From:	Biddulph Town Council
To:	Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject:	Biddulph Planning recommendations
Date:	07 September 2020 14:21:32

Good afternoon,

Below are the most recent planning recommendations from Biddulph Town Council:

SMD/2020/0301	Mr George Brown Aldi Stores Limited	Development of a new food store (use class A1), associated parking, accessing, servicing and landscaping at Former Meadows School Site off Meadows Way

There was discussion about the relationship between Aldi and James Bateman Middle School, and the possibility of a land-swap.

Councillor Yates felt this was a necessary development, but there seemed to be discrepancies with the details. Councillor Yates questioned the validity of the geological survey, which seemed to be for the alternative site.

Councillor Yates noted that there were 25 staff and only four parking spaces. There was potential that this could overspill into the local streets. It would be beneficial to have a final exploratory conversation with regard to a land swap. The Town Council should work towards getting this development completely right, not nearly right.

Councillor Yates noted this was a delegated decision at the District Council; the application should go to the Planning Committee.

Councillor Smith stated that her daughter would attend James Bateman in the Autumn and was concerned about access issues that had been raised. Councillor Smith was also concerned about the aesthetics; red brick and cladding would not be appropriate in this location. There is a Green Belt back-drop; there should be a more natural appearance.

Councillor Jones agreed; the utilitarian, retail park look should be replaces with wood and/ or stone. Councillor Jones agreed that this should go to the Planning Committee.

Councillor Jackson agreed, and added that it would be a much better development if a land swap was possible. This development would be poor for foot and bus access.

The Town Council pays for the 93-bus service; access for people using public transport would be preferable. It may also be possible to have a footway from the Biddulph Valley Way.

Councillor Rogers did not want to lose Aldi in the town, but agreed that changes were necessary. A bus stop should be considered.

Councillor Garvey did not feel the access was sufficient and wondered whether there could be better use of the second access road.

Councillor Hawley summed up the discussion. This is the Garden Town of Staffordshire; the standard Aldi look is not ideal. Bus access is also unclear. Councillor Hawley noted that there were policies in the Regulation 16 version of the Neighbourhood Plan, which were relevant:

NE 2: URBAN EDGE New development on the edge of the Biddulph Town and rural settlements must incorporate sensitively designed boundary treatments and landscaping to create an appropriate transition to the rural environment.
INTERPRETATION This policy requires sensitive boundary treatments to create a 'soft' transition, such as hedges and planting. Hard boundary treatments, such as concrete and timber close boarded fencing, would not be appropriate.

NE 5: PROTECTION OF VIEWS OF LOCAL IMPORTANCE This policy aims to preserve or enhance significant local views of important buildings, townscape, and skylines within the built and natural environment of Biddulph Town Centre. The following views and vistas (see below) have been identified as being locally important, visible from the town centre:
1. From the Inner Relief Road towards Mow Cop;
2. From the Inner Relief Road north towards Biddulph Town Centre;
3. Well Street towards Mow Cop;
4. John Street towards the north;
5. Wharf Road towards Mow Cop;
6. Wharf Road roundabout towards Mow Cop;
7. Station Road towards the north;
8. War memorial towards the north;
9. South View towards the west;
10. Between 66 and 68 High Street (currently Wetherspoons and B&M).

The Design and Access Statement that supports planning applications for developments that may affect these views and vistas must demonstrate how the proposal would preserve or enhance them.
INTERPRETATION This policy seeks to protect key views within Biddulph Town Centre and vistas towards the open countryside.

INF 1: CRITICAL ROAD JUNCTIONS In considering whether development would have and severe adverse impact on road capacity or safety, particular regard should be made to the following congestion pressure points:
• A527- Newpool Road
• A527- Park Lane
• A527- Tunstall Road
• A527- St Johns Road

INF 3: COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE In considering allocation of CIL or section 106 monies, the following infrastructure priorities should be considered:
• Adequate and proper provision for surface water and foul water management;
• Areas that currently experience flooding.
• Schemes that provide innovative planting and improvements to bio-diversity will be encouraged;
• Provide better linkages to national cycle network, including the Biddulph Valley Way, Route 55;
• Provision of improved access to public transport;
• Provision of new Local Green Spaces, including formal park space;
• Sensory garden;
• Play facilities, including those for older young people;
• Creative space, including entertainment facility and expansion of heritage facilities within the town centre and improvements in public realm.
• Sites and opportunities to enhance areas shown on the Nature Recovery and Wildlife Corridors Map (see Opportunities in Appendix F)
• Improve or enhance the Biddulph Valley Way for the enjoyment of the community and natural habitat value.
In allocating Section 106 financial contributions made against local plan policy requirements, similar priorities are encouraged.

DES 1: DESIGN New development must complement the local context and be sustainable. Development must:
• complement the existing character and townscape in terms of scale and massing;
• complement the established layout in terms of set-back from the road and spacing around dwellings;
• use high quality, authentic durable materials, to complement the site, character and surrounding context;
• provide sustainable drainage and permeable surfaces in hard landscaped areas;
• provide screened storage space for bins and recycling. Authentic, distinctive, site-specific architectural solutions will be encouraged, especially innovative designs in terms of building energy performance.
INTERPRETATION Design and access statements submitted with planning applications should make clear how the requirements of this policy have been met. In terms of high-quality materials, the policy would be met by authentic local materials and other durable materials with a high standard of finish and durability.

Councillor Rogers was also concerned that the parent and child spaces were next to the delivery entrance.

Councillor Smith agreed; these spaces are in the wrong place.

Councillor Redfern noted that the ward Councillors would need to request that this goes to the District Council Planning Committee. Councillor Yates would

call this in, liaising with Councillor Hawley about the content of the call-in.

Councillor Hawley noted that there had not been a Highways response.

Councillor Hawley queried what the Committee would like to do. The issues are:

- **Can the land swap be resurrected?**
- **This application should be considered by the Planning Committee**
- **Aesthetics of the building should be considered**
- **Can the Pocket Park be used for parking?**
- **There should be a bus stop**
- **There should be consideration of the Neighbourhood Plan policies**
- **Parent/ child parking is in the wrong place**
- **What will the old road be used for?**
- **Further information is required from Highways.**

In principle, the Committee were in favour of the application.

Councillor Hawley felt it was important to meet with Aldi; they do not have local knowledge, and it must be right.

Councillor Jones supported the idea of a meeting. This should be approved, with a list of concerns.

Councillor Rushton felt this store should encourage footfall into the town.

It was agreed that a meeting should be requested as soon as possible. This would be actioned forthwith.

SMD/2020/0336	22 Halls Road Biddulph	Single storey side extension to the rear of the property to the extend the kitchen. Measuring 3800 x 1200 x 2400 (at eaves) matching existing building - roof/materials, with 1 full height window.
Approved, subject to valid neighbour planning concerns.		
SMD/2020/0283	The Old Engine House Biddulph Road Mow Cop	Listed building consent for a proposed re-instatement of south eastern wing. Re-submission following approval under SMD/2019/0523 and SMD/2019/0524
Recommend approval.		
SMD/2020/0306	95 Hillview Cottage Woodhouse Lane Biddulph	Replacement of existing timber framed general purpose domestic storage building with new steel frame new build.

Councillor Garvey noted that the existing building is an eyesore; Councillor Jones agreed.

Recommend approval, subject to not contravening the greenbelt restrictions.

SMD/2020/0348	Hilberie Lodge Barn Road Knypersley	Provide new flat roofed detached garage set into existing garden

Approved, subject to valid neighbour planning concerns.

DOC/2020/0051	121 Tunstall Road Knypersley	Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28 in relation to SMD/2017/0510

It was agreed to recommend that the Planning Officer determine if this is appropriate.

SMD/2020/0345	44 Newpool Road Knypersley	Construction of two storey side extension over existing garage.

Approved, subject to valid neighbour planning concerns.

SMD/2020/0316	Smithy Farm Dial Lane Congleton	Proposed replacement agricultural buildings

Councillor Hawley noted that this did not contravene the Green Belt.

There was discussion about the use of the building; this is a working farm

Recommend approval.

SMD/2020/0331	227 Tunstall Road Knypersley	Proposed two storey extension to side to form new bedroom, bathroom, kitchen, utility and shower room

It was noted that the neighbour's property should be protected during construction.

Approved, subject to valid neighbour planning concerns.

SMD/2020/0314	13 Marsh Green Road Biddulph	Demolition of Garage and Conservatory and Erection a New Garage and Single Storey Rear Extension

Recommend approval.

SMD/2020/0354	4, Dylan Road, Biddulph,	Lawful development certificate for a proposed single storey side extension less than half the width of the original house

Councillors discussed by a lawful development certificate was necessary for this development.

Approved, subject to valid neighbour planning concerns.

SMD/2020/0310	63 High Street Biddulph	Change of use from ground floor A3 restaurant to A1/B1 use class. Change of use at first floor from A3 restaurant ancillary to C3 residential 2 bedroom apartment

Councillor Rogers welcomed a new retail unit within the town.

Councillor Jones felt it was a shame it wasn't a restaurant. He wished the new business luck.

Councillor Smith that anything that brough business to the High Street was a good thing.

Councillor Perkin felt this was in-keeping with the intention of the Neighbourhood Development Order, encouraging a combination of uses on the High Street.

Recommend approval.

SMD/2020/0368	8 Dales Close Biddulph Moor	Proposed single storey rear extension and construction of replacement garage

There was consideration of the impact on the neighbours.

Approved, subject to valid neighbour planning concerns.

SMD/2020/0400	Woodhead Farm Top Road Biddulph Moor	Conversion of garage to ancillary domestic accommodation

Councillor Jones recommended **No Adverse Comments, subject to any**

green belt concerns.

Agreed.

SMD/2020/0410	Melford Farm Biddulph Park Road Biddulph	Proposed single storey side extension

Councillor Hawley recommended **No Adverse Comments, subject to any green belt concerns**.

Agreed.

DET/2020/0040	Dial Lane Farm Dial Lane Congleton	Proposed change of use of agricultural building to 1no.dwellinghouse

There was discussion about whether this was the same footprint.

It was agreed to **recommend approval subject to non-contravention of greenbelt, with conservation conditions and a protected species mitigation licence.**

SMD/2020/0435	31 Farmside Lane Biddulph Moor	Proposed single storey rear & side extension

Councillor Hawley recommended **Approval, subject to neighbours valid planning concerns.**

Agreed.

SMD/2020/0434	Hockadilla Farm Farmside Lane Biddulph Moor	Part double/single storey rear and side extension

Councillor Jones felt this site had been a mess for a while. He would recommend **No Adverse Comments**.

Agreed.

SMD/2019/0720	Land Off Woodhouse Lane Biddulph	Approval of reserved matters following outline planning permission SMD/2017/0775

It was noted that some of the matters that had been raised by Biddulph Town Council previously had been addressed. Neighbours had raised concerns about soakaways, traffic and Saturday working.

Councillor Garvey wondered whether this was an infill site; loss of a view is not enough of a consideration to decline the application. Infill is a suitable way to deal with development.

It was agreed that the views of residents were important and should be addressed. Issues still remain in relation to soakaways, traffic and Saturday working.

SMD/2020/0307	95 Hillview Cottage Woodhouse Lane Biddulph	Change of use of existing redundant stable block to retail shop and store and associated development

At the point that the Town Council was considering this application, there were nine letters of objection. Councillor Hawley outlined the local concern.

Councillor Rushton left the meeting to attend another appointment.

Councillor Jones felt that new business should be encouraged. If Highways are happy, there are no reasons for refusal. It should not matter what is being sold in the store.

Councillor Rogers could not condone a 'vape shop'.

Councillor Garvey was surprised that Highways had no concerns; this would be a high-throughput business.

Councillor Garvey noted that the roof height was being raised. He wondered whether there could be restrictions about the design of the shop frontage.

Councillor Yates was also amazed that Highways had no concerns. This is an 'accident waiting to happen'. He wondered whether there was an issue with sustainability. Councillor Yates raised concerns about the lighting, signage, opening hours and green belt restrictions.

Councillor Jones agreed with Councillor Yates. Councillor Hawley summarised the proposed recommendations:

The Town Council is echoing the concerns of residents and recommends Approval subject to

- **Non-contravention of green belt restrictions**
- **Consideration of the visual impact of the building (including lights and signage)**
- **Operation of reasonable hours of business.**

Councillor Davies noted that advertising would be via a separate application. There was a vote. Councillors Smith, Rogers and Davies abstained. Agreed.		

SMD/2020/0445	92 Thames Drive Biddulph	Erection of a forward-facing porch.
Councillor Hawley recommended **Approval, subject to neighbours valid planning concerns.** Councillor Yates noted that the properties were staggered. Councillor Garvey felt this was relatively modest in relation to the footprint of the property. Agreed.		

Very best wishes,

Sarah Haydon

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

Tel: 01782 297845
Mobile: 07511 225933
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.