STAFFORDSHIRE
moorlands
DISTRICT COUNCIL
ACHIEVING · EXCELLENCE

Simon W. Baker B.Ed MBA MIMSPA
Chief Executive

Mr Greame Perry
GJPerry Planning Consultant
62 Carter Street
Uttoxeter
ST14 8EU

Mr Oldham
c/o 62 Carter street
Uttoxeter

Application no: SMD/2016/0214

Determined on: 15/06/2017

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

Location of Development:
Tearne Quarry Main Road Hollington Staffordshire ST10 4HR

Description of Development:
Proposed demolition of existing offices and workshop buildings and the redevelopment of the site with 7 open market dwellings.

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council in pursuance of powers under the above mentioned Act hereby **REFUSE** to permit the development described above in accordance with plans ref: A2561 001, 002E, 003B, 004B and 005D for the reason(s) specified below:-

1. Hollington is identified as a Small village in the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy DPD. There is no settlement boundary around the village. In such locations Policy SS6b seeks to restrict new housing development to that which meets a local need or enhances community vitality. This is because of the poor range of services and facilities. Hollington contains a Church, Village hall and two public houses. There are no other local services or community facilities of note and there is very limited public transport provision. The supporting text to the Policy says that in order to guide development an Infill Development Boundary will be defined within which appropriate development will be allowed. Although an Infill boundary has yet to be defined, Policy H1 gives further policy advice on indicative thresholds for development on windfall sites within the infill boundaries of smaller villages; it refers to a maximum of 5 dwellings. Furthermore Policy SS1 (amongst other things) expects new development to provide easy access to jobs, shops and transport services and to contribute towards a reduction in carbon emissions. The majority of trips from the development would be car borne. As a result, the proposal would conflict with the Policy SS6b which forms part of the spatial strategy for the District and which underpins the Core Strategy and conflict with Policy SS1 and one of the Government's core planning principles which is to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling (NPPF para 17). The proposal is therefore environmentally

Simon W. Baker B.Ed MBA MIMSPA
Chief Executive

unsustainable.

2. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposal would not constrain any future quarrying under the extant permission or lead to loss of amenity for future occupants of the proposed dwellings. The submitted Noise Assessment has not taken account of the extant permission. As such there is conflict with Policy 3.2 of the Minerals Local Plan, Policy SD4 and advice in the NPPF which seeks to protect Mineral Safeguarding Areas and the amenity of future occupiers and the proposal is considered to be economically and socially unsustainable.

3. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on and relationship with existing trees and hedgerows. As such the layout fails to respond to existing landscape features, the setting of the settlement and the character and appearance of the area. As such there is conflict with Policy DC3 and the NPPF and the proposal is considered to be environmentally unsustainable.

4. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing, in accordance with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, it is concluded that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission in this case would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefit that the provision of 7 dwellings would bring when assessed against the polices in the Framework taken as a whole.

Informatives

1.The Local Planning Authority (LPA), in reaching this decision, has followed the guidance in paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Framework advises that the LPA should work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Despite advice it has not been possible to negotiate a solution to overcome the environmental, social and economic harm identified above.

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

STAFFORDSHIRE
moorlands
DISTRICT COUNCIL
ACHIEVING · EXCELLENCE

Simon W. Baker B.Ed MBA MIMSPA
Chief Executive

NOTES

1. If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. If the decision to refuse planning permission is for a householder application, and you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 12 weeks of the date of this notice.

3. If this is a decision to refuse planning permission for a minor commercial application, and you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 12 weeks of the date of this notice.

4. If this is a decision to refuse express consent for the display of an advertisement, if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 8 weeks of the date of receipt of this notice.

5. If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision for any other type of development, including listed building consents then you must do so within 6 months of the date of this notice Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from the Secretary of State at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN (Tel: 0303 444 5000) or online at https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk

6. The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal, but will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal. The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to the Secretary of State that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.

7. If either the local planning authority or the Secretary of State refuses permission to develop land or grants it subject to conditions, the owner may claim that he can neither put the land to a reasonably beneficial use in its existing state nor render the land capable of a reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted. In these circumstances, the owner may serve a purchase notice on the Council (District Council, London Borough Council or Common Council of the City of London) in whose area the land is situated. This notice will require the Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

STAFFORDSHIRE
moorlands
DISTRICT COUNCIL
ACHIEVING • EXCELLENCE

Simon W. Baker B.Ed MBA MIMSPA
Chief Executive

8.