

Councillor Hawley proposed that this issue is left to the Planners to decide. This was agreed.

No adverse comments.

SMD/2020/0292

Members believed that tourist accommodation was necessary within the town. Councillor Hawley recommended approval.

Recommend approval subject to not contravening Green Belt Policy.

SMD/2020/0282

Councillor Hawley recommended approval subject to advice provided by the Conservation Officer.

Councillor Jones felt the development was good; we should not put obstacles in the way.
Councillor Redfern agreed.

Councillor Garvey felt this was a sympathetic restoration.

Recommend approval subject to feedback from the Conservation Officer.

SMD/2020/0276

Recommend approval subject to no neighbour valid planning concerns.

If you need more information, please let me know.

Very best wishes,

Sarah Haydon

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

Tel: 01782 297845

Mobile:

www.biddulph.co.uk

‘Garden Town of Staffordshire’

RHS Britain in Bloom, Gold and Large Town Category Winner 2019

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.