
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 20 January 2015

Site visit made on 20 January 2015

by SD Harley BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI ARICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/A/14/2228678

**Barton Marina, Barton Turn, Barton under Needwood, Burton-on-Trent
DE13 8AS**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Cameron Homes Limited against East Staffordshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2014/00755 is dated 6 June 2014.
 - The development proposed is residential development for up to 75 residential units including car parking, landscaping and amenity areas.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for up to 75 residential units including car parking, landscaping and amenity areas at Barton Marina, Barton Turn, Barton under Needwood, Burton-on-Trent DE13 8AS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/2014/00755 dated 6 June 2014, subject to the conditions in the Conditions Schedule below.

Application for costs

2. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by Cameron Homes Limited against East Staffordshire Borough Council. This application will be the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The application is in outline with all matters except layout and access reserved for future consideration. Plans showing a possible way of developing the site have been submitted for illustrative purposes only. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
4. The appeal is against the failure of the Council to issue a decision in respect of application Ref P/2014/00755 within the prescribed period. This appeal was submitted on 10 November 2014 and after that the Council could no longer determine the application. On the 8 December 2014 the Council's Planning Committee resolved that, if the Council had been in the position to decide the application, that subject to the completion of an appropriate legal agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (the 1990 Act), permission would be granted subject to conditions. The Council therefore advised on 16 December 2014 that no further statement of case would be

provided in respect of the appeal and that Officers would not be offering any case at the Hearing but would provide clarification and answer questions.

Main Issues

5. Whilst the Council is not now opposed to the development on the basis of the representations made I consider the main issues to be:
 - whether the proposals would be sustainable development having regard to the provisions of paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the location of the site and the character and appearance of the area;
 - whether other harm would be caused by the development; and, if so,
 - whether that harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing additional housing.

Reasons

Planning Policy Background

6. Planning applications and appeals should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. However, the weight to be attached to policies in the development plan should be according to their degree of consistency with the Framework, which sets out the Government's planning policies and is a material consideration.
7. The Framework states that local planning authorities should identify a supply of deliverable sites to provide 5 years worth of housing land to meet their Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN), with an additional buffer of 5% (or 20% if there has been persistent undersupply). At the Hearing the parties agreed that, irrespective of extant permissions, the Council does not have a deliverable 5 year Housing Land Supply to adequately meet OAHN.
8. The actual extent of the shortfall is not yet determined but the Local Plan Inspector, in his report "Interim Findings of the Examination into the East Staffordshire Borough Council Local Plan" in November 2014 (the emerging LP) suggests that, amongst other things, further consideration is required in relation to OAHN and whether the choice of allocations should be widened over a range of site sizes and capacity to offset an apparent reliance on a small number of strategic sites which are likely to be comparatively slow in delivering the requisite amount of housing land. The Council is considering its response to the Interim Findings and further hearings have been postponed pending the agreement of a revised programme.
9. The Planning Committee report on application Ref P/2014/00755 refers to Saved Policies in the East Staffordshire Local Plan, 2006 (the LP) and policies in the emerging LP. Policy NE1 of the LP seeks to restrict new development outside defined Development Boundaries to that which could not reasonably be accommodated within development boundaries; or is essential to the efficient working of agriculture; or is close to an existing settlement with facilities reasonably accessible on foot, by bicycle or by public transport.
10. Having regard to Paragraph 49 of the Framework the limitations which broadly prohibit housing outside a Development Boundary in the countryside, must be considered as not up-to-date and so afforded little weight in terms of housing

supply and location. This is because housing land to accommodate future growth beyond 2011, which is the adopted LP period, cannot be accommodated within the existing adopted development boundaries. Whilst the Framework says that weight may also be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, the emerging LP is unlikely to significantly progress to adoption in the near future, so that weight must be limited.

11. The site is outside the Barton under Needwood Development Boundary in the LP and its development for residential purposes would therefore be contrary to the development plan provisions. The site is not within the Settlement Boundary of the emerging LP. However, the Examination into the emerging LP has not yet addressed the question of whether the Settlement Boundary should be amended to include the appeal site, and the emerging LP is still subject to change. Accordingly only limited weight can be attached to the emerging LP in the context of assessing whether the broad principle of housing development would be acceptable in this location.

Prematurity

12. During the Hearing it was put to me by interested parties that it would be premature to grant permission on the appeal site. National Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance) says that planning permission could be refused on the grounds that a development would be premature in relation to an emerging local plan. However, paragraph 14 of the Framework says that, where the development plan is absent or out-of-date, planning permission should be granted, other than where it is clear that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, taking the policies in the Framework and any other material considerations into account.
13. In this case little weight can be given to housing allocation policies in the LP or the emerging LP and to that extent the development plan must be considered to be absent or out of date. The Guidance explains that arguments about prematurity are unlikely to justify the refusal of permission unless the development proposed, individually or cumulatively with other proposals, would be so substantial that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging Local Plan. Due to the size of the proposals the development would not be so significant as to undermine the decisions in the emerging local plan. The Council has raised no concerns in respect of prematurity and, taking into account the Guidance, I see no reason to disagree. For these reasons I consider the proposals could not be resisted on the grounds of prematurity.

Sustainability

14. The Framework has a presumption in favour of sustainable development which is defined in respect of three roles. These are an economic role, including contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy by ensuring a sufficient supply of the right land is available for development to support growth and co-ordinating development including the provision of infrastructure; a social role, including a supply of housing for present and future generations with high quality development and accessible local services; and an environmental role which includes contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.

15. Barton under Needwood has a range of facilities including primary, junior and secondary schools, a health centre, shops, playing fields and play areas. More extensive services, facilities and employment opportunities are available nearby in Burton on Trent and along the A38. Accordingly the village can be regarded as a relatively sustainable location in relation to access to services and facilities.
16. The appeal site lies within the Barton Marina complex separated from the built up areas of Barton under Needwood by some of the Marina lakes and open space/playing fields. The village facilities are within about 2 kms walking distance of the appeal site along an established footpath (although the junior school is much closer) and the site is relatively close to employment opportunities on the nearby A38 and there is a bus stop nearby.
17. The village facilities are within the distance that would provide a realistic alternative to some vehicle trips, albeit at the upper end of that distance. In addition, Barton Marina also has a range of easily accessible facilities including a butcher/delicatessen shop, other retail, café/restaurants, a public house, a cinema and extensive public open space. Whilst these facilities would by no means deliver all the day to day needs of residents their presence adds significantly to the opportunities for reducing vehicle reliant trips and I am told that occupiers of some of the house boats at the Marina use the facilities in this way. On balance I conclude therefore that the site has sufficient access to facilities as to be regarded as being in a sustainable location.
18. The proposed development would bring economic benefits to the construction industry. There is an extant permission for a hotel and leisure club which if implemented would also provide construction employment and would have the further benefit of providing employment into the future. However, this permission was granted in 2001 and the hotel and leisure club have not come to fruition. I was told at the Hearing that it was unlikely that a hotel would be pursued on the appeal site given the permissions that have been granted for other hotels in the Borough. Accordingly I do not give significant weight to the likelihood of economic benefits accruing in relation to the hotel and leisure club in the foreseeable future.
19. As the Council has cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, provision of up to 75 additional dwellings would contribute a significant benefit to the community by way of needed residential accommodation. Affordable housing, either on site or by way of a financial contribution towards affordable housing off site, would be an additional benefit. Extra residents would also help support facilities and services. I give significant weight to the opportunity for increasing housing supply.
20. I turn now to the effect of the proposed development on the natural, built and historic environment. The Barton Marina was formerly part of a quarry and has become an established recreational facility. The appeal site is between the access road which runs behind the Marina buildings and the lake edge. The site is an open, relatively flat area used for over spill parking and amounts to previously developed land in the context of the Framework.
21. The existing buildings are typically two storey built in brick with a mix of gabled and hipped roofs. Saved Policies BE1 and H6 of the LP and the East Staffordshire Design Guide, 2008, seek to ensure developments relate well to their surroundings and to that extent reflect the principles in the Framework.

Most of the proposed dwellings would be arranged in a curved layout facing a lake in a similar arrangement to that of the permitted hotel. There would be a separate building in a similar location to that of the approved leisure club. The existing access would be used with parking in landscaped bays.

22. The illustrative plans show three storey apartments and two storey dwellings arranged in back to back terrace blocks and linear terraces. The illustrative plans show a design reflective of the existing Marina buildings and heights not significantly different to those of the permitted hotel and leisure club. Whilst this is not the only way in which the proposals could be built, the plans demonstrate how the proposed buildings could read in relation to the existing buildings.
23. At some distance to the east are the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area and the A38 Trunk Road. Distant views of the proposals would be possible from certain vantage points. However, the proposed built form would be read in the context of the existing Marina buildings and uses and would not be out of character with the Marina or the surrounding area. I therefore conclude the proposed development would cause relatively insignificant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
24. Concern has been expressed by interested parties that the proposed houses would require enclosed private gardens which would detract from the openness of the Marina and that domestic paraphernalia would detract from the appearance of the Marina. However, as the proposed floor space would be significantly less than the permitted hotel and leisure club, the overall effect, even taking into account boundary arrangements for gardens, would not result in an unacceptable loss of openness.
25. Concern has been raised that the density of development would be too high. However, the form of development proposed reflects that of the existing Marina buildings and a low density suburban style of development would be out of character with these. Satisfactory living conditions, amenity areas and parking would be provided for future occupiers. The living conditions of occupiers of other dwellings would be unaffected. Accordingly there would be no adverse effects to justify refusal on the grounds of proposed density of development.
26. Paragraph 118 of the Framework seeks to protect biodiversity from harmful effects of development. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been provided which concludes that the effects on biodiversity would be relatively small but that a number of mitigation measures should be put in place. It seems likely that wildlife uses the nearby lakes and I observed a variety of water fowl during my visit. The appeal site itself is grass with a gravel area used for overspill parking, and with appropriate mitigation measures, the habitat or foraging environment of protected species would be not be unacceptably affected by the proposed development.
27. There are two conservation areas in the locality. However, the Council considers these are so far away that the proposed development would not have adverse impacts on views into or out of the designated areas. From what I saw on my site visit I see no reason to disagree with this view. The Council has noted there is the possibility of archaeological interest in the area and that archaeological investigations could be secured by condition. From the available evidence I see no reason to disagree.

28. Accordingly with appropriate safeguarding conditions the proposed development would not have an unacceptable effect on the natural, built or historic environment.
29. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposals would satisfy the economic, social and environmental roles for sustainable development as set out paragraph 7 of the Framework.
30. A recent appeal decision at Barton Gate, Barton under Needwood, Ref APP/B3410/A/14/2227504, found that a proposed extension to form a new house was not sustainable development given its location some 2 km outside the main core of the village. The Inspector found that the village does not have a large supermarket, there was no evidence of any major source of employment and there was a strong likelihood that journeys to work and the supermarket etc would involve private motor vehicles.
31. The Barton Gate site is a similar distance from the village centre to the Barton Marina site. However for the reasons set out above the Barton Marina site would benefit from access to a range of facilities without the need for car journeys; would use previously developed land; would have access to the employment opportunities along the A38 without driving through the village and would provide infrastructure contributions including affordable housing. For these reasons I consider the Barton Gate proposal to be significantly different and so I give relatively little weight to that decision in my consideration of the appeal before me.

Other harm

32. The site is within Flood Zone 1. A Flood Risk Assessment has been provided. This concludes that the risk from fluvial and surface water flooding is low. Neither the Environment Agency nor the Staffordshire County Council's Flood Risk Officer raise objections but to mitigate against extreme events recommend that finished floor levels are raised slightly above existing ground level and this could be secured by condition.
33. Barton under Needwood Parish Council and local residents have explained that significant flooding incidents have occurred in the vicinity, particularly at residential properties on Lichfield Road. Discussions are taking place with Severn Trent Water to address the problems experienced but the Parish Council and local residents fear that the proposed development would exacerbate the problems. Severn Trent Water has advised that foul sewer capacity is being investigated and expect to carry out improvement works in the foreseeable future. No objections are raised but a planning condition is requested. This is discussed below.
34. Paragraph 122 of the Framework says that local planning authorities should focus on whether the proposed development is an acceptable use of the land and the impact of the use rather than the control of processes or emissions which would be subject to approval under other controls. A Preliminary Drainage Strategy has been submitted and, whilst final details have not yet been agreed with Severn Trent Water, I see no reason to conclude that a resolution could not be found and this could be secured and implemented through appropriate planning conditions. I therefore conclude that the effect of the development on drainage would not be unacceptable.

35. The Parish Council and local residents object on the grounds of increased traffic in the village, which together with the development on Efflinch Lane would cause congestion. Access would be via the main entrance to Barton Marina, which is located off the B5016/Barton Turns. A Transport Statement has been provided. This concludes that the location is sustainable with the centre of Barton under Needwood accessible by foot or cycle and with bus stops to Burton and Lichfield within some 700m of the site. No off-site highway works would be required and there would be a negligible impact on the local highway network. The Highway Authority raises no objections on highway safety or efficiency grounds.
36. I observed traffic having to queue in the village during school closing time and the proposed development is likely to exacerbate this to some extent. The Parish Council are investigating ways of alleviating the existing problems. The proposals include a contribution towards the Safer Barton Centre project which could be used to help offset the effects of additional traffic through the village. On this basis I consider the effect of the proposed development on highway safety would not be unacceptable.
37. The Parish Council and local residents object to the loss of parking for visitors to the Marina. Planning permission for the formation of a 23 space car parking area was granted in October 2014, Ref P/2014/00868. This would help offset the displaced over spill car parking and, if hard surfaced, would be more useable. The Marina complex has other areas that could be used for over spill parking and accordingly it is unlikely that the displacement of overspill parking from the appeal site, which could also occur if the hotel permission is implemented, would be detrimental to highway safety or convenience.
38. The provision and maintenance of woodland to help deliver the National Forestry Strategy as set out in Policy CSP6 of the LP could be achieved by way of a contribution secured under s106 of the 1990 Act. The footpath link to Barton under Needwood would benefit from surfacing and the lighting requires repair and maintenance. This is outside the red line of the appeal site. However, at the Hearing it was agreed by the parties that given the contractual land arrangements in place with the land owner there was a reasonable prospect of securing these improvements by way of a condition requiring a scheme of delivery.
39. Concern has been raised about whether the noise from the Marina tourism/leisure uses could adversely affect the living conditions of occupiers of the proposed dwellings. However, the installation of sound insulation, which could be secure by condition, would mitigate against external noise inside the properties and future occupiers would be aware of the surrounding uses before taking up occupation. There would be no adverse effect on the living conditions of existing residents by way of overlooking or over shadowing given the distance from the site to existing dwellings.

Balancing any harm against the benefits of providing additional housing

40. There is a shortfall in housing land supply, and so, having regard to paragraph 49 of the Framework, the policies in the development plan relating to that matter must be considered out-of-date. This shortfall is something to which significant weight should be attached. For the reasons set out above I have concluded that the site is suitably sustainable and that the provision of housing as proposed must be seen as a significant benefit.

41. Therefore, having regard to paragraph 14 in the Framework, the benefit of this housing has to be balanced against the harm identified. Moreover, to justify resisting the proposals under paragraph 14 the harm must “significantly and demonstrably” outweigh the benefits. As explained above I have identified relatively insignificant harm to the character and appearance of the area. I have concluded that other harm to living conditions, highway safety, ecological and archaeological interests could be addressed through mitigation measures. I have found that the proposals would not undermine the plan-making process.
42. For the reasons set out above I conclude no harm has been shown that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing this additional housing in this location. Accordingly although the proposal does not accord with the housing land supply policies of the LP, material considerations, including the provisions in the Framework, indicate that permission should be granted.

Conditions and planning obligations

43. I have assessed the suggested conditions against the six tests for conditions in paragraph 206 of the Framework and against the Guidance.
44. As the application is in outline further details are required of all matters except layout and access. At the Hearing it was agreed that the site should be developed quickly and that a shorter time for the approval of reserved matters should be imposed. The parties agreed that one year was an appropriate time scale for submission of reserved matters. In this case due to the shortfall of deliverable housing land I would agree this would be appropriate, as would the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and compliance with the submitted plans.
45. To ensure a satisfactory appearance details of materials to be used and boundary treatments are required, and the approved landscaping should be implemented, with provision made for future retention and maintenance of open areas. To ensure usability and for public safety improvements to the surface and lighting of the footpath link to Barton under Needwood are required.
46. In the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity the implementation of the mitigation proposals in the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal should be secured.
47. Severn Trent Water Limited has proposed a condition to prevent occupation until it has identified any necessary improvements to the foul water sewers in the area. However, in this case such a condition would not meet the tests in the Guidance as the works are necessary to address existing problems; the condition would be imprecise in terms of the works required and the timescale for completion and, being beyond the control of the appellant, would be unreasonable. However, to protect public health, it is appropriate that foul and surface water drainage arising from the development should be agreed and implemented. Similarly any contamination discovered should be dealt with. To reduce the risk of flooding details of existing and proposed ground and floor levels are required and the recommendations in the Flood Risk Assessment should be implemented.

48. A Construction Methodology Statement is necessary and appropriate to manage the interaction of traffic and construction vehicles with visitors to the Marina. In the interests of securing the historic environment archaeological investigations and recording should take place.
49. A signed and dated Unilateral Planning Obligation under the provisions of s106 of the 1990 Act has been submitted and the Council indicated at the Hearing that this was acceptable.
50. Provision is made for affordable housing which would help meet identified local housing need and would accord with the Supplementary Planning Document "Housing Choice".
51. Provision is made for contributions towards the provision of primary and secondary school places, with John Taylor High School preferred for secondary places. This would meet the educational needs arising from the development and accord with the requirements of the Education Authority.
52. Provision is made for woodland planting, open space and contributions towards the Safer Barton Centre Project. This would help provide an appropriate environment for residents in the future and meet the requirements of the National Forest Company and the Supplementary Planning Document "Open Space".
53. Provision is made for refuse containers. Such contributions would ensure a satisfactory method of managing waste arising from the development and would meet the requirements of the Waste Storage and Collection Guidance for New Developments.
54. Provisions for notification of the Council of trigger points during the development process are necessary to ensure implementation of the obligations. I conclude that the provisions made in the Unilateral Undertaking are necessary to address the effects of the proposed development on infrastructure, are proportionate and do not conflict with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, 2010.

Final conclusion

55. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other relevant matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

SDHarley

INSPECTOR

Conditions Schedule

- 1) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than one year from the date of this permission.
- 2) Details of the appearance and scale of the buildings to be erected and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

- 3) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2086/01 Rev A and 2086/03 Rev E.
- 5) No development shall take place and no site works related to the development hereby permitted shall be carried out until details of existing and proposed levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include the proposed grading and mounding of land areas including the levels and contours to be formed, showing the relationship of proposed mounding to existing vegetation and surrounding landform and slab levels. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) No development shall take place until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface water including a timetable for implementation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 7) No development shall take place until samples and details of all the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings hereby permitted (including details of eaves and verges, balconies, if any, and hard surfacing) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be provided. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with a timetable submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 9) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i) The routing of demolition and construction vehicles to and from the site;
 - ii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - iii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iv) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - v) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - vi) wheel washing facilities;
 - vii) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction; and

- viii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.
- 10) No development shall take place until a written programme of archaeological work has been implemented in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 11) No development shall take place until details of ecological measures (including bird nesting and bat roosting facilities and incorporating the recommendations in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal produced by Absolute Ecology) to be installed on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved ecological enhancement measures shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation and shall be kept available for their designated purposes thereafter.
- 12) No development shall take place until a scheme for the improvement and on going maintenance of the footpath link from the site into Barton under Needwood including a timetable for implementation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 13) If during the course of development contamination not previously identified is found to be present on the site, then no further development shall be carried out on that part of the site until a method statement detailing how and when the contamination is to be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The contamination shall then be dealt with in accordance with the approved details.
- 14) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written approval to any variation.
- 15) Construction work shall not begin until a scheme for protecting the proposed dwellings and private gardens from noise from the commercial and leisure activities associated with Barton Marina has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; all works which form part of the approved scheme shall be completed before any dwelling or associated garden is occupied.
- 16) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that Flood Risk Assessment Version 3.0 prepared by JBA and the Drainage Strategy prepared by Travis Baker including the following mitigation measures:
- a. normal surface water run off generated by the site shall not exceed a maximum of 5l/s;
 - b. all surface water shall be discharged to the lake to the west of the site and not to the ditch to the south;

- c. 500 cubic metres of attenuation flood storage shall be provided on site and retained thereafter;
- d. finished floor levels shall be set no lower than 51.17m above Ordnance Datum ; and
- e. finished ground levels shall be set no lower than 51.00m above Ordnance Datum.

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Janet Hodson	JVH Planning Consultants
Tom Beavin	JVH Planning Consultants
D Baker	Travis Baker Ltd
Ian Burns	Cameron Homes

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Jim Malkin	Principal Planning Officer, East Staffordshire Borough Council
Emily Christie	Planning Officer, East Staffordshire Borough Council
Steve Payne	Housing Manager, East Staffordshire Borough Council
Naomi Perry	Senior Planning Policy Officer, East Staffordshire Borough Council

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Jacqui Jones	Ward Councillor, East Staffordshire Borough Council
Julia Jessel	Ward Councillor, East Staffordshire Borough Council
Chris Hall	Student on placement, East Staffordshire Borough Council
Jeannette Taylor	Councillor, Barton under Needwood Parish Council
Edward Sharkey	Vice Chairman, Barton under Needwood Parish Council
Gerald Taylor	Local resident
Jonathan Flint	Local resident
Graham Lamb	Local resident

DOCUMENTS submitted at the hearing

- 1) Signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking, s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990
- 2) Planning permission Ref P/2014/00868: Formation of a 23 space car parking area
- 3) Letter Severn Trent Water Ltd dated 25 March 2014
- 4) Sewer Record (Tabular) dated 25 March 2014
- 5) Plan Ref 14025 01 Rev A, Drainage Strategy, dated 3 September 2014
- 6) Plan Ref BTM/1/402 Hotel Leisure Suite Elevations and Roof Plan dated April 2000
- 7) Plan Ref BTM/1/401 Proposed Ground Floor Leisure Club, Proposed First Floor Leisure Club dated February 2000
- 8) Plan Ref BTM/1/304 Proposed Hotel Elevations, North, South, East and West dated February 2000

- 9) Notification of hearing venue letter East Staffordshire Borough Council, dated 16 December 2014
- 10) Minutes of the Planning Committee of 8 December 2014
- 11) Costs response on behalf of East Staffordshire Borough Council
- 12) Annotated aerial photograph of Barton under Needwood

Richborough Estates