
From:
Sent: 12 October 2022 13:03
To: Alan Harvey
Subject: RE: RE: P/2021/00999 – Land West of Ellastone Village Hall Wootton Lane Ellastone

This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If the sender appears as someone within ESBC - BEWARE!

Hi Alan,

Thanks for the email, slightly strange one as I'm not aware that we should have to provide any sequential test or to look at alternative sites for a holiday let scheme. Saying that however, I have spoken to the applicant and they have advised that there other farmland is located at Onecote and at Calwich. I was hoping to get plans from the applicant to send to you, but these haven't arrived as yet and I wanted to get something back to you by lunch as requested.

Both of these areas of land were considered for the holiday let accommodation, the land a Calwich was immediately discounted as this is rented land and therefore not available for the proposed holiday accommodation. In addition, the land is clearly in a less sustainable location to that at Ellastone and therefore in locational terms is less preferable.

With regards to Onecote, this land is again isolated from any public amenities and scores incredibly low in sustainability terms, there is no bus service, no public house in walking distance and would certainly necessitate daily use of the private motor car, unlike the site at Ellastone. The land is therefore unavailable for the proposed holiday use.

It is therefore clear that there are no other sites available to the applicant on which the development could be completed.

Best Regards,

Jim

Jim Malkin MRTPI
Director



Registered Office: 14A Market Place, Uttoxeter, Staffordshire, ST14 8HP
Registered in England No. 10123332

This e-mail contains confidential information belonging to the sender, which is legally privileged; it is believed to be free of viruses that may affect any IT system. It is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that any e-mails or attachments are virus free, as JMI Planning Limited accepts no responsibility. Reports, Statements and other technical attachments are the property of JMI Planning Limited and are only to be altered by employees of JMI Planning Limited. Should you not be the intended recipient then any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action

in reliance on the contents of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us immediately, and permanently delete this message.

From: Alan Harvey <Alan.Harvey@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 October 2022 18:27

Subject: FW: RL: P/2021/00999 Land west of Ellastone Village Hall Wootton Lane Ellastone
Importance: High

Dear Jim

RE: P/2021/00999 – Land West of Ellastone Village Hall Wootton Lane Ellastone

I refer to above application and specifically going back through the various correspondences and submissions I can not find at any point in time where you have referenced or addressed the comments of the then conservation officer in relation to the consideration of other potential sites (as per the summary sheet sent with my email of 20.12.2021 and attached again here). I would be obliged by of clarification if you could advise as to why that was/remains the case given that James in his comments set out the view that *“only if alternative sites are not available would it be reasonable to go on to consider whether the benefits of the proposal would sufficiently outweigh harm so as to overcome the statutory presumption against granting planning permission which would arise from section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.”* It was of course also James’s view that the scheme itself would give rise to *less than substantial harm to heritage assets and their settings* (hence the issue of the use of para 202 of the NPPF in relation to any planning balance consideration).

I would be obliged if you could respond to the above by return email in order that officers may discuss the matter with Sherrie Grant having regard to the preparation of any report to Planning Committee. As such an expedient response would be beneficial

Thanks in anticipation.

Alan Harvey

(nb I am on leave on weds – so you will get an out of office - but I will aim to look at my emails around midday on weds to see if there is any response).

From: Alan Harvey
Sent: 20 December 2021 12:53

Subject: RE: P/2021/00999 – Land west of Ellastone Village Hall Wootton Lane Ellastone

Dear Jim Malkin,

RE: P/2021/00999 – Land West of Ellastone Village Hall Wootton Lane Ellastone

I refer to the above application and further to our recent conversations I would re-iterate in overarching terms it is considered that at present the submissions do not provide sufficient information to provide for a fully informed decision making process to be undertaken by members of the Planning Committee. Having regard to the comments of the various consultees and interested parties I would highlight that additional clarification/ amended drawings need to be provided in the following respects.

The Principle of the development

The Council has recently published a document to help inform the application process in relation to applications for holiday accommodation. This document can be viewed at the following link.

Officers consider in these circumstances that it would be appropriate for any applicant with a 'live application' to be given the opportunity to review the document and submit further documentation. This review clearly provides such an opportunity.

Impact on Heritage Assets/Character of the locality

The Conservation Officer has commented in some detail on the likely impact of the scheme in terms of the impacts on heritage assets, and concludes - even on the basis of the level of information provided to date - that the scheme will have minor material harm on the setting. This conclusion is shared as the case officer. This issue was of course the focus of the appeal decision from 1995 when the inspector concluded the residential scheme was detrimental to heritage assets.

There have since that time (1995) been changes in the national and local plan policies – and of course the planning balance is most recently set out in the July 2021 version of the NPPF – but it is considered that the contribution of the site to the Conservation Area as identified by the Inspector remains wholly salient.

In terms of the current scheme, there are a number of matters which need resolving to a sufficient level so as to provide for an informed decision making process to be achieved. These are as follows:-

- **The precise impact of the built pod structures and associated works on the visual amenities of the locality/heritage assets.**

Streetscape views/cross-sections - the submissions to date are merely artist impressions whereas as a full application the submission should have detailed streetscape views to a metric scale (including complete cross-section drawings). I have marked up on an attached block plan the streetviews/cross-sections required (plan to follow).

Levels – A levels/site topography plan should be provided showing the finished platform levels for the pods and any ground re-grading works required to site the pods, provide associated amenity space and provide the parking area(s) and pedestrian paths etc.

The floor layouts of the pods are not clearly annotated/delineated – there is no precise indication of usage eg. Bedroom, kitchen, toilets etc (which of course have parking (space Nos.) and service/infrastructure implications – see also below). The necessary revised drawings are required showing the use of the internal areas of the pods

- **The associated provision of infrastructure – all of which have potential visual impacts and should be indicated;**

Lighting – will be required to the pods and/or alongside drive/roads for safety. Please show the intended scheme

Sewerage/Heating – it is recognised that these can be conditioned in terms of precise details, however, in the known absence of mains drains/gas on site if above ground structures are required (oil tanks/septic tanks etc) these may impact on visual amenities and details should be provided

Refuse facility – clearly this will be required and its location and appearance would be material and thus details need to be provided.

- **Highway Safety/Parking Provision**

I would advise that the County Highway Authority have now clarified that what they are meaning in terms of the reference to a 'pedestrian crossing' and that is included in the updated response sheet attached. In terms of the parking provision on the site this needs to be accurately depicted on the submitted drawings in terms of the numbers of spaces, their location, size and surfacing. These of course need to reflect the likely levels of people on site (hence the need for the pod 'room' uses to be clarified).

- **Public Footpath**

As per the comments of the SCC PROW Officer the “*application documents need to recognise the existence of Public Footpath No 19 Ellastone Parish which runs through the application site (through the proposed access/parking area).*” This should be accurately delineated on the revised plans accordingly.

Other Matters

A number of residents have raised objections on residential amenities (as you will note when the redacted letters are sent across – and I have actioned redaction) and you are of course able to respond to any matters raised by them in due course. One resident has raised concerns about fires on site given the use of oil tanks in the locality to adjoining properties (and thus potential hazards).

I trust the above sets out all salient matters at this stage and would thank you in anticipation of your responses/additional submission in relation to which it is intended would be subject to a further round of consultations before the application is reported to Planning Committee. I would of course stress at this stage that any request for additional/technical information is made without prejudice to the final determination of the application. I will get redacted copies of the responses of interested parties to you as soon as possible.

Alan Harvey

Principal Planner Officer
Development Control
East Staffordshire Borough Council

Tel. (01283) 508618

www.eaststaffsbc.gov.uk

“Help save paper - do you really need to print this email?”

If you are visiting The Town Hall please note that we have limited car parking spaces available. Short stay parking (free for up to 2 hours) is available at the front of the Town Hall. There is also a pay and display car park at the nearby Burton Train Station (next to the Travel Lodge). ES spaces in the Town Hall car park are strictly for PERMIT HOLDERS ONLY.

We hold a **Comments and Compliments Register**, therefore if you would like to comment or compliment us on the service you have received, please e-mail direct to the officer who dealt with you or alternatively to dcsupport@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk.

To take advantage of our new and improved **Pre-Application Advice Services** and to find out more please follow this [link](#).

The Burton Town Hall is an excellent venue for Weddings, Conferences, Exhibitions, Parties, Concerts and Festivals. To find out more please contact our Civic Functions Suite on 01283 508549 or visit our website at www.eaststaffsbc.gov.uk

This e-mail and files or other data transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, disclosure, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying is strictly prohibited and you must not take any action in reliance upon it. Please notify the sender immediately and delete the message. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of East Staffordshire Borough Council unless explicitly stated otherwise. East Staffordshire Borough Council may monitor the contents of e-mail sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures. East Staffordshire Borough Council does not enter into contracts or contractual obligations via electronic mail, unless otherwise explicitly agreed in advance in writing

between parties concerned. The Council believes in being open with its information and the contents of this e-mail and any replies may be released to a third party requesting such information at a future date.



