

**PLANNING APPEAL**

**AGAINST THE DECISION OF  
STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS COUNCIL  
IN REFUSING PLANNING PERMISSION FOR  
THE ERECTION OF THREE DWELLINGS**

**PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFS:  
PINS: APP/B3438/W/18/3207919  
LPA: SMD/2017/0613**

**OCTOBER 2018**

## 1.0 ADDENDUM STATEMENT

- 1.1 The Appellant has been invited by the Planning Inspectorate to provide any comments on the appeal in light of the third party correspondence.
- 1.2 We note the two objections submitted in regard to the appeal. We do not consider the representations include any new relevant planning arguments in relation to the appeal. These arguments are considered in detail in the Appeal Statement. Notwithstanding this, I set out below a response to clarify a number of specific points raised.

*The representations refer to how the outcome on other planning applications are irrelevant as each application is determined on its own merits. The representations also refer to the plot size and number of dwellings as above a threshold for limited infill development.*

- 1.3 It is fully accepted that each application site is different and should be determined based on the individual merits of the application. The submitted appeal statement sets out the merits of this particular site and the relevant planning assessment of the proposals. It reviews the site context and its suitability for residential homes, it reviews the Council's 5 year housing land supply, and it assesses the application against relevant planning policies.
- 1.4 The reason of refusal relates to whether the proposal constitutes as limited infill development within a small village. Neither national or local planning policy provides a fixed definition of what constitutes as limited infill development, and it certainly does not refer to a maximum size of site, number of homes or restrict limited infill development due to specific site characteristics (other than it being within a village, and deemed suitable for a limited amount of residential housing).
- 1.5 Therefore, given this planning assessment requires a subjective judgment on what constitutes as limited infill development, the appeal statement refers to other noticeable examples of infill development in the area and across England. These examples illustrate the planning assessment that should be undertaken, and in particular illustrate that there is not a maximum threshold for the size of the site, or number of homes, that can constitute as limited infill development. To the contrary, much larger sites have been determined as limited infill development where it has been demonstrated that the land neatly fits within the context of the settlement and provides a natural infill site.

***The representation refers to the land being used as agricultural land.***

- 1.6 This statement is incorrect. The land has not been used for any agricultural purpose. The site is too small and sloped to provide such use. The land is situated at the heart of Longsdon village, along a street of predominantly residential homes, and is currently predominately scrub land.

***The representations refer to the number of planning applications that have been submitted for the site.***

- 1.7 To our knowledge, and from a review of the Council's online planning history search, we understand the site has been subject to two planning applications. The application, which is the subject of this appeal, and a planning application in 2008 for the erection of a dwelling house (SMD/2008/1067). Each planning application is determined on the planning policy that is adopted at the time. Therefore, the outcome of previous applications is largely irrelevant to this appeal. National planning policy significantly changed through the introduction of the NPPF in 2012, and again in July 2018. The need and emphasis to deliver new homes, particularly in areas with poor past housing delivery, has continued to grow. The appeal needs to be determined in accordance with the current development plan and national planning policy framework, and reference to past applications is irrelevant.

***The representations refer to impacts on private views and the openness of the Green Belt***

- 1.8 Planning policy does not protect private views across third party land, and this is not a material consideration.
- 1.9 Limiting infilling in villages is considered an appropriate development within the Green Belt (Paragraph 145). Limited infilling will always inevitably involve some impact on the openness of the Green Belt (through its loss), which is implied by Paragraph 145. However, the appeal scheme is considered in detail in the Appeal Statement (paragraphs 5.21- 5.23) to demonstrate that the impact will be minimal and acceptable in the context of the village.
- 1.10 The site location is perfectly suited for limited infill development, and a natural location to provide much needed new homes in the village. This has been recognised by draft planning policy documents, where the Council independently assessed the most suitable locations for new housing in Longsdon. The Appeal site was considered arguably the most suited location for new housing development throughout this process, and considered to amount to the least harm. No weight is attached to the draft planning policy document, but we agree with this independent assessment of suitable locations for new homes in the village.

- 1.11 In this context, the appeal scheme has sought to ensure it fully integrates into its context and minimises any impact on the wider openness of the Green Belt. The appeal scheme responds to the character, density and typology of the village and the site can comfortably accommodate 3 houses. It also provides large gaps between houses to achieve a degree of visual inter-connectivity with the landscape beyond. The appeal scheme also only includes development on a small proportion of the land, which secure the rear of the site to be preserved as open.
- 1.12 Therefore, the appeal scheme has been sensitively considered and the impact on the openness will be minimal in the context of the village. The appeal should be determined in accordance with Paragraph 145 of the NPPF, and the need to allow limited infill development to provide much needed new homes in an area which has a poor past performance in regard to housing delivery.