Dear Members

Planning Committee

A meeting of the Planning Committee will be held in the **Craddock Room, Civic Suite, Civic Centre, Riverside, Stafford on Wednesday 16 January 2019 at 6.30pm** to deal with the business as set out on the agenda.

Please note that this meeting will be recorded.

Members are reminded that contact officers are shown in each report and members are welcome to raise questions etc in advance of the meeting with the appropriate officer.
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Planning Applications

Report of Head of Development

Purpose of Report

To consider the following planning applications, the reports for which are set out in the attached APPENDICES:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page Nos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/28965/FUL</td>
<td>Crown Wharf, Crown Street, Stone</td>
<td>4 - 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/29308/HOU</td>
<td>4 New Row, Bradley Lane, Hyde Lea, Stafford ST18 9BH</td>
<td>27 - 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Head of Development considers that this application should be presented to the Committee for a decision.

Officer Contact Richard Wood, Development Lead (Large Scale) - Telephone 01785 619324

This application is referred to Committee because the applicant is an employee of Stafford Borough Council.

Officer Contact Sarah Poxon, Development Lead (Small Scale) - Telephone 01785 619507

Previous Consideration

Nil

Background Papers

Planning application files are available for Members to inspect, by prior arrangement, in the Development Management Section. The applications including the background papers, information and correspondence received during the consideration of the application, consultation replies, neighbour representations are scanned and are available to view on the Council website.
Reason for referral to Committee

The Head of Development considers that the application should be presented to the Planning Committee for decision.

Context

The site is about 0.35 ha and is currently used mainly as a car park. There is an existing access off Crown Street which is shared with the adjacent boatyard and which would be utilised by the new development. Another part of the site adjacent to the access is currently used for open storage and would provide car parking space for the proposals.

The scheme shows the reuse and incorporation of the derelict wharfinger’s store and cottage as a backstage area, changing/green rooms and stores for the theatre, to which it would be attached. Additional stores are shown along the northern boundary. The theatre would seat up to 140 and have a more distinctive shape and form compared to the bar buildings, but it would be linked to its foyer area and theatre bar within the main public house building. The theatre bar would be partitioned off from the main public house but would share a central servery. A manager’s flat is shown on the first floor at the eastern end. Toilet facilities, board and function rooms would occupy another, separate first floor area at the western end adjoining the theatre.

The public house would have a more traditional appearance, reusing elements in the design of the former brewery stores further to the north west along the canal side. Brick and slate would be the predominant materials. A tower feature apparent on the submitted plans is not on the application site and is not part of this application.

Pedestrian access to both facilities is shown on the north side facing into a courtyard and the bars would have access onto a covered terrace facing the canal.
The applicant has submitted the following in support of the application:-

“(When the previous residential application was rejected) Stone Town Council formed a steering group to encourage the development of the site which would embrace the canal-side location and ensure greater public amenity.

The steering group is made up of representatives from:-

- Stone Town Council
- Canal & Rivers Trust
- Stone Revellers Theatre Group
- Canal Cruising boatyard

This application is for a Joule’s flagship Tap House (and) the location is especially suitable for this purpose as it is a site of important brewery history. The site was cleared in 1961 for the original brewery to expand. This was to have connected the brewhouse [now a supermarket site] and offices, to the Joules warehouse. Joules cooperage (where the barrels were made) was located opposite, on the site of the current Crown and Anchor car park, which was also a Joules pub. Crown Wharf (would have been) in the shadow of the former brewery tower and central to the old brewery footprint in the town stretching from the Crown and Anchor, to the old Joules maltings on Newcastle Street.

In November 2017, the Canal & Rivers Trust agreed terms for the site with Joules Brewery on the prospectus of a leisure orientated scheme. The Trust has an objective to promote the canal, and to make the canal more accessible to the town centre. The development principles were agreed that would deliver this result. The trust has worked closely with the steering group in creating the proposals presented here.

...This proposal is for a new Public House and Studio Theatre, incorporating the historic heritage asset, the former Wharfinger’s Cottage and Stores. Crown Wharf will be ‘Joules in Stone’ and the sister pub to the Red Lion at Market Drayton, two halves of the current Joules Brewery business...

Stone is the home of the Joule’s beer brand, (and) the trade mark Stone Ale and cross are synonymous with Stone. The brand has an important role in the cultural heritage of the town, such was the scale and regional impact of the old brewery.

The building proposed reflects the canal side heritage and trading wharf origins with design cues which are industrial, and (borrow from) the warehouse nomenclature of the canal side origins. The most striking design cues come from the Joules warehouse buildings, there are numerous references to this building in the design. Some of these are subtle, the use of dramatic roof lines, gables, interesting sight- lines and materials. The design also has some less subtle, more direct references, the finials are proposed to be cast iron copies of the originals; the brackets and rainwater goods will all be bespoke trademark elements that reflect the original warehouse. These crafted architectural details echo the original where Joules displayed its corporate pride, rarely seen today where design is often much more functional, and cost engineered.
The building is much more than just a pub, it is a bespoke and highly individual design, encompassing a theatre. A bold and confident approach; a building that can only be used for its proposed purpose and provides high drama suitable to the location.

Crown Wharf will have a sense of being reclaimed … The design will particularly reflect a sense of a ‘second life’ using reclaimed materials. There will be no overriding attempt or intention to create a period design, it is timeless. The emphasis will be on natural materials, crafted excellence, quality, finishes, patina, polish and texture. A carved mahogany fire place, grand and polished will sit next to reclaimed brick and steel windows… panelling to the boardroom will mirror the Mouse Room at the Market Drayton brewery.”

**Officer Assessment – Key Considerations**

1. Policy

The site lies within the settlement boundary of Stone as shown in Part II of The Plan for Stafford Borough (TPSB), and Stone is second only to Stafford in the sustainable settlement hierarchy under Spatial Principle (SP)3 of TPSB. The site is also within the town centre boundary and in the conservation area as defined in the Stone Town Centre Inset Plan of TPSB.

Spatial Principle (SP)7 of TPSB states that development of a scale and nature appropriate to secure the sustainability of each settlement, as here proposed, will be supported within settlement boundaries.

Policy Stone 1 – Stone Town of TPSB states that, reflecting its role as the second settlement of the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy set by Spatial Principle SP3, the strategy for Stone town will seek to enhance its role by increasing both its range and quality of services and facilities. The proposal would conform with this intention.

The aim of that policy is also to strengthen Stone town centre's role as a market town within the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy (Spatial Principle SP3) by:

a) Encouraging the development and expansion of the town centre to provide a vibrant place where people can meet, shop, eat and spend leisure time in a safe and pleasant environment; and

d) Improving and strengthening both the range and diversity of educational, health, cultural and community services and facilities in the town.

The policy also intends to promote Stone as a tourist destination with its unique architectural character and heritage by:

i. Conserving and enhancing the character of Stone town centre, its historic buildings, street patterns and rich heritage;

ii. Supporting canal based regeneration initiatives in Stone town centre that enhance the context and character of the canal as a focal point and tourist attraction;

iii. Increasing tourist opportunities for visitors … by facilitating the development of innovative tourist attractions; and
v. Ensuring new development protects and enhances the significance of Stone's many heritage assets.

The application would serve to further these aims, and Policy E8 Town, Local and Other Centres of TPSB also supports the proposal in this location.

No objection is thus raised in principle.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework:
Paragraphs 11, 80, 82, 85, 91, 92.

The Plan for Stafford Borough:
SP1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SP3 Stafford Borough Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy
SP7 Supporting the Location of New Development
Policy Stone 1 Stone Town
Policy E8 Town, Local and Other Centres

2. Character and appearance

Whilst the observations of the Conservation Advisor, Historic England and the Theatres Trust are noted, it is stressed that these are based on amended drawings received from the applicant following a meeting with officers, including the Conservation Advisor and Design Advisor, at which design issues were discussed. The latest plans show the deletion of staff flats from within one of the new buildings on the rear boundary and its use now as a store, as there was insufficient space shown around it for residential amenity purposes. The other changes are:-

- Theatre building is now based on an octagonal shape on plan, providing more facets to the wharf-side elevation and allowing the theatre to be more visually prominent.
- Crown to the roof of the theatre is raised so it is more prominent when viewed from the far side of the canal.
- Additional glazed panels to the back of the theatre where it adjoins the theatre bar and tap house to provide more visual separation.
- Gables to the wharf-side are now 40 degrees pitch rather than the 35 degrees previously shown.
- Untidy void/corner to the wharf-side, where the terrace meets the theatre, is simplified. Height of this section of wall is dropped to prioritise the view of the theatre from the canal.

These changes are considered to result in the design of the theatre being more individual, bespoke and distinctive compared to that of the public house, which the applicants clearly acknowledge forms a statement of the company brand. However, both designs are considered to enhance this prominent canal bank site and this part of the conservation area, particularly given its current appearance as a rough surfaced, informal open car park. The scheme would also restore and rejuvenate the derelict wharfinger’s cottage and store which were once central to the canal wharf function of the site.
More detailed responses are given to the main concerns of each of the key consultees/representations below:-

A) Conservation Advisor:

“My objection to the original submission was that the submitted design was a disappointingly unimaginative response to the opportunities offered by the site, both in terms of the location of the new building so far towards the canal frontage of the former wharf, and in mirroring the distinctive design of the former brewery warehouses just to the north along the canal.”

Case officer response:

Whilst this may still be the case for the public house, the design of the theatre was more distinctive and significant changes have been made to the design of the theatre to make it more visually dominant in the context of both buildings. It must also be borne in mind that it is designed around specialist internal functions.

Conservation Advisor:

“Overall it was felt that the various elements of the proposal (historic cottage, theatre, and beer hall) were poorly co-ordinated and lacked any sense of visual excitement. I argued that the submission failed to conserve or enhance the conservation area (Section 72(1) of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 test) or to address the requirements of TPSB policies N1, N8 and N9 relating to design, context and historic environment.”

Case Officer response:

Changes have been made to the scheme and the consideration of design issues can be subjective even though this is carried out with informed judgement.

Conservation Advisor:

“It has been unfortunate through all these discussions that the applicant has been reluctant to give substantive reconsideration to the architectural expression of the scheme and that the revised elevations are not substantially different to those originally tabled… the overall concept of reproducing the appearance of the 19th century brewery ranges remains, diminishing the significance of the surviving historic buildings and creating an undistinguished new range redolent of the “heritage” themed pubs of major brewery chains.”

Case Officer response:

It is not considered that this approach to the design of the public house is necessarily out of place in the acknowledged historic brewery related context of the location.

Conservation Advisor:
“The adoption of an octagonal plan for the theatre, while reflecting suggestions made by Borough Council officers, has not fully exploited the potential of the geometry to create an eye-catching feature on the site. Its restricted height lacks presence and its asymmetric absorption into the beer hall range blunts any sense of distinction or identity at ground floor level. It remains regrettable that the beer hall range is positioned so close to the canal losing the sense of the site as an historic open wharf. The density of buildings along this frontage is cluttered and overbearing, further underlining the departure from the historic character of the space and its relationship to the waterway."

Case Officer response:

It is considered that the design of the theatre has been improved within the constraints of its internal functional requirements including the shared use of space within the public house structure. Space for a terrace to the public house fronting the canal and access to the canal bank is included in the layout. The introduction of buildings onto the historically open wharfage area necessarily constrains the space but the Conservation Advisor has stated his support in principle for such buildings.

Conservation Advisor:

"With the presence of various stores and back of house service buildings also accessed from the (courtyard) space it is likely to lead to pedestrian-vehicle conflict; there remains no legible entrance to the theatre. It is unfortunate that other than showing a simple flight of stairs from the fire station site the amended drawings still do not evince any realistic connectivity between the two sites."

Case Officer response:

The stores and service buildings as well as the service functions eg beer deliveries would be screened from the canal behind the main buildings. Pedestrian access to the main buildings is shown on the courtyard side as this is the most direct route from the car park and from the existing Crown Street access. A further possible pedestrian only access via the old fire station site to the north to Crown Street remains an aspiration of the steering group and is not part of this application. Whilst the clarification of the Highway Authority on pedestrian access is awaited, vehicles would be expected to move at very slow speeds in carrying out service functions in this area. Such service functions are also unlikely to coincide with the public use of the main buildings.

B) Historic England

“We are concerned that the current proposals do not fully realise the potential of this historic canal side site within Stone Conservation Area.”
Case Officer response:

It is not considered that this is a sufficient reason for refusing planning permission.

Historic England:

“… we are concerned that the current proposals would result in an uncomfortable and unconvincing mix of architectural influences. The Design, Access and Planning Statement ... emphasises that there is no overriding attempt or intention to create a ‘period design’. As such this has, in our view, resulted in a scheme of assembled elements, rather than displaying a more unified architectural language. This lack of either a faithful pastiche following traditional proportions and detailing, or a clearly contrasting contemporary design, generates an awkward juxtaposition when compared against other authentic historic canal buildings within the locality.”

Case Officer response:

It is not considered that the harm that would result from the development has been defined so as to be a sufficient reason for refusing planning permission.

Historic England:

“Whilst we would support the principle of the retention and reuse of the Wharfinger’s Cottage and store, it is unclear from the submitted information as to exactly how much of the structure remains, or would be lost through the repair process. We note the addendum to the 2011 structural report, and assume that the applicant is in discussions with your conservation advisers regarding the details of the proposed works.”

Case Officer response:

Plans and elevations of the surviving structure of these buildings have been submitted. An historic buildings assessment of them dated October 2013 and carried out on behalf of the Canal and Rivers Trust has also been submitted. This concludes that whilst the unlisted buildings are in a fragile condition and parts are supported by scaffolding, re-use would require a degree of re-building, replacement and restoration of historic fabric. However, it does not detail how much of the buildings could be retained or would require rebuilding. The submitted plans show only the finished appearance of the restored buildings. A condition on the planning consent would clarify that the buildings should not be demolished and that more detail on their restoration should be submitted.

C) Theatres Trust

“…despite a revised indicative layout our concerns …(remain) on how the split between pub and theatre will be managed operationally. (There is a) … need to ensure it complies with relevant standards and building regulations… there needs to be further refinement of the proposed designs.”
Case Officer response:

The first two issues are not planning matters and it is not specified what the design refinements should be.

Theatres Trust:

“The plans for the theatre show two changing spaces, but the changing space south of the entrance hall also appears to be the only means of access to the stage and backstage therefore it would be expected that people would regularly pass through. This would severely limit its usability, particularly in the event of the theatre hosting productions involving children. A suggested solution is that space to the rear of the stage is given to one or even two changing rooms, with the existing changing spaces being utilised for storage and the proposed stores used as a studio for rehearsals. This would also potentially allow the rehearsal studio to be used simultaneously with the main theatre, which might allow for regular hires thus improving the theatre’s income.

We would suggest that the seating layout within the theatre ought to be reviewed and refined as we believe that the indicative layout will result in poor sight-lines to some positions. The theatre must also ensure it complies with Part M of the Building Regulations in terms of providing sufficient wheelchair spaces as these currently aren’t shown on the plans.

It should also be ensured that there is appropriate acoustic control to the theatre, not just to prevent leakage of sound from performances but to prevent noise into the auditorium from what could potentially be a busy pub and bar particularly at weekends.

The supporting documents indicate that the pub and theatre are to be independently operated, but clearly there are elements of the development that are shared and potential opportunities for cross-funding and mutual benefit. We would suggest clear and unambiguous agreement between the two parties as to how facilities such as the function space will be managed and who is responsible for building maintenance and staffing… We would encourage Stone Revellers to engage a theatre consultant to advise on their business plan, if they have not already done so, to ensure the theatre is viable and sustainable including factoring in the potential impact of leakage of spend from their own bar towards the pub.”

Case Officer response:

These are non-planning matters.

Theatres Trust:

“… plans show there to be three independent residential units (separate from the public house) which are labelled on the Site Layout Plan as ‘staff flats’… we would caution against conventional housing in this location due to potential conflict with the theatre and pub which could undermine their use. Although neither uses on the site are as yet established, paragraph 182 of the NPPF is reflective of the challenges faced by cultural facilities and other noise-generating uses where their activities are curtailed due to complaints from neighbours.”
Case Officer response:

This element has been deleted from the proposals.

Case Officer conclusion:

It is considered that sufficient cases for the refusal of planning permission have not been made out by the key respondents, given in particular the appropriate changes made to the exterior design of the scheme. However, the advice of the Theatres Trust would be referenced in an informative on a decision. Details of floor levels are shown on the plans but conditions would secure more information of external levels and materials, hard and soft landscaping and boundary features.

Another condition would secure the construction and completion of the theatre and the refurbishment of the wharfinger’s store and cottage before the public house is first used, to ensure the implementation of this mixed use development as intended.

Policies and Guidance:

National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraphs 124, 130, 131, 184, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 200.

The Plan for Stafford Borough
Policy N1 – Design;
Policy N9 – Historic Environment
Policy Stone 1 – Stone Town

3. Amenity

Acceptable circumstances of privacy would be achieved from the flat above the public house in terms of the 21m guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document on residential design (SPDD). The Environmental Health Officer raises issues with regard to the potential impact of noise and disturbance from construction works and the use of the premises on residential neighbours including canal boats, but suggests appropriate conditions to achieve acceptable mitigation. The site lies within the town centre boundary of Stone under TPSB and clearly mixed use developments can be acceptable with such mitigation.

Policies and Guidance:-
National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraphs 180, 182

The Plan for Stafford Borough
Policy N1 – Design;
Supplementary Planning Document - Design
4. Trees

A number of trees would be removed from the proposed car park area and the northern boundary to the site. The observations of the Tree Officer would be available at the meeting. A landscaping condition would secure new planting in mitigation.

Policies and Guidance:-
National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraphs 124, 127, 130, 184, 190, 192.
The Plan for Stafford Borough
Policy N1 – Design;
Policy N9 – Historic Environment

5. Parking and highways

The layout plan shows 20 parking spaces mainly on the section of land fronting Crown Street currently used for open storage. There are no parking standards in TPSB for public houses but a theatre would normally require 1 space per 5 fixed seats and adequate turning and loading space, including for a coach or a 16.5m long lorry. The theatre is shown with 90 fixed seats and thus 18 spaces should be provided and are shown.

At the time of writing the report, further amendments to the layout of the parking spaces and turning areas are awaited and the observations of the Highway Authority on these changes would be available at the meeting.

Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraph 108, 109, 110.
The Plan for Stafford Borough
Policy T1 Transport
Policy T2 Parking and Manoeuvring Facilities

6. Surface water drainage

It is intended to collect storm water from the site in an underground system that includes attenuated discharge into the canal. The site lies within Flood Zone 1, the zone of least flood risk, and the Local Lead Flood Authority raises no objection.

Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraphs 148, 149, 155, 163, 165

The Plan for Stafford Borough
Policy N2 Climate Change
7. Ecology

The submitted planning statement explains that the derelict Wharfinger’s Cottage has no roof covering and is not considered to be a likely habitat for birds after the summer months. A bat survey carried out in August 2014 concluded that there had been some bat emergence and the buildings were suitable for foraging and transient bats in the summer but the site was not suitable for winter roosting. It concludes that this situation has not changed and any works to the old buildings would be outside of the period for transient bat activity.

The observations of the Biodiversity Officer on the issue of bat habitat would be available at the meeting.

Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraphs 170, 174, 175.

The Plan for Stafford Borough
Policy N4 The Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure

8. Gas pipeline

There is a gas main beneath the towpath on the opposite bank of the canal. However, neither the Health and Safety Executive nor Cadent raise any safety concerns in relation to the development.

9. Conclusion

The proposals would result in sustainable development and is considered to provide economic and social benefits as well as the environmental benefit of the enhancement of the canal side, the townscape of Stone town centre and the conservation area.

Consultations

Highway Authority:
16 spaces is low for the cottage, theatre and public house, although we have no parking standards for a public house. If it is agreed that this is a town centre site and there is alternative public parking then this overcomes the number of parking spaces issue. However there is not enough detail on the plans to determine if the parking spaces to be provided are of a correct size and if there is at least 6m behind each bay. Some bays look difficult to access/egress. There is no indication how pedestrians will access the public house, theatre, or residential properties without walking on the proposed access road. There is no indication as to where loading for the public house or theatre will take place. Can a delivery vehicle or refuge vehicle turn within the site? Turning circles required.
The only other condition we would have would be for a Construction Management Plan with details of wheel wash, site store of materials, loading/unloading and parking for site staff.

**Conservation Advisor:**

5 December 2018

The proposed development has the potential to deliver a major enhancement to the conservation area and facilities for the town centre. The principle of the development is therefore fully worthy of support in conservation terms. My objection to the original submission was that the submitted design was a disappointingly unimaginative response to the opportunities offered by the site, both in terms of the location of the new building so far towards the canal frontage of the former wharf, and in mirroring the distinctive design of the former brewery warehouses just to the north along the canal.

Overall it was felt that the various elements of the proposal (historic cottage, theatre, and beer hall) were poorly co-ordinated and lacked any sense of visual excitement. I argued that the submission failed to conserve or enhance the conservation area (Section 72(1) of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 test) or to address the requirements of TPSB policies N1, N8 and N9 relating to design, context and historic environment.

We have since held meetings with the applicant, Canal and Rivers Trust (CRT) and (representatives of) Stone Town Council which has given an increased understanding of the objectives of the scheme. These have helpfully emphasised the potential benefits the scheme could offer to canal users, visitors to Stone and local people, and in turn to the profile of the town and the local economy. We have also seen the CRT Design Brief for the site and learned of the intention to develop a town heritage centre as a linked attraction in the adjacent former fire station. It is regrettable that the Borough Council was not invited to share in pre-application discussions as suggested in the CRT Design Principles.

It has been unfortunate through all these discussions that the applicant has been reluctant to give substantive reconsideration to the architectural expression of the scheme and that the revised elevations are not substantially different to those originally tabled. While some changes have been made, for example to the roof pitch of the gabled range, the overall concept of reproducing the appearance of the 19th century brewery ranges remains, diminishing the significance of the surviving historic buildings and creating an undistinguished new range redolent of the “heritage” themed pubs of major brewery chains.

The adoption of an octagonal plan for the theatre, while reflecting suggestions made by Borough Council officers, has not fully exploited the potential of the geometry to create a eye-catching feature on the site. Its restricted height lacks presence and its asymmetric absorption into the beer hall range blunts any sense of distinction or identity at ground floor level. It remains regrettable that the beer hall range is positioned so close to the canal losing the sense of the site as an historic open wharf. The density of buildings along this frontage is cluttered and overbearing, further underlining the departure from the historic character of the space and its relationship to the waterway.
The applicant has argued that the design of the new building and its positioning close to the canal accords with the CRT Design Principles and has allowed the creation of a public courtyard to the north and will relate to the forthcoming heritage centre in the fire station. This remains unconvincing, and is not supported by a reading of the CRT Principles. With the presence of various stores and back of house service buildings also accessed from the space it is likely to lead to pedestrian-vehicle conflict; there remains no legible entrance to the theatre. It is unfortunate that other than showing a simple flight of stairs from the fire station site the amended drawings still do not evince any realistic connectivity between the two sites.

In summary, while the proposed uses have the potential to enhance the site and conservation area the architectural expression of the development remains seriously lacking and will cause harm to the significance of the conservation area. The harm is augmented given the prominence of the site and the failure to realise the opportunity to enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The NPPF Section 1 stresses that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning process should achieve and at paragraph 130 advises that permission should be refused for development that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. Historic Environment advice in the NPPF, in particular paragraph 200, advises that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new developments within conservation areas to enhance their significance; and at para 193 it attributes great weight to conserving heritage assets in the decision making process. The application fails to comply with policies N1 and N9 of TPSB; the tests of S72(1) of the Planning(Listed Building & Conservation Areas)Act 1990 and, consistent with NPPF advice on good design and place making, I therefore recommend refusal.

1 November 2018

Last week’s meeting with the applicant and CRT was very helpful in understanding the background to the application and the aspirations of the developer for the future of the site. However nothing was said to persuade me that our criticisms of the design and siting of the proposal are misplaced. I remain of the view that there are other ways of designing the new building and laying out the site which would deliver the applicants’ objectives, satisfy CRT constraints and create a more exciting development which would enhance this distinctive conservation area setting. To that end I am more than willing to continue in negotiation with the applicant to explore alternative options.

The applicant’s e-mail of 30 October seems to be under a misapprehension that SBC need to determine the application in the near future leaving no time to explore other options. Provided the applicant is agreeable to an extension of time surely we can defer a planning decision to create that time. As things stand I would recommend refusal of permission on design grounds but if the matter was taken to appeal I suspect PINS would take a dim view that no attempt had been made to negotiate an acceptable solution.

I suggest we write back reiterating our view that a design solution is achievable and our willingness to defer determination of the application to allow time for further negotiation.

7 September 2018

The application site occupies a prominent and historic canalside location in Stone conservation area. Originally an important town wharfage on the Trent and Mersey canal the site has been used for car parking for many years. There is the potential to redevelop
the area to deliver a major enhancement to the conservation area and facilities for the town centre. The former wharfingers cottage still stands at one end of the site; it is unclear if this is to be demolished or incorporated in the new building.

In principle there is no conservation objection to siting a new theatre and bar on the site. The design of the current proposal is a disappointingly unimaginative response to the opportunities offered by the site. The attempt to mirror the distinctive design of the distinctive former brewery range just to the north along the canal diminishes the unique character of those buildings and their contribution to the townscape of Stone. The reworking of the design lacks the vigour of the original buildings and fails to produce a development which offers any sense of visual excitement. The polygonal theatre auditorium does not link coherently with the bar range and with its low pitched roof fails to make a significant architectural statement. The internal planning seems inconveniently arranged in both theatre and bar ranges; the location close to the canal edge misses the chance to improve public accessibility to this land.

In its present form the design of this submission fails to conserve or enhance the conservation area (S72(1) test, or to address the requirements of PF8B policies N1, N8 and N9 relating to design, context and historic environment. It is suggested that a meeting be held with the designers to explore how the design might be modified to produce a building that would be a worthy addition to this sensitive site.

**Historic England:**
4 December 2018
Having considered the additional information submitted, whilst we would support the amendments which have been made, they do not appear to fully address the issues we previously raised. We would therefore refer you to the content of our letter dated 6 November 2018, and for the reason previously given, we remain unable to support the current scheme.

Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice.

6 November 2018
Historic England would have no objection in principle to the redevelopment of the current car park, and supports the retention and reuse of the historic Wharfinger’s Cottage. However, we are concerned that the current proposals do not fully realise the potential of this historic canal side site within Stone Conservation Area.

Historic England is therefore unable to support the current scheme, and would recommend that the application is held in abeyance to enable further discussions with your design and conservation advisers.

The application site is located within the Stone Conservation Area, adjacent to the Trent and Mersey Canal and close to the core of the historic market town. Although the site was largely cleared and has been utilised as a car park for a number of years, this prominently positioned former wharfage offers excellent opportunities to better understand and appreciate the historic importance of the canals to the development of this part of Staffordshire.
In view of the sensitive location we would draw your attention to the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which emphasised the need to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, and sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

As you will be aware, section 16 of the NPPF emphasises the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, and that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within conservation areas to enhance or better reveal their significance. Section 12 further states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Planning decisions should therefore ensure that development adds to the overall quality of an area; is visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; is sympathetic to local character and history, and establishes or maintains a strong sense of place. Furthermore, permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Having considered the application we are concerned that the current proposals would result in an uncomfortable and unconvincing mix of architectural influences. The Design, Access and Planning Statement highlights a range of historic canal ‘design cues’ which have been incorporated into the proposals. However, it also emphasises that there is no overriding attempt or intention to create a ‘period design’. As such this has, in our view, resulted in a scheme of assembled elements, rather than displaying a more unified architecture language. This lack of either a faithful pastiche following traditional proportions and detailing, or a clearly contrasting contemporary design, generates an awkward juxtaposition when compared against other authentic historic canal buildings within the locality.

Whilst we would support the principle of the retention and reuse of the Wharfinger’s Cottage and store, it is unclear from the submitted information as to exactly how much of the structure remains, or would be lost through the repair process. We note the addendum to the 2011 structural report, and assume that the applicant is in discussions with your conservation advisers regarding the details of the proposed works.

Clearly Historic England would wish to support the Council’s and local community’s aspirations for the redevelopment and regeneration of this important canal side site, and its wider economic and public benefits for Stone. We would therefore recommend that the applicant continues to work with your design and conservation advisers to bring forward a revised scheme, more appropriate for this important site. If you would find it of assistance we would be happy to be involved in such discussions.

**Design Advisor:**
Observations would be available at the meeting.

**Local Lead Flood Authority:**
The development is mainly on existing hard standing, with no significant change to the impermeable area, so little change to the surface water runoff generated by the site.
As the site is within Flood Zone 1, is not within the 1 in 100 year flood event outline and there are no recorded flooding hotspots within 20m or ordinary watercourses within 5m, the site is considered to be at low risk of flooding.
We therefore have no bespoke comments to make on this occasion.

The site is adjacent to the Trent and Mersey Canal, and the drainage strategy indicates that surface water is to drain to the canal. This will require the approval of the Canal and Rivers Trust.

**Environmental Health Officer:**
No objection subject to conditions to restrict hours of construction work and related deliveries; burning and running of equipment outside of construction working hours. Due to the proximity of residential boats, a condition should secure a noise assessment and a specification for noise mitigation. Justification should be provided for any driven piling work during construction compared to other methods given the potential for noise disturbance.

**Tree Officer:**
Observations would be available at the meeting.

**Canal and Rivers Trust:**
Consultation expiry date - 17 December 2018. No reply received.

**Cadent:**
Although Cadent Gas does have a pipeline in the vicinity, the proposed development is outside of the criteria requiring National Grid to carry out any improvements.

**Health and Safety Executive:**
Do not advise against granting permission on safety grounds.

**Inland Waterways Association:**
Wholeheartedly support proposal. For many years we have wanted to see an appropriate development for this historic site which would retain the historic wharfingers cottage, that would deliver community benefits, and would recognise the importance of the adjacent canal. This proposal would appear to do all that and more and we support it fully.

**Stone Town Council:**
No objection. If there is any damage to the heritage assets, it would be far outweighed by the gain provided to the general public.

**Neighbours:**
56 notified; 37 replies/representations received from 29 addresses. 33 support proposals; 1 is neutral; 3 object on grounds summarised as follows:

- Inadequate car parking and overspill onto private road
- Inadequate accessibility
- Poor architectural detailing and design
- Disturbance from vehicles using car park, music, and use of outdoor areas
Site Notices:
Expiry dates 24 August 2018

Adverts:
Expiry dates 29 August 2018

Other representations

Theatres Trust:
14 December 2018:
We consider the revisions to the layout and function of backstage areas within the theatre to be an improvement. Some queries regarding use of the wider site have been clarified. However, despite a revised indicative layout our concerns regarding the auditorium remain as do our previous comments on how the split between pub and theatre will be managed operationally. We strongly recommend that the applicant engages a specialist theatre consultant/architect, as the long-term sustainability and viability of the theatre must be a priority as is the need to ensure it complies with relevant standards and building regulations.

We would like to reiterate that we support the principle of this development which we feel would be greatly beneficial for Stone and would like to see permission granted, but there needs to be further engagement with relevant stakeholders and further refinement of the proposed designs.

17 August 2018:
This application has been brought to the attention of the Trust as it includes the creation of a new theatre.

We welcome this development which will provide a new theatre for Stone alongside a new public house, helping to activate the canalside and provide a positive use for vacant land occupying a prominent site within the designated Stone Town Centre boundary. Both the theatre and public house are uses recognised by the NPPF (2018) as being beneficial to the sustainability of communities, for which policies and decisions should plan positively.

The principle of this development would appear policy compliant and contributes towards the objectives of the Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031 (2014). Policy Stone 1 – Stone Town, Stone Town Centre part a. encourages development and expansion of the town centre to provide a vibrant place where people can meet, eat and spend leisure time in a safe and pleasant environment. Part v. seeks to improve the range and diversity of cultural and community services and facilities in the town. Policy E8 recognises Stone’s role as a visitor destination, key service centre and market town with a vibrant evening economy, to which this proposal would be in conformity. Part b. of Policy E8 also promotes a diversity of uses including entertainment and cultural activities.

Although we support this development, we would urge the applicant and the theatre operator to take into account our comments set out below to ensure the long-term sustainability and operational effectiveness of the theatre, maximising its ability to attract the type of shows and performers outlined within the application documentation. Crucially,
suggested amendments to the design and layout would also help the space function effectively as an asset for local community groups.

The plans for the theatre show two changing spaces, but the changing space south of the entrance hall also appears to be the only means of access to the stage and backstage therefore it would be expected that people would regularly pass through. This would severely limit its usability, particularly in the event of the theatre hosting productions involving children. A suggested solution is that space to the rear of the stage is given to one or even two changing rooms, with the existing changing spaces being utilised for storage and the proposed stores used as a studio for rehearsals. This would also potentially allow the rehearsal studio to be used simultaneously with the main theatre, which might allow for regular hires thus improving the theatre’s income.

We would suggest that the seating layout within the theatre ought to be reviewed and refined as we believe that the indicative layout will result in poor sight-lines to some positions. The theatre must also ensure it complies with Part M of the Building Regulations in terms of providing sufficient wheelchair spaces as these currently aren’t shown on the plans.

It should also be ensured that there is appropriate acoustic control to the theatre, not just to prevent leakage of sound from performances but to prevent noise into the auditorium from what could potentially be a busy pub and bar particularly at weekends.

The supporting documents indicate that the pub and theatre are to be independently operated, but clearly there are elements of the development that are shared and potential opportunities for cross-funding and mutual benefit. We would suggest clear and unambiguous agreement between the two parties as to how facilities such as the function space will be managed and who is responsible for building maintenance and staffing. We would suggest that given its nature a peppercorn rent might be appropriate for the theatre, if this has not already been agreed. We would encourage Stone Revellers to engage a theatre consultant to advise on their business plan, if they have not already done so, to ensure the theatre is viable and sustainable including factoring in the potential impact of leakage of spend from their own bar towards the pub.

Looking at the wider site, plans show there to be three independent residential units which are labelled on the Site Layout Plan as ‘staff flats’. It would be helpful for supporting documentation to set out the actual role and function of these, what relationship (if any) they have with the theatre and whether the intention is to let these on a commercial basis as they do not appear to be referenced elsewhere other than as ‘key worker’ accommodation on the application form. It would seem unusual to have two independent units associated with ancillary landlord accommodation when there is one which lends itself more naturally to such function attached to the pub. We do not necessarily object to these and visitor accommodation/holiday lets could be considered to be compatible with the use of the site. However, we would caution against conventional housing in this location due to potential conflict with the theatre and pub which could undermine their use. Although neither uses on the site are as yet established, paragraph 182 of the NPPF is reflective of the challenges faced by cultural facilities and other noise-generating uses where their activities are curtailed due to complaints from neighbours.
In conclusion, we support this proposal which we consider would greatly benefit Stone and contribute towards the cultural well-being of local people. We recommend the granting of planning permission, but would strongly suggest that amendments are made to the final design and layout in line with our suggestions and that operational matters are clearly defined so as to ensure the theatre is viable and sustainable for the long term.

**Police Architectural Liaison Officer:**
Use Police approved Secured By Design techniques and features

**Relevant Planning History**

15/23178/FUL – Erection of retirement apartments for the elderly – refused permission on 10 August 2016 due to excessive four storey height; over dominant and overbearing; harm to established small-scale character of canal frontage; disruption of townscape in Conservation Area; undermining the plan-led strategy for Stone town centre; not canal-based regeneration; insufficient information on surface water drainage; no provision for affordable housing or Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation mitigation.

Adjacent land

05/04769/FUL – New mooring basin to accommodate up to six narrow boats – approved 19 August 2005 and built

**Recommendation**

Approve, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

2. The approved plans are drawing nos. 1881 D01A; D02A; D03A; D04A; D05A; and D06A. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans except as required by other conditions of this consent.

3. No above ground construction shall be carried out until named samples of the external materials to be used for the theatre, public house and wharfinger’s cottage and store have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, only the approved external materials shall be used unless alternatives have first been agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

4. Notwithstanding any information in the application, no above ground construction shall commence until a scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include details of proposed ground levels, surfacing, retaining walls and the means of boundary enclosure, and a programme for the implementation of the works. Thereafter, the approved works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved programme. If any plants die, become diseased or are removed within 5 years of planting, they shall be replaced in the next planting season.
5. The public house shall not be brought into use unless and until the theatre has been constructed and completed, and the wharfinger’s cottage and store restored and refurbished in accordance with the approved details.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)Order 1987 as amended and those of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)(England)Order 2015, the public house shall only be used as a drinking establishment as defined in Use Class A4 and shall not be used for any other purpose except ancillary uses.

7. No development shall take place until an assessment on the potential for noise from the development affecting residential properties in the area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall include noise from the proposed theatre, the proposed bars, the plant room adjacent to the proposed flat above the bars, and construction noise including driven piling.

If the assessment indicates that noise from the development is likely to affect neighbouring residential properties, a detailed scheme of noise mitigation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The noise mitigation measures shall be designed so that nuisance will not be caused to the occupiers of neighbouring noise sensitive premises, including canal boats, by noise from the development or during the construction phase and shall include a programme for implementation.

The noise assessment shall be carried out by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant/ engineer and shall take into account the provisions of the NPPG: The national planning policy guidance, BS4142: 2014 "Method of rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas" and BS 8233: 2014 "Sound Insulation and Noise Insulation for Buildings - Code of Practice" where applicable.

The approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved programme and the mitigation measures shall be retained where necessary.

8. Notwithstanding any information in the application, this consent does not grant or imply permission to demolish the wharfinger’s cottage and store.

9. Notwithstanding any information in the application, no construction works or alterations shall be carried out to the wharfinger’s cottage and store until a detailed specification including plans for their restoration and refurbishment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include methods to secure the stability of the structures during the works, external materials and finishes, and door and fenestration design and materials. Thereafter, the buildings shall be restored in accordance with the approved specification.

10. No development shall commence until a construction management plan with details of wheel washing facilities, site storage space for materials, and space for loading, unloading and parking for construction staff has been submitted to and approved in
writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the approved plan shall be implemented throughout the construction phase of the development.

11. All construction works including demolition and related deliveries shall only take place between the hours of 8.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday; 8.00 am to 2.00 pm Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or bank holidays.

12. There shall be no burning on site during development.

13. Any equipment which must be left running outside the allowed working hours shall be inaudible at the boundary of occupied residential dwellings including narrow boats.

The reasons for the Council’s decision to approve the development subject to the above conditions are:

1. To comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. To define the permission.

3. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development (Policies N1 g and h of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

4. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development (Policies N1 g and h of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

5. The proposal is for a mixed use development and therefore to ensure that it is implemented as such.

6. To ensure sufficient space remains available for car parking (Policy T2 of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

7. To safeguard the occupiers of nearby properties and narrow boats from undue noise and general disturbance. (Policy N1 of the Plan for Stafford Borough).

8. To define the permission.

9. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development (Policies N1 and N9 of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

10. In the interests of the safety and convenience of users of the highway. (Policy T1c of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

11. To safeguard the amenities of the area (Policy N1e of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

12. To safeguard the amenities of the area (Policy N1e of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
13. To safeguard the amenities of the area (Policy N1e of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

Informative(s)

1 The Local Planning Authority consider the proposal to be a sustainable form of development and therefore it complies with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The attention of the applicant is drawn to the observations of the Theatres Trust and Crime Prevention Design Officer on this application. All comments received can be viewed online through the planning public access pages Council's website (www.staffordbc.gov.uk).

3 This permission does not grant or imply consent for any signage.
18/28965/FUL
Stone Town Council Car Park
Crown Street
Stone
ST15 8QN
Application 18/29308/HOU
Case Officer Steven Owen
Date Registered 06.11.2018
Target Decision Date Extended To 21.12.2018
01.02.2019
Address 4 New Row
Bradley Lane
Hyde Lea
Stafford
ST18 9BH
Ward Seighford And Church Eaton
Parish Hyde Lea
Proposal Change to roof and internal modifications
Applicant Sheryle Dooley
Recommendation Approve, subject to conditions.

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The application has been referred to Committee because the applicant is an employee of Stafford Borough Council.

Context

No. 4 New Row, Bradley Lane is a two-storey terraced property located outside of the Stafford settlement boundary.

Planning permission was granted in 2018 under 18/28156/HOU for alterations to the existing single storey rear kitchen and WC extension, together with an additional flat roof element to enlarge the kitchen. The scheme also included altering the existing flat roof to a mono pitched design. The scheme has not however been implemented to date.

This current proposal therefore represents an amended scheme to that previously approved and seeks the following changes:-

- Removal of the proposed flat roof kitchen extension and boundary treatment.
- Removal of the side facing bathroom window.
- The creation of a rear bathroom window and a rear door.

The footprint of this proposal is therefore the same as the existing rear extension.
**Officer Assessment – Key Considerations**

1. **Principle of Development**

   Spatial Principle 3 (SP3) of the Plan or Stafford Borough sets out where the majority of future development will be delivered within the Borough through the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy which consists of Stafford, Stone and 11 Key Service Villages. The property is located in the open countryside and Policy C5 requires that in areas outside the settlements identifies in SP3 the extension of a dwelling should not result in additions of more than 70% of the dwelling as originally built, unless at provision (Cii) the design and appearance of the proposed extension is proportionate to the type and character of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

   The original floor area of the property measures 64.94sqm. The terraced dwellings along Bradley Lane have single storey rear projections dating from at least 1928. However, the rear projection at No.4 appears to have been demolished and replaced, which therefore equates to a 21.9% increase over the original floor area.

   Unlike the previous proposal (18/28156/HOU) this application does not propose to increase the floor area of the existing rear extension and therefore the floor area increase over the existing dwelling would remain at 21.9%. The proposal would therefore not exceed the 70% threshold provided for under Policy C5 (c).

   **Polices and Guidance:**

   National Planning Policy Framework
   Paragraphs 8 & 11

   The Plan for Stafford Borough
   Policies SP3 Sustainable Settlement Hierarch and C5 Residential Developments outside the Settlement Hierarchy

2. **Character & Appearance**

   There have been no material changes to the dwelling or the surrounding area since the consideration of the previous application, 18/28156/HOU.

   No. 4 sits in the middle of a row of terraced properties dating from at least the early 20th century. Each house is narrow and modest in size with attractive and symmetrical features.

   To the rear, it would appear that all of the terraced houses when originally constructed had a single storey rear projection. Over the years these rear projections have either been altered or completely replaced which has resulted in a varied mix of rear extensions which differ in shape, size, age and character.

   This proposal to add a mono-pitched roof to replace the existing flat roof would integrate with the neighbouring rear projections. In addition, the roof design is similar in form and scale to that previously approved under 18/28156/HOU.
No harm would result to the character and appearance of the proposed extension from the addition of a rear door and bathroom window.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework
Section 12. Achieving well-designed places

The Plan for Stafford Borough
Policies N1 Design, N8 Landscape Character
Supplementary Planning Document – Design

3. **Amenity**

Although the shape and floor area of the existing rear projection would not change the roof is proposed to be altered from a flat to a mono pitch design.

The existing rear projection results in a technical breach of the Council’s Supplementary Planning Document on Design as outlook from the rear lounge window of No.3 Bradley Lane is impeded along a 45 degree horizontal plain of view at a distance of 3.8m and interrupts outlook for 2.2m.

Whilst this breach would remain the proposed mono pitched roof design would rake away from No. 3 where it is considered that no further harm to outlook to No. 3 would result over and above the existing situation. Furthermore, there is an intervening 1.8m high boundary fence between the two properties which further mitigates this breach.

It should also be noted that the previously approved scheme included a flat roof element closer to the boundary to No. 3 which is now removed.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraph 127

The Plan for Stafford Borough
Policy N1 Design
Supplementary Planning Document - Design

4. **Parking**

The proposal would not alter the need or provision of car parking.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework
Section 9. Promoting sustainable transport

The Plan for Stafford Borough
Policies T1 Transport, T2 Parking and Manoeuvring Facilities, Appendix B – Car Parking Standards
5. Conclusion

The proposal is not considered to harm the character and appearance of the area and would not affect the need or provision of parking. Although a technical breach of the Council’s Design Supplementary Planning Document would result this is not considered to harm neighbour amenities over and above the existing situation or the previously approved scheme.

Consultations

Parish Council:
No objections received.

Neighbours (6 consulted):
No representations received

Site Notice:
Expiry date: 21.12.2018

Relevant Planning History

18/28156/HOU - Single Storey rear extension – approved - 19.04.2018

Recommendation

Approve subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

2. This permission relates to the originally submitted details and specification and to the following drawings, except where indicated otherwise by a condition attached to this consent, in which case the condition shall take precedence:-

   - Location Plan (At a scale 1:1250)
   - Proposed Elevations and Block Plan (At a scale 1:500 and 1:50) Drawing No. EDS_0556_04 Revision E
   - Proposed Floor Plan, Roof Plan and and Block Plan (At a scale 1:500 and 1:50) Drawing No. EDS_0556_03 Revision E

3. The external materials to be used in the approved development shall match those of the existing building.

The reasons for the Council’s decision to approve the development subject to the above conditions are:

1. To comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. To define the permission.

3. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area (Policy N1h of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

Informative(s)

1 The Local Planning Authority considers the proposal to be a sustainable form of development and therefore complies with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.