

Kerry Challoner

From: Philip Metcalfe
Sent: 18 October 2017 11:35
To: DC Team
Subject: P/2017/01110 Land to the South of Tatenhill Lane

FAO Kerry Challoner

Dear Kerry,

Thank you for consulting us on this application. We note that this is a resubmission of application P/2017/00263 which is currently under consideration.

A Unilateral Undertaking has been submitted as part of the application which appears to replicate that agreed at outline stage. Schedule 6 concerns National Forest planting and requires either a scheme of planting to be submitted and agreed or a financial contribution to be paid in lieu. The application does not appear to include any details of a scheme to address this requirement therefore it is assumed that the obligation will be addressed by way of a financial contribution. The NFC would be grateful if the applicant could be asked to confirm this position. It is noted that the Schedule expects the contribution to be paid prior to commencement.

While the proposed Unilateral Undertaking (UU) reflects that agreed at outline stage, the method of calculating contributions has changed for applications registered after the 1st September 2017. Calculations should now be based on £35,000 per hectare (not £50,000 as included in the UU). The amount of National Forest planting required is also incorrect in the agreement. This should be calculated at 20% of the site area as set out in Appendix 1 of the adopted Local Plan. The site area is 2.66ha therefore 20% of this equates to 0.53ha. The amount to be secured within the UU should therefore be $£35,000 \times 0.53 = £18,550$.

Please note that this change to the figure to be used in calculating financial contributions to the National Forest has been agreed by our Planning Technical Working Group which includes representatives of each Local Authority, including East Staffordshire.

The NFC requests that the UU is amended to reflect the updated costs since the previous agreement.

The NFC welcomes the detailed landscaping plans submitted which incorporate significant specimen tree planting. This sets out a good range of species with an appropriate mix of formal and more natural planting styles. This will assist the development to meet adopted Local Plan Strategic Policy 24 which expects street tree planting within the National Forest. It is difficult to read the species details on the plan on your system, but we would expect a mixture of shrub species to be planted around the sub-station and pumping station to assist with screening these from view. These would also form small areas of valuable habitat in addition to the trees.

The proposed open space adjacent to plot 23 would be better designed as an area of shrub planting with trees rather than meadow. This would deter access and would need minimal management.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss these comments further.

Kind regards,
Phil

Philip Metcalfe | Green Infrastructure & Planning Officer

The National Forest Company, Bath Yard, Moira, Swadlincote, Derbyshire DE12 6BA
Tel: 01283 551211
Direct Dial: 01283 554209
Email: pmetcalfe@nationalforest.org
www.nationalforest.org

Grow a Tree from Seed and help to create the National Forest. Now is the time to get out and about and start collecting acorns. Plant your acorns in pots, register your seedlings with us, grow your trees for 2-3 years and you'll be invited to an event in the

Kerry Challoner

From: Christopher Humphreys
Sent: 10 October 2017 14:24
To: Kerry Challoner
Subject: Environmental Health Consultation Response - P/2017/01110

Dear Kerry Challoner

Our Ref - CAS-84466-G4Z6P8

Planning Ref - P/2017/01110

**Demolition of 78 and 80 Tatenhill Lane and erection of 55 dwellings including access/
highway infrastructure and all associated works**

Land South Of Tatenhill Lane, Tatenhill Lane

Please find below the consultation response on behalf of Environmental Health in relation to the above planning application.

Noise

The noise impact assessment undertaken by ADC Acoustics concludes that no specific attenuation measures are required. In reaching the conclusion for outdoor noise it is assumed that garden areas will have a 1.8m boundary fence. Although fencing is indicated on the drawings it is unclear what specification will be provided. The fencing specification should be included on approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt (1.8m high, minimum, close boarded fencing equivalent to 10kg/m²) or similar agreed specification, otherwise condition 8 of the outline permission cannot be discharged.

Air Quality

No comments were made as part of the outline application.

Contaminated Land

Previous comments made on planning permission P/2010/01245/MB/PO relating to land contamination have been re-iterated as are still relevant:

To: Michael Brown/Joanne Roebuck

PROPOSAL: Outline application for the erection of 33 dwellings, including the demolition of 54 Tatenhill Lane to facilitate the creation of a new access

REF: P/2010/01245/MB

OUR REF: 2143356

Location: Land off Tatenhill Lane Tatenhill Lane Branston Staffordshire

CONTAMINATED LAND

Paragraph C2

CONDITION

If during the course of development, contamination is found to be present at the site, then no

further development shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a method statement to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for approval, detailing how the contamination is to be dealt with.

Upon completion of the approved remediation, a signed declaration outlining the works that have been carried out shall be submitted to the LPA, including confirmation that remedial targets have been achieved. This shall be submitted and approved prior to any occupation of any of the dwellings on site unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.

GROUND GASES

Paragraph L3

CONDITION

It should be noted that the eastern edge of the development proposal is approximately 200m from a historic licensed landfill site. Records held by this department indicate that the landfill accepted pulverised fuel ash, sewage sludge and excavated materials from between 1977 and 1989. Therefore, this may represent a potential risk from landfill gas and leachate migration.

It is the developer's responsibility to ensure that the application site is free from landfill gas. Consideration should be given to protection measures within the building construction, to prevent ground gas ingress.

JAPANESE KNOTWEED

CONDITION

It has been noted that Japanese Knotweed has been positively identified on the site, and that a survey has been carried out to determine the feasible extent of the plant. Accordingly, full details of a scheme for its eradication and/or control shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work on site, and the approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the use of the building(s). Note that full eradication can take longer than one growing season.

It is recommended that all reports are submitted electronically where possible.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

- i) Any material imported for landscaped areas or gardens should be analysed to ensure it is suitable for use, the results of which should be submitted to the Local Authority for approval.
- ii) Please note: - Sitecheck reports and similar (such as homecheck and Groundsure residential searches), do not satisfy the needs of CLR 11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination for the Production of a Phase I Report. These are conveyancing reports for purchasing property and are not designed for use as part of the process of developing a site under the needs of PPS23. The use of such reports will be dismissed as being unsuitable and not allow further discharge of land contamination conditions without further works being undertaken. If in you are in any doubt about the work needed or are unsure please ask the LPA or Environmental Health Pollution Team what is needed before purchasing your report.

Dave Fountain
Contaminated Land Officer

Housing Standards

No comments required

Food/Health & Safety

No comments required

Other

No comments required

Should you have any other queries regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards,

Christopher Humphreys & Martyn Manning
Environmental Protection
Environmental Health
East Staffordshire Borough Council

Tel: 01283 508509

Email: christopher.humphreys@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk

martyn.manning@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk



06 October 2017

Ms Kerry Challoner
East Staffordshire Borough Council
PO Box 8045
Burton upon Trent
Staffordshire
DE14 9JG

Our Ref CRTR-PLAN-2017-23263
Your Ref P/2017/01110

Dear Ms. Challoner,

Proposal: Demolition of 78 and 80 Tatenhill Lane and erection of 55 dwellings including access/highway infrastructure and all associated works

Location: Land to the south of Tatenhill Lane, Branston, Burton upon Trent

Waterway: Trent & Mersey Canal

Thank you for your consultation.

The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is the guardian of 2,000 miles of historic waterways across England and Wales. We are among the largest charities in the UK. Our vision is that "living waterways transform places and enrich lives". We are a statutory consultee in the development management process.

The Trust has reviewed the application. This is our substantive response under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. On the basis of the information available the Trust advises that **planning permission should not be granted** for the following reasons:

We note from the submitted Planning and Affordable Housing Statement that this planning application is stated to be identical to the reserved matters application currently under consideration by the Council under reference P/2017/00263 (see paragraphs 3.9 and 6.3 of the Statement).

However, although the supporting documents and reports all appear to be unchanged, the submitted site plan (drawing BRTL_01_02A) appears to have been amended from that submitted with the reserved matters application, and is annotated as Revision B. The revision is stated on the plan to be an amendment in accordance with Highways comments. We note that this revision omits the electricity substation previously shown adjacent to the Trent & Mersey Canal towpath, and relocates the foul water pumping station from a position by the towpath to the open space area south of Plots 14 and 15. This amendment is not reflected in other documents and plans, including the Preliminary Drainage and Levels Strategy Plan.

It is therefore unclear whether the intention is to remove both the electricity substation and pumping station from their locations close to the towpath or not, as the application is ambiguous in this respect.

**Canal & River Trust Fradley Junction, Alrewas, Burton-Upon-Trent,
Staffordshire, DE13 7DN**

T 0303 040 4040 E planning@canalrivertrust.org.uk W www.canalrivertrust.org.uk

Patron: H.R.H. The Prince of Wales. Canal & River Trust, a charitable company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales with company number 7807276 and registered charity number 1146792, registered office address First Floor North, Station House, 500 Elder Gate, Milton Keynes MK9 1BB



The Trust objected to the reserved matters application currently under consideration by the Council (see our letter of 3rd May 2017). The concerns raised, in part, related to the location of the substation and pumping station. We therefore consider that, without further clarification of the discrepancy highlighted above, our previous comments must still stand in their entirety, and are reproduced below.

The references to discharging Condition 9 of the outline permission (which secured submission of detailed surface water and foul drainage details) are still relevant insofar as this application should also be clear on the intended drainage arrangements (including location of the pumping station and the risk of any adverse impacts on water quality in the canal arising from the foul drainage arrangements), at least sufficiently to be satisfied that the final details can be secured via a planning condition.

The proposed layout due to the proximity of the pumping station and sub-station has the potential to adversely impact on the structural integrity of the Trent & Mersey Canal and be visually intrusive when viewed from the canal corridor, adversely impacting on the character of the Trent & Mersey Canal Conservation Area. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the layout as proposed adheres to the principles of the outline approval or demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact to the canal. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policies SP23, 24 & 25 and DP6, 7 & 8 of the adopted East Staffordshire Borough Council Local Plan 2012-2031.

Impact on Heritage, Character and Amenity of the Waterway

The site is located to the south-east of the Trent & Mersey Canal which is a designated conservation area, and the site adjoins the towpath to the canal with an existing hedge marking the boundary line.

The outline application approved the site layout and although layout is not a reserved matter the current submission does include revisions to the approved layout. Whilst the majority of these amendments do not appear to significantly alter the layout from that approved at outline stage there are some amendments which are of concern to the Trust. These include the introduction of a sub-station and possible foul water pumping station adjacent to the north-western site boundary. Whilst these features are identified on the site plan no further details have been provided. It is therefore difficult to determine the full impact these will have on the amenities of the area and structural integrity of the waterway.

The sub-station and pumping station are shown in close proximity to the canal boundary and it is considered that these will degrade the character of the canal corridor and likely result in the need for visually inappropriate security fencing at later design stages. Maintaining and enhancing the existing hedgerow to the site boundary with the towpath is a positive strategy for existing bio-diversity and the retention of rural canal side character within the scheme. However, the pumping station would appear to result in the loss of a mature tree on the canal side boundary. This tree adds to the canals existing rural character and would help to visually soften the development and should be retained.

**Canal & River Trust Fradley Junction, Alrewas, Burton-Upon-Trent,
Staffordshire, DE13 7DN**

T 0303 040 4040 **E** planning@canalrivertrust.org.uk **W** www.canalrivertrust.org.uk

Patron: H.R.H. The Prince of Wales. Canal & River Trust, a charitable company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales with company number 7807276 and registered charity number 1146792, registered office address First Floor North, Station House, 500 Elder Gate, Milton Keynes MK9 1BB



The submitted elevation 'BB' within the street scenes attempts to cut the structures out though it continues to show water, boats, towpath users, but no hedgerow. This does not give a true reflection of what the canal side would be like and should be amended. Both the sub-station and pumping station have the potential to create noise affecting the canals tranquillity and adversely impacting on those using the towpath and mooring in the area. This has not been considered / addressed in the current submission.

The submitted layout also appears to remove the access link to the towpath, this works against the canal's ability to be a treasured local public amenity, its use as a local resource for healthy activities as well as a sustainable vehicular free route to work.

On the layout plan approved under the outline application Plot 14b was orientated so that the gable end faced the canal. This does not appear to have been carried through in the revised proposals and is considered to dilute the quality of the scheme and how it would appear as a setting within the canals outward perspective.

The scale, form and setback of the proposed plots appears reasonable though the proposed fibre cement weather boarding is not considered to be in keeping with surrounding context. The Trust request that the materials palette is limited to a local brick, render and slate and the weather boarding removed.

Impact on Structural Integrity of the Waterway due to proximity of works and drainage proposals

With any development, close to the waterway there is the potential for adverse impacts on the infrastructure of the canal in terms of stability, drainage, pollution, erosion, increase in water levels etc.

As already highlighted above the submission does not include any detail on the proposed sub-station or pumping station and therefore their full impact cannot be assessed. Reserved matters approval and discharge of Condition 9 should therefore not be given until this detail has been submitted and assessed.

The Trust wish to highlight that the attenuation/Infiltration pond's invert is 700mm below the normal water level in the canal. The pool is approximately 15m from the towpath and canal bank. When this is excavated any leakage paths are to be resolved by the developer and not the Trust as there is currently no evidence of seepage/leakage at this location. The developer should also be aware that there is an abandoned culvert within the site and this should be considered during the development.

The applicant is advised that any surface water discharge to the waterway will require prior consent from the Canal & River Trust. As the Trust is not a land drainage authority, such discharges are not granted as of right-where they are granted they will usually be subject to completion of a commercial agreement.

The applicant/developer is also advised that there are fibre optic cables within the vicinity of the site along the footpath/towpath and necessary measures should be taken to ensure that

**Canal & River Trust Fradley Junction, Alrewas, Burton-Upon-Trent,
Staffordshire, DE13 7DN**

T 0303 040 4040 **E** planning@canalrivertrust.org.uk **W** www.canalrivertrust.org.uk

Patron: H.R.H. The Prince of Wales. Canal & River Trust, a charitable company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales with company number 7807276 and registered charity number 1146792, registered office address First Floor North, Station House, 500 Elder Gate, Milton Keynes MK9 1BB



these are not adversely affected during development. For further details and advice on this matter please contact Sam O'Neill on 01926 626108

Impact on Natural Environment of the Waterway

The waterways have a rich biodiversity, with many areas benefiting from statutory designations. Developments can have an adverse impact on the ecology of the waterways and it is therefore important that this is considered and any impacts suitably mitigated.

Due to its proximity to the waterway the proposed pumping station poses a potential contamination risk. Prior to the discharge of Condition 9 full details on the construction of the pumping station including pollution prevention / emergency response measures should be submitted for assessment.

The landscape plans show Cotoneaster horizontalis, this is a schedule 8 species and is best avoided and replaced with a native berry species. The submitted plans also indicate that the existing hedge is to be enhanced though no further details on these proposals are provided.

The Trust advise that waterside lighting affects how the waterway corridor is perceived, particularly when viewed from the water, the towpath and neighbouring land, for example waterside lighting can lead to unnecessary glare and light pollution if it is not carefully designed. The submitted lighting proposals appears to take into consideration the need to minimise the impacts of lighting on species such as bats. However, to ensure this is minimised column HLS-2 could be relocated to the south side of the proposed access road to further reduce light spill to the waterway.

The submission indicates that the construction compound is to be located directly adjacent to the canal boundary though the Construction Method Statement does not identify the canal corridor or canal users as sensitive receptors. Considering the proximity of the compound to the canal the CMS is not considered to be sufficiently detailed in relation to the potential impacts or mitigation required.

It will be necessary to ensure that surface water drainage is diverted from the waterway during construction. Consideration needs to be given to the canal corridor and users in relation to noise and dust. Dust suppression methods should be set out due to the close proximity of the construction traffic access. Consideration should also be given to wind-blown material/waste given the compound is so close to the waterway.

We ask that you clarify whether the substation and/or pumping station are to be relocated, and if they are, we further ask that all documents are appropriately updated to reflect this, and that we are given the opportunity to comment further on this application.

If you have any queries please contact me, my details are below.

Yours sincerely

**Canal & River Trust Fradley Junction, Alrewas, Burton-Upon-Trent,
Staffordshire, DE13 7DN**

**T 0303 040 4040 E planning@canalrivertrust.org.uk W www.canalrivertrust.org.uk
Patron: H.R.H. The Prince of Wales. Canal & River Trust, a charitable company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales with company number 7807276 and registered charity number 1146792, registered office address First Floor North, Station House, 500 Elder Gate, Milton Keynes MK9 1BB**

Kerry Challoner

From: Philip Sharpe
Sent: 01 October 2017 16:49
To: Kerry Challoner
Cc: Ian Dickinson (CRT); Roger Evans (T&MCS)
Subject: East Staffs application P/2017/01110 - South of Tatenhill Lane - IWA response

Ref: P/2017/01110

Location: Land to the south of Tatenhill Lane, Branston, Burton upon Trent

Proposal: Demolition of 78 and 80 Tatenhill Lane and the erection of 55 dwellings including access/highway infrastructure and all associated works.

Dear Kerry Challoner,

Thank you for consulting us on the above planning application adjacent to the Trent & Mersey Canal.

The Inland Waterways Association (IWA) is a national charity which campaigns for the conservation, use, maintenance, restoration and development of the inland waterways for public benefit. The Lichfield Branch of IWA has considered this application in relation to the environment of the canal and the interests of its users.

The Trent & Mersey Canal is a historic waterway and a valuable amenity and recreational corridor, providing leisure boating, walking, angling, cycling and nature conservation benefits to the area. It is designated as a Conservation Area for its special architectural and historic interest.

This application appears to be essentially similar to P/2017/00263 which we commented on in April and to which we raised no objections.

However, we note that the Site Plan does not show the access to the canal towpath that forms part of the Ecological Masterplan within the Landscape & Ecological Management Plan. This will help integrate the site with the amenity and recreational opportunities of the canal corridor and we would welcome confirmation of agreement with Canal & River Trust on this access, and on appropriate payments to improve the towpath surfacing to cater for the increased footfall locally.

Subject to this, the Inland Waterways Association has no objection to the application.

Regards,

Philip G. Sharpe

Chairman & Planning Officer
Inland Waterways Association, Lichfield Branch
34 Old Eaton Road, Rugeley, Staffs. WS15 2EZ
Tel. 01889 583330
Email: philip.g.sharpe@ntlworld.com

The Inland Waterways Association is a non-profit Distributing Company Limited by Guarantee No 612245
Registered Charity No 212342. Registered Office: Island House Moor Road CHESHAM HP5 1WA.
Website: www.waterways.org.uk

Kerry Challoner
Planner
Development Control
East Staffordshire Borough Council
P.O. Box 8045
Burton Upon Trent
Staffordshire DE14 9JG

Contact: Duncan Fisher

duncan.fisher@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk
Our Ref: **05.10.17 (102.17.ES)**
Your Ref: P/2017/01110
Date: 5th of October 2017

Architectural Liaison Officer
(Designing Out Crime Officer)
Crime Reduction
Ground Floor, Block 9
Weston Rd,
Stafford ST18 0YY

Dear Kerry,

Ref: P/2017/0110
Proposal: Demolition of 78 and 80 Tatenhill Lane and erection of 55 dwellings including access / highway infrastructure and all associated works
Location: Land to the south of Tatenhill Lane, Burton upon Trent, Branston

I have taken the opportunity to examine the above planning application with reference to the Association of Chief Police Officer's Secured by Design Criteria and the Principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.

Whilst I have no objections to Outline Application, it is important that I take this opportunity to provide the following guidance and recommendations aimed at reducing opportunities for crime and ensuring that high level of physical security is incorporated in this development.

Particular attention must be paid to ensuring that those Plots with side and rear boundaries to footpaths and open land are secure. The proposed pedestrian links and Public Open Space must be designed as features of the site, and be well overlooked. All pedestrian and vehicle links should be to the North West of this site.

The Secured by Design Website (www.securedbydesign.com) provides valuable information regarding police and home office recognised standards and licensed component manufacturers.

If I can be of any further assistance with regard to reducing opportunities for crime or fear of crime and disorder in this proposal, please do not hesitate to contact me on 07855 856 437.

1. **Design Concerns.**

There is a history of a small amount of Burglary in the adjacent Tatenhill Lane. If possible, I recommend that the access route between 52 and 54 Tatenhill Lane be adopted by either or both of these properties.

Providing an outward looking approach to the Water Park and existing footpaths, with dwelling frontages overlooking the park and access routes, would help to reduce opportunities for further incidents of Burglary.

I recommend that there be no pedestrian link between Plots 23 and 24. This link will provide unwanted visitors with a legitimate reason to explore this area of the neighbourhood unchallenged, and provide a potential escape route for criminals.

I support the intention to provide a 'back to back' layout for existing Tatenhill Lane Plots. I would prefer that the layout provided an outward looking approach to The Water Park and access routes.

Particular attention should be applied to promoting natural surveillance over pedestrian access routes and Public Open Space.

Attention must be paid to the design of boundaries and landscaping where the side and rear boundaries of Plots are facing accessible open land and footpaths.

1.1 Footpaths and Footpath Design.

Where a segregated footpath is unavoidable, for example a public right of way, an ancient field path or heritage route, designers should consider making the footpath a focus of the development and ensure that it is:

- As straight as possible
- Wide
- Devoid of potential hiding places
- Overlooked by surrounding buildings and activities

Secured By Design Homes 2016. Section 13 Rear Access Footpaths.

Section 13.1 Research studying the distribution of burglary in terraced housing with open rear access footpaths has shown that up to 85% of entries occurred at the back of the house.

Footpath design guidance.

Secured By Design. New Homes 2016.

Section 8 Layout of roads and footpaths.

Section 8.1 Vehicular and pedestrian routes should be designed to ensure that they are visually open, direct, well used and **should not undermine the defensible space (Note 8.1) of neighbourhoods.**

Note 8.1: *Defensible space has the simple aim of designing the physical environment in a way which enables the resident to control the areas around their home. This is achieved by organising all space in such a way that residents may exercise a degree of control over the activities that take place there.*

Section 8.3 A review of available research in this area concluded that: "Neighbourhood permeability... is one of the community level design features most reliably linked to crime rates, and the connections operate consistently in the same direction across studies: more permeability, more crime. Several studies across several decades link neighbourhood property crime rates with permeability versus inaccessibility of neighbourhood layout. Neighbourhoods with smaller streets or more one-way streets, or fewer entrance streets or with more turnings have lower property crime rates..." **Source: Taylor R B 2002 "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED): Yes, No, Maybe, Unknowable, and all of the above" in Bechtel RB (ed) "Handbook of Environmental Psychology", John Wiley, New York, Pages 413 – 426. Cited by Professor Ted Kitchen Sheffield Hallam University 2007.**

With this guidance in mind, I recommend that the hedgerows and landscaping between dwelling boundaries and the routes to the rear of plots is low enough to provide natural surveillance and flow of light from the adjacent dwellings and street lighting. A landscape maintenance programme should be agreed. **I recommend that there be no pedestrian link between Plots 23 and 24. This link will provide unwanted visitors with a legitimate reason to explore this area of the neighbourhood unchallenged, and provide a potential escape route for criminals.**

Note: Where there is potential for problems relating to off road motorcycles, then suitable motorcycle barriers should be installed at junctions to footpaths/cycle paths.

1.2 Boundaries (Design guidance).

I am unsure about the intended use for the triangle of land adjacent to Plot 23. I recommend that this area is adopted by the adjacent Plot 23. Where this is not the case, then natural surveillance over this area must be promoted.

Appropriate demarcation between public and private areas must be visible.

- Frontages should have a low boundary such as an open boarded fence, walls or hedges at around 1,000-mm in height.
- Vulnerable areas such as the side and rear of gardens should be secured with a robust fence or wall, without footholds, to a minimum height of 1,800-mm.
- **Boundaries and rear gardens facing footpaths, car parking or open land may benefit from additional deterrent features such as trellis top, or defensive planting.**
- Open boarded fencing may be required to offer natural surveillance over property (adjacent garage entrances, car parking etc.).
- Horizontal fence members must be positioned to the inside of a boundary to footpaths, car parking or open land, to prevent climbing.

Note: Particular attention should be paid to ensuring that the rear and side boundaries backing onto open and accessible land are secure. Please consider using trellis topping to bring these boundaries to 2m in height.

Access to the Rear of Properties.

Where access to the rear of a property is proposed (public footpaths, alleyways, adjacent parking courts, access for refuse collection etc.):

- A strong lockable gate should be used to secure boundaries to the rear of gardens and include anti lift hinges and bolts mounted to the top and bottom horizontal members.
- Rear boundaries between properties etc. and gates securing against access to these areas, should be positioned as close as possible to the buildings front elevation or building line (recessed no more than 600mm) to help prevent unauthorised access to the side and rear of properties, where most burglaries take place.
- Gates and adjacent boundaries must be to the same height.

Note: Where there is access proposed to the rear of 1 or more dwellings, then an initial lockable gate must be erected as described above. It should be possible to unlock this gate from both sides.

Refuse Collection.

Recent developments provided with rear access routes to store and move bins for collection have resulted in these bins being left constantly to the front of dwellings. These bins are often misused including use as climbing aids. I recommend accessible bin stores or a dedicated store area be provided to the front of dwellings or to the end of a block of dwellings.

1.3 Car Parking (Design guidance).

In-curtilage car parking arrangements are preferred but where communal car parking areas are necessary, they must be in small groups, close and adjacent to the owner's dwellings that they serve and open to view from regularly habitable rooms.

Note: Where it is not possible to park within an owner's direct view, this can lead to obstruction of footpaths and highways and damage to landscaping etc.

Landscaping Adjacent to parking Bays.

I recommend that any planting adjacent to parking bays should preferably be berberis or thorny and should have a mature or maintained growth height of 500mm to help prevent people from hiding in those areas.

Garages.

Secured By Design Homes. Section 16 Car Parking.

Section 16.5 Where dedicated garages are provided within the curtilage of the dwelling the entrance should be easily observed from the street and neighbouring dwellings. Locating garages forward of the building line can obscure views to and from the dwelling.

Lighting To Parking Areas and Facilities.

Secured By Design Homes. Section 16 Car Parking.

Section 16.7 Communal parking facilities must be lit to the relevant levels as recommended by BS 5489-1:2003. **Post mounted lighting is not recommended as this suffers as a result of poor driving, vandalism and can provide a climbing aid.**

1.4 Street Lighting.

Secured By Design Homes. Section 18. Street Lighting.

Section 18.1 All street lighting for adopted highways and footpaths, private estate roads and footpaths and car parks must comply with BS 5489:2013.

Section 18.3 Bollard lighting is not compliant with BS5489:2013 because it does not project sufficient light at the right height and distorts the available light due to the 'up-lighting' effect; making it difficult to recognise facial features and as a result causes an increase in the fear of crime.

Section 18.4 Care should be taken to ensure that landscaping, tree planting and lighting schemes work together to mitigate the effects of seasonal variations.

Note: Street lighting should be carefully designed to cover all vulnerable areas without creating shadows. This can significantly reduce potential danger spots and reduce the fear of crime. Landscaping, tree planting and lighting schemes must not be in conflict with each other.

1.5 Landscaping.

Note: Landscaping must not impeded natural surveillance and must not create potential hiding places for intruders, **especially where it is adjacent to footpaths, public open space** or where it may obscure views of and from doors and windows. This is valuable in helping to maintain a clear field of vision around a site, and in reducing fear of crime and opportunities for crime.

Secured By Design Homes. Section 17 Planting in New Developments.

Section 17.3 Planting should not impede the opportunity for natural surveillance and must avoid the creation of potential hiding places.

Attention should be given to the location of walls and hedges so that they do not obscure doors or windows, and the position of trees that may become climbing aids into property or obscure lights or CCTV cameras.

1.6 Design of Public Open Space.

Note: The design and provision of Public Open Space and equipment in recent residential development has shown that the process can benefit from being delayed until a high percentage of dwellings are occupied and the residents can be included in the consultation process. This helps to ensure that any equipment meets the requirements of the appropriate age group.

1.7 Dwelling Gable Ends.

Secured By Design Homes 2016. Section 12. Gable end walls.

Section 12.1 It is important to avoid the creation of windowless elevations and blank walls immediately adjacent to public spaces; this type of elevation, commonly at the end of a terrace, tends to attract graffiti, inappropriate loitering and ball games. The provision of at least one window above ground floor level, where possible, will offer additional surveillance over the public area.

1.8 Climbing Aids.

Boundary walls, bin and fuel stores, any low flat roofs, existing or proposed mature trees should be designed and located so as not to provide climbing aids into grounds or property.

2. Component Parts of Physical Security.

It is important that a high level of physical security is incorporated in these proposals, and that this development conforms to the minimum standard of security outlined within these recommendations.

The Secured by Design Website (www.securedbydesign.com) provides all necessary information regarding police and home office recognised standards and licensed component manufacturers.

Utilities.

In order to reduce the opportunities for theft by bogus officials, utility meters should be positioned to the outside and front of dwellings where they can be overlooked. This will prevent the need for an official to enter the building in order to read a meter.

This is important to consider alongside the location of boundaries and gates between dwellings, as they should not be recessed more than 600mm and meters must be in front of these boundaries and gates (even when they are smart meters, as service providers still require access).

3. Further Information and Guidance.

Further help and information can be gained from the following web sites:

- www.securedbydesign.com
Police preferred specification scheme and recognised component manufacturers.
- www.bsi-global.com
Various recognised and tested security standards.
- www.brecertification.co.uk
Loss Prevention Certification Board Government test house.

Crime prevention design advice is given free without the intention of creating a contract. The Police Service and the Home Office does not take any legal responsibility for the advice given. However, if the advice is implemented, it will reduce the opportunity for crimes to be committed.

Yours sincerely,

D. Fisher (B.Sc. Hon's)
Architectural Liaison Officer.
(Designing Out Crime Officer.)

Kerry Challoner
East Staffordshire Borough Council
Development Control
Grain Warehouse (6) Derby Street
Burton-on-Trent
Staffordshire
DE14 2JJ

Our ref: UT/2017/116599/01-L01
Your ref: P/2017/01110
Date: 05 October 2017

Dear Madam

DEMOLITION OF 78 AND 80 TATENHILL LANE AND ERECTION OF 55 DWELLINGS INCLUDING ACCESS/ HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE AND ALL ASSOCIATED WORKS

LAND TO THE SOUTH OF TATENHILL LANE, BURTON UPON TRENT, BRANSTON

Thank you for consulting us on the above application which was received on 15 September 2017.

The site is in Flood Zone 1 therefore we have no objections to this application.

Yours faithfully

Ms Noreen Nargas
Senior Planning Advisor

Direct dial 020 8474 5004

Direct fax

Direct e-mail swwmplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk

Environment Agency
Sentinel House, 9 Wellington Crescent, Fradley Park, Lichfield, Staffs, WS13 8RR.
Customer services line: 03708 506 506
www.gov.uk/environment-agency

End



ramblers
at the heart of walking



Staffordshire Area
www.staffordshireramblers.org
www.ramblers.org.uk



Ms K Challoner
Planner- Development Control
East Staffordshire Borough Council
PO Box 8045
Burton upon Trent
DE14 9JG

30th September 2017

Your Ref: P/2017/01110

Dear Ms Challoner

Demolition of 78 and 80 Tatenhill Lane and erection of 55 dwellings, etc., land to the south of Tatenhill Lane Branston

Thank you for your letter dated 15th September 2017 and the enclosed plans relating to the above application. The Ramblers have no objection to the development.

Yours sincerely

D N Hewett
District Footpath Secretary

Staffordshire County Council
1 Staffordshire Place
Tipping Street
Stafford
ST16 2DH

Fao: Ms. Kerry Challoner
Planning Delivery Team
East Staffordshire Borough Council
The Maltsters,
Wetmore Road
Burton-upon-Trent
Staffordshire
DE14 1LS

Telephone: (01785) 277285
Facsimile: (01785) 211279
Email: debbie.taylor@staffordshire.gov.uk
Please ask for: Mrs. D. Taylor

3rd October 2017

Our Ref: HoEC/EC3210/ES/DT/CST6468

Your Ref: P/2017/01110

Dear Ms. Challoner,

Land to the south of Tatenhill Lane, Burton upon Trent

Thank you for your consultation regarding the above reserved matters application for the demolition of 78 and 80 Tatenhill Lane and erection of 55 dwellings including access/highway infrastructure and all associated works on land to the south of Tatenhill Lane, Burton upon Trent.

The application is supported by the results of an archaeological evaluation across the site which was undertaken in fulfilment of condition 11 of application P/2010/01245 and condition 16 of application P/2013/01160. I can confirm, taking into account the negative results of the evaluation, that I would raise no further archaeological concerns regarding the proposed development.

Should you have any queries regarding the content of this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Debbie Taylor
Historic Environment Advisor





Developments Affecting Trunk Roads and Special Roads
Highways England Planning Response (HEPR 16-01)
Formal Recommendation to an Application for Planning Permission

From: Catherine Brookes (Divisional Director)
Operations Directorate
Midlands Region
Highways England
planningm@highwaysengland.co.uk

To: **East Staffordshire Borough Council - FAO Kerry Challoner**

CC: transportplanning@dft.gsi.gov.uk
growthandplanning@highwaysengland.co.uk

Council's Reference: P/2017/01110

Referring to the planning application referenced above, consultation dated 15 September 2017, for demolition of 78 and 80 Tatenhill Lane and erection of 55 dwellings including access/highway infrastructure and all associated works, on land to the south of Tatenhill Lane, Burton upon Trent, Branston, notice is hereby given that Highways England's formal recommendation is that we:

- a) offer no objection;
- ~~b) recommend that conditions should be attached to any planning permission that may be granted (see Annex A — Highways England recommended Planning Conditions);~~
- ~~c) recommend that planning permission not be granted for a specified period (see Annex A — further assessment required);~~
- ~~d) recommend that the application be refused (see Annex A — Reasons for recommending Refusal).~~

Highways Act Section 175B is not relevant to this application.¹

¹ Where relevant, further information will be provided within Annex A.

This represents Highways England's formal recommendation and is copied to the Department for Transport as per the terms of our Licence.

Should you disagree with this recommendation you should consult the Secretary of State for Transport, as per the Town and Country Planning (Development Affecting Trunk Roads) Direction 2015, via transportplanning@dft.gsi.gov.uk.

Date: 03 October 2017

Signature:

Name: Graham Broome

Position: Asset Manager

Highways England:

Highways England | The Cube | 199 Wharfside Street | Birmingham | B1 1RN

Graham.Broome@highwaysengland.co.uk

Sent: 27 September 2017 12:38:45 (UTC+00:00) Dublin, Edinburgh, Lisbon, London
To: Wendy Keach
Cc: ECU Consultations (Place)
Subject: RE: Consultee letter for PlanningApplication Application: P/2017/01110 Tatenhill Lane Branston - PRoW Response

Dear Wendy,

Rights of Way

The County Council's Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way shows that no Public Rights of Way cross the proposed application site.

The County Council has not received any application under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to add or modify the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way, which affects the land in question. It should be noted, however, that this does not preclude the possibility of the existence of a right of way at common law, or by virtue of a presumed dedication under Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980. It may, therefore, be necessary to make further local enquiries and seek legal advice in respect of any physically evident route affecting the land, or the apparent exercise of a right of way by members of the public.

Regards
Shona

Shona Frost CGeog (GIS) FRGS
Staffordshire County Council
01785 277280

-----Original Message-----
From: Rochfort, Paul (F&C)
Sent: 26 September 2017 09:52
To: Frost, Shona (F&C)

Kerry Challoner

From: Thomas, Rhiannon [Rhiannon.Thomas@severntrent.co.uk]
Sent: 27 September 2017 15:51
To: Kerry Challoner
Subject: stw ref: 2017091592275 / lpa ref: P/2017/01110 / Land to the South of Tatenhill Lane
Burton upon Trent Branston

Good Day,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this planning application. Please find our response noted below:

With Reference to the above planning application the company's observations regarding sewerage are as follows.

I can confirm that we have no objections to the proposals subject to the inclusion of the following condition:

- The development hereby permitted should not commence until drainage plans for the disposal of foul and surface water flows have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and
- The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first brought into use. This is to ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage as well as to prevent or to avoid exacerbating any flooding issues and to minimise the risk of pollution.

Please note if you wish to respond to this email please send it to Planning.apwest@severntrent.co.uk where we will look to respond within 10 working days. Alternately you can call the office on 01902 793851.

If your query is regarding drainage proposals, please email to the aforementioned email address and mark for the attention of Rhiannon Thomas (Planning Liaison Technician).

Kind regards,

Asset Protection Team
Severn Trent

Asset Protection (West)
Severn Trent Water - Waste Water Services
Tel: 01902 793851
email: Planning.apwest@severntrent.co.uk

Severn Trent Plc (registered number 2366619) and Severn Trent Water Limited
(registered number 2366686) (together the "Companies") are both limited companies
registered in England & Wales with their registered office at Severn Trent Centre,
2 St John's Street, Coventry, CV1 2LZ

This email (which includes any files attached to it) is not contractually binding on its

own, is intended solely for the named recipient and may contain CONFIDENTIAL,

Kerry Challoner

From: School Organisation [school.organisation@staffordshire.gov.uk]
Sent: 26 September 2017 16:30
To: Kerry Challoner
Subject: RE: Consultee letter for Planning Application: P/2017/01110

Planning Application for a Residential Development at Tatenhill Lane, Branston, Staffordshire (P/2017/01110)

In response to the above planning application the School Organisation team has the following comments:

This development falls within the catchments of Rykneld Primary School and Paget High School (within the Burton High Cluster).

The development is scheduled to provide 55 dwellings, with the demolition of 2 existing dwellings. Excluding the 4 1 Bedroom RSL Houses from Primary and Secondary calculations and excluding the remaining 4 RSL dwellings from secondary only, a development of 49 houses including 4 RSLs could add 10 Primary School, 7 Secondary and 1 6th Form Pupils.

All schools, and the respective Clusters, are projected to be full for the foreseeable future.

Based on the current housing mix we would, request a contribution towards additional Primary school and Secondary school provision.

We would seek an Education Contribution for Primary School places (10 x £11,031 = £110,310), 7 High School places (7 x £16,622 = £116,354) and 1 Sixth Form place (1 x £18,027 = £18,027). This gives a total request of £255,722.

We note that this site has an extant outline planning permission under application number P/2013/01160 for which a S106 agreement was sealed on 24th December 2014.

Could you advise whether you intend to use the existing, sealed, Section 106 agreement or whether this application will be treated as a new planning application requiring a new Section 106 agreement?

The above is based on current demographics which can change over time and therefore we would wish to be consulted on any further applications for this site.



Matthew Link | SOAT Officer
Business and Executive Support team

Location Address: 3rd Floor, Staffordshire Place 1, Stafford, ST16 2DH
Postal Address: Staffordshire County Council, Staffordshire Place 2, Stafford, ST16 2DH
☎: (01785) 276093
✉: matthew.link@staffordshire.gov.uk
🌐: www.staffordshire.gov.uk

Please find attached Consultee letter for PlanningApplication application P/2017/01110

630893

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: planning correspondence

Memorandum from the Head of Service

To: **Kerry Challoner**
Planning Officer

Your Ref: P/2017/01110
My Ref: PF/170926/01110

From: **Paul Farrer**
Environment Manager

e-mail: paul.farrer@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk

Tel: 01283 508599

Date: 26 September 2017

Proposal: Demolition of 78 and 80 Tatenhill Lane and erection of 55 dwellings including access/
highway infrastructure and all associated works

Location: Land to the south of Tatenhill Lane
Branston
Staffordshire

Comments:

The developer will be required to provide the appropriate external storage containers for refuse and recycling collection (in accordance with the Council's specification) or pay a financial contribution to the Council for their provision via a Section 106 Agreement. This includes individual dwellings and flats/apartments that have communal facilities.

I note that a draft S06 has been provided based on a sum of £65 per dwelling. This should be increased to £75 per dwelling to reflect the current cost of container provision.

The developer must ensure that all containers are provided to residents prior to occupation and prior to the commencement of the Council's collection service. A detailed specification of all container types may be obtained from the Environment section.

The recent highway works carried out as part of the Branston Locks development have resulted in revised access arrangements to Tatenhill Lane. All traffic is now required to access this lane via the old canal bridge. The County Council has imposed an 18 tonne weight restriction on this bridge which prohibits access by 26 tonne refuse vehicles. This matter has been raised separately with the County Council and must be resolved as access for refuse collection is to be maintained.

Date: 22 September 2017
Our ref: 226486
Your ref: P/2017/01110



Ms K Challoner
East Staffordshire Borough Council
The Maltsters
Wetmore Road
Burton upon Trent
DE14 1LS

Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

BY EMAIL ONLY

dcteam@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk

Dear Ms Challoner,

Planning consultation: Demolition of 78 and 80 Tatenhill Lane and erection of 55 dwellings including access/ highway infrastructure and all associated works

Location: Land to the South of Tatenhill Lane, Burton upon Trent, Branston

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 15 September 2017.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)

Natural England's comments in relation to this application are provided in the following sections.

Statutory nature conservation sites –

Based upon the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.

Protected species

We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published [Standing Advice](#) on protected species.

You should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation.

The Standing Advice should not be treated as giving any indication or providing any assurance in respect of European Protected Species (EPS) that the proposed development is unlikely to affect the EPS present on the site; nor should it be interpreted as meaning that Natural England has reached any views as to whether a licence is needed (which is the developer's responsibility) or may be granted.

If you have any specific questions on aspects that are not covered by our Standing Advice for European Protected Species or have difficulty in applying it to this application please contact us with details at consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Local sites

If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local site, e.g. Local Wildlife Site, Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Site (RIGS) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local site before it determines the application.

Priority Habitat as identified on Section 41 list of the Natural Environmental and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006

The consultation documents indicate that this development includes an area of priority habitat, as listed on Section 41 of the Natural Environmental and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, namely an area of deciduous woodland to the south east of the proposed site, forming part of Branston Water Park Local Nature Reserve. The National Planning Policy Framework states that 'when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity. If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

Green Infrastructure

The proposed development is within an area that Natural England considers could benefit from enhanced green infrastructure (GI) provision. Multi-functional green infrastructure can perform a range of functions including improved flood risk management, provision of accessible green space, climate change adaptation and biodiversity enhancement. Natural England would encourage the incorporation of GI into this development.

Biodiversity enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that '*Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity*'. Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that '*conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat*'.

Landscape enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider new development and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Risk Zones

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires local planning authorities to consult Natural England on "Development in or likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest" (Schedule 4, w). Our SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI.

The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the data.gov.uk website

We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

For any queries regarding this letter, for new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely,

Consultations Team

To: East Staffordshire, DCM
East Staffordshire Borough Council
The Maltsters
Wetmore Road
Burton-on-Trent
DE14 1LS

Applicant: MRS NATALIE GOTOBED
Address: LIONCOURT HOMES LTD & COUNTY
DEVELOPMENT
LIONCOURT HOUSE
3 APEX PARK, WAINWRIGHT ROAD
WARNDON, WORCESTER
WR49FN

Application Type: FULL

Application Number: ES2017/1110

Date Received: 15-SEP-2017

Road Number: D3478

Officer: John Derry

Date: 22-SEP-2017

Particulars of Development:

DEMOLITION OF 78 AND 80 TATENHILL LANE AND CONSTRUCTION OF 55 DWELLINGS INCLUDING ACCESS/HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE AND ALL ASSOCIATED WORKS,

Location of Development:

LAND TO THE SOUTH OF TATENHILL LANE, BURTON UPON TRENT, STAFFORDSHIRE

CONDITIONAL:

Recommendations: There are no objections on Highway grounds to the proposed development subject to the following conditions being included on any approval:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the junction with Tatenhill Lane (D3478) as broadly indicated on Drg. No.NTT/415/001 Rev. P6 in the submitted Transport Assessment has been completed to base level in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.
2. Before the proposed development is brought into use the private road shall be built with surface water drainage interceptors which shall be sited across the access immediately to the rear of the highway boundary and connected to a surface water outfall.
3. Before construction works of any kind are commenced on site details of a wheel cleaning regime for the prevention of deposition of deleterious material on the public highway during the construction of the proposed development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.
4. Before construction works of any kind are commenced on site a Construction Traffic Route Plan for vehicles in excess 7.5T shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Traffic Route Plan shall provide details of an alternative route to and from the site, together with signage and timing in the event of any closure of Branston Road (D3478) between the site and the A38 interchange to the east.
5. No dwelling hereby permitted without access to a garage shall be occupied until a secure weatherproof cycle storage facility for that dwelling has been provided in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

IMPORTANT INFORMATIVES

- i) This consent will require approval under Section 7 of the Staffordshire Act 1983 and will require a Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. The developer should be advised to contact Staffordshire County Council to ensure that approvals and agreements are secured before commencement of works.

ii) Condition 1 above shall require a Major Works Agreement with Staffordshire County Council and the applicant is therefore requested to contact Staffordshire County Council in respect of securing the Agreement. The link below provides a further link to a Major Works Agreement Information Pack and an application form for the Major Works Agreement. Please complete and send to the address indicated on the application form which is Network Management Unit, Staffordshire County Council, 2 Staffordshire Place, Tipping Street, Stafford. ST16 2DH. (or email to nmu@staffordshire.gov.uk)
<http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/transport/staffshighways/licences/>

NOTES TO PLANNING OFFICER

a) It is my understanding that the proposed internal road layout is to remain private. Therefore if you are minded to grant Planning Consent it will be necessary for the Planning Authority to ensure that there is an appropriate mechanism in place which will enable the developer to seek exemption under Section 219 of The Highways Act, 1980. An example would be either the establishment of a Maintenance Management Company whose terms of reference are secured by either a Section 106 Agreement (Town and Country Planning Act, 1990) or a Unilateral Undertaking.

b) With reference to Condition 5 above plots 11-27, 45 & 52 are not provided with garages.

c) The above comments relate purely to the effects of the development on roads for which Staffordshire County Council is the Highway Authority. For consideration to be given to the effects of the development on the A38 Trunk Road, it will be necessary for you to consult Highways England.

REASONS

1. In the interest of highway safety and to ensure the roadworks are designed to adoptable standards.

2-4. In the interests of highway safety.

5. In the interests of site sustainability.

To comply with East Staffordshire Local Plan (2012-2031) Policies SP1, SP35, and also Paragraph 32 of the NPPF.

**Commissioner for the Built County
on behalf of the County Council
as Highway Authority**

Kerry Challoner

From: Kerry Challoner
Sent: 20 September 2017 16:45
To: 'Derry, John (E,I&S)'
Subject: FW: P/2017/01110: Land to the South of Tatenhill Lane, Burton.

Hi Jake

Please see email below from the developer confirming that the roads will be private.

I hope this information is of assistance

Kind regards

Kerry

From
Sent: 20 September 2017 16:30
To: Kerry Challoner
Cc: Dean Knight
Subject: RE: P/2017/01110: Land to the South of Tatenhill Lane, Burton.

Hi Kerry,

I can confirm the roads will be private and that the box was ticked in error on the form. Would you like me to send in an amended copy?

Kind Regards,

From: Kerry Challoner [<mailto:Kerry.Challoner@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>]
Sent: 20 September 2017 16:22
To:
Subject: FW: P/2017/01110: Land to the South of Tatenhill Lane, Burton.

Please see email below from Staffs County Council Highways. At a meeting last week I asked Dean Knight about the status of the new roads, he advised that the roads would be private due to the level of permeable tarmac proposed. Could you please confirm the intended status of the roads within the site?

Many thanks

Kerry

From: Derry, John (E,I&S) [<mailto:john.derry@staffordshire.gov.uk>]
Sent: 20 September 2017 15:59
To: Kerry Challoner
Subject: P/2017/01110: Land to the South of Tatenhill Lane, Burton.

Hi Kerry,

With regards to the above site I have previously dealt with an outline planning application (P/2013/01160) and a reserved matters application (P/2017/00263).

The outline planning application indicated that new public roads were to be provided within the site. During e-mail correspondence with the County Council's Network Management Unit, that impacted on the reserved matters application, it transpired that the developer intended the internal road network to remain private.

With the current full application I note that with reference to Section 6 of the Application Form new public roads are to be provided within the site. Could I please have confirmation from the developer of the intended status of the new roads before I proceed any further.

Best Regards

Jake

Jake Derry

Project Engineer (DC)

Staffordshire East Area

Local Development Projects

Staffordshire County Council

Location: Third Floor, Staffordshire Place 1, Stafford. ST16 2LP

Postal Address – Staffordshire County Council, 2 Staffordshire Place, Tipping Street, Stafford. ST16 2DH

Tel: 01785 276644

john.derry@staffordshire.gov.uk

www.staffordshire.gov.uk



****NEW** Information for Developers** including Pre-Application Planning Advice, Highways Work Agreement applications, road adoptions and Design & Build services – www.staffordshire.gov.uk/developers

Staffordshire County Council

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

Find out more by visiting the [Staffordshire County Council](http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk) 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](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: DC Support

Sent: 25 September 2017 13:37

To: DC Support <DCsupport@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

I would like to object to the number of houses being built and also the demolition of the 2 properties. Currently there is no parking outside my property and all parking is on the pavement opposite the 2 properties that are to be demolished.

I cannot understand the reasoning for all the houses to be built on land next to the waterpark. We are already committed to having 2,500 homes etc on Lawns farm land, a rugby club the other side of the canal and a new comprehensive.

If we need so many houses why can't the houses within the town be redeveloped (Social housing) instead of using all the green space around our village.

We will be joined to Birmingham at this rate.

The water park is of natural beauty, with all these extra houses being built on flood water land, we will be prone to flooding which we already are so this will exasperate the situation even more. The Wildlife will decrease, and we will be overcome with cars and noise. I moved to my property for the peace and quiet and greenery, now we are over run with houses and cars, total noise.

Comment Type is Neighbour Objection

Your Ref: P/2017/01110



25/9/17

Dear Sir,

I wish to object to the above application, demolition of 78 and 80 Tatenhill Lane and erection of 55 houses. The greenfield site is in a flood plain according to the Environment Agency

In 2000, the field had standing water, the adjacent houses had flooding up to their patios and some had flooding in their front gardens

In November 2012, No 80 Tatenhill Lane had standing water in the field behind their garden, up until Spring 2013

The new houses I presume will be built higher, thus compromising the existing houses even more.

In 2012 the Burton Rugby Club site, the other side of the Trent and Mersey Canal was like a sea, all over the low fields. I was born where I now live and have never seen the fields flooded to that extent before.

There are over three and a half thousand houses being built in this area in the coming years. Why

do you need more houses on a green field site next to the Bramston Water Park? The water park is an S.S.I. with the reed beds and wildlife. How will the houses, noise and lighting affect the wildlife at the water park?

The area is a Conservation Area close to the Bridge Inn public house, why spoil it by building these houses. I have spoken to canal boaters moored by the field and water park and they would not moor there if houses are built there, thus losing tourists.

The field is almost the only greenfield site south of Burton-on-Trent. Why don't the Council buy it and use it as a picnic site and wildlife centre to attract tourists. Incorporate it with the water park and save some green space for future generations.

There is a high water table here, the water has to go somewhere. Who can the Tatenhill Lane householders sue when their houses flood, KSB or the developers?

yours sincerely

Ms K Challoner
Planning Department
Town Hall
Burton upon Trent
Staffordshire
DE14 9JG

3rd October 2017

Dear Ms Challoner

Re: Your Reference: P/2017/01110
Application – Demolition of 78 & 80 Tatenhill Lane & Erection of 55 Dwellings

We live adjacent to the proposed development site and are writing to ask that East Staffordshire Borough Council refuse this planning application.

Please find below our comments and objections relating to this planning application:

1. The dwellings will be visually overbearing. They are an inappropriate design for this part of Tatenhill Lane. These 55 dwellings would be totally out of keeping with the neighbouring properties, which are mainly detached, semi-detached style houses and single storey bungalows.
2. Traffic: More traffic will cause pollution and dust at all times of the day and night.
3. Tatenhill Lane is already a busy road due to the general public using it to go to the Water Park; this additional concentration of traffic will cause traffic problems and create a safety hazard for other motorists.
4. As you are aware Staffordshire County Council are already building 2,500 new homes in Tatenhill called Branston Locks – is this not enough?
5. Flooding: With the new development, Branston Water Park and the River Trent, I feel it's only a matter of time before Tatenhill Lane is flooded.
6. The Wildlife has already been affected with no provisions in place.

Yours sincerely

Kerry Challoner

Sent: 03 October 2017 22:06
To: Kerry Challoner
Subject: Tatenhill Lane Development

Dear Planning Committee,

Thank you, once again, for giving us the opportunity to comment on the proposed development slated for the land south of Tatenhill Lane – basically between our back gardens and Branston Water Park.

We refer you to our previous letters where we have stated our objections and point of view – and these remain the same.

1. The flood risks
2. Increased traffic and parking
3. Loss of green belt and conservation areas

The Flood Risk/Potential for Flooding.

The developers state that they will construct the new houses (increased from the original 28 – when the land was classified as being in Flood Risk Zone 3a, to 33 and currently 55 houses!) with a minimum ground floor elevation of 600mm. But the houses in Tatenhill Lane have no such elevation. The new development will also, by its nature, have considerable areas of tarmac and other non-porous materials, through road-ways, drives etc, never mind the displacement of draining land due to the properties themselves. We have lived in Tatenhill Lane for over 25 years and I was also farm manager with responsibility for this field during the 1980s and have therefore experienced the water-logged conditions of the field (described in the flood report as 'free draining' – a statement with which I disagree) and indeed these conditions have sometimes spread into our back garden. When attending a planning meeting some 4 years ago, we were told that the flood risk had been reduced – but what we were **not** told, was HOW this had been achieved. Have new dykes been dug? Have bunds been put in place? What steps were taken to change/reduce the flood risk? There appears to be little or no explanation of what offsite measures have been or will be taken, but you will appreciate that the residents of the lane are quite anxious that their flood prevention needs are as pertinent as those of the new development. We therefore object to the development on the grounds that there is too great a risk of flooding to established properties in the area. If the development should go ahead, what flood prevention plans are in place to protect the established properties? And what, if any, insurance plans have the developers taken out, should flooding occur in the future?

Increased Volume of Traffic/Parking

No one can fail to have noticed the changes that have taken (and are taking) place at the top of the lane, due to the construction of the new bridge over the canal to provide adequate access to the new High School, Rugby Club and the Lawns Farm housing development. This has mitigated the risks that were there when the entrance into the lane was a T-junction – making access a great deal safer. However, there are now two further issues.

Children are going to be encouraged to walk to school down Tatenhill Lane – in fact, there will, according to the plans, be a walkway and cycle path that will give local children completely safe access straight to the new school. But. If there is to be, a quite significant new junction due to the demolition of the bungalows at numbers 78 and 80 to provide access to the new development, the walk and cycle way will no longer be completely safe, as there will be, conservatively, some 55 to 70 vehicles (averaging 1 or 2 cars per household, and it is likely to be more than this) coming in and out of the new development, plus the cars that already travel up and down the lane, especially at key times of the day. (The current Arney workforce have commented that they find the amount of traffic that uses the lane – a cul de sac – considerably more than they would have thought).

We have previously drawn your attention to the fact that the lane is used as a 'car park' for people who take advantage of car sharing – being near to a junction on the A38, it is ideal for this purpose. We have not heard of any residents in the lane complaining about this, most commenting that car sharing is a good idea. However, they park just where the proposed junction is to be built, as there is currently a stretch of road that has no driveway access. Where will they park if they cannot park there? Further down the lane where they block access to driveways and/or narrow the road even further? They often half park on footpaths as it is to avoid causing a blockage in the road. This is probably not your problem, but it may become ours in the future. As it is, this same area is used as an overflow car park for the Bridge Inn, which can, at certain times of the day, cause quite a hazard, especially if something large needs to access the lane.

Loss of Green Belt and Conservation

With the government's drive to build more and more houses, green belt areas are disappearing from around many towns. However, the construction of the rugby club (where the need for significant drainage has been highlighted over the last few weeks – see above) has meant that a considerable area used for nesting by lapwings has been lost, although the building of a rugby club cannot really be classed as loss of green belt. But as construction continues, the green fields that mark the edge of the town and give Branston Water Park such a 'countryside' feel will also disappear. Conservation of areas used to encourage larks – numbers of which are declining across Europe – has been a big issue for the last ten years or so, with farmers being given subsidies to leave strips in cultivated fields where they can nest. And yet lark numbers and their nests do not seem to have been considered when building on this piece of land – please correct us if we are wrong in this.

Thank you for taking our views into consideration.