

Planning Statement

Erection of an Agricultural Building

Ivy House Farm, Leek Road, Werrington

October 2024

Ivy House Farm

Project	Ivy House Farm
Client	Mr C Tideswell
Reference	2402
Project Team	Jon Imber
Version	1.1

Document Produced by:

JMI Planning Limited
62 Carter Street
Uttoxeter
Staffs
ST14 8EU

Phone: 01889 566107
Email: enquiries@jmiplanning.com

www.jmiplanning.com

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Site and Planning History	3
3	The Proposed Development	4
4	Planning Policy Context	5
	National Planning Policy Framework.....	5
	Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (2020)	6
5	Planning Considerations	6
	Principle of Development	6
	Landscape and Visual Impact	9
	Impact upon Amenity	9
	Other Material Considerations	10
6	Conclusions	10

1 Introduction

- 1.1 JMI Planning is a Midlands based town planning consultancy. Its directors are chartered town planners with over 30 years' combined experience in both the public and private sector.
- 1.2 The author of this appraisal, Jon Imber, has worked as both a development control and forward planning officer in local government, and more recently as a senior planning consultant in the private sector. He has extensive knowledge of the planning system and experience of the appeals process. He is a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

2 Site and Planning History

- 2.1 The application site comprises a small farmstead at Ivy House Farm, Leek Road, Werrington. The site lies within a rural area approximately one kilometre south of Cellarhead.
- 2.2 The holding extends to approximately 7.5 acres.
- 2.3 Surrounding uses include the applicant's dwelling and outbuildings to the west, the applicant's fields to the east, agricultural land to the north and a neighbouring dwelling to the south.
- 2.4 The site is relatively flat. It sits within a wider landscape context of gently undulating countryside.
- 2.5 Planning permission was refused for the erection of an agricultural building on the site

in May 2025 (LPA reference SMD/2024/0557). The application was refused on two grounds: firstly that it constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt; and secondly that it would harm the character and appearance of its rural surroundings.

2.6 The site lies within the Stoke on Trent Green Belt.

2.7 The site and surroundings are shown in the photographs below.



Figure 1 - Aerial Image of Site and Surroundings

3 The Proposed Development

3.1 The applicant remains committed to erecting an agricultural building on the site for

the storage of machinery and hay. This application seeks to overcome the reasons for the refusal of SMD/2024/0557.

- 3.2 The building is to be sited immediately east of an existing outbuilding.
- 3.3 The building measures approximately 12.2 metres wide by 27.4 metres long. It has a ridge height of approximately 5.9 metres.
- 3.4 The building will be finished in timber boarding and profile sheets.

4 Planning Policy Context

National Planning Policy Framework

- 4.1 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It explains that in the context of decision taking, this means approving proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.
- 4.2 Paragraph 85 of the NPPF prescribes significant weight to the need to support economic growth and productivity.
- 4.3 Paragraph 88 of the Framework supports the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas through both the conversion of existing buildings and the provision of well-designed new buildings. It specifically supports the development of agricultural and other land based rural enterprises.

- 4.4 Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that *“inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”*.
- 4.5 Paragraph 154 states that local planning authorities should view new buildings within the Green Belt as inappropriate development, apart from certain exceptions. One of these exceptions is *“buildings for agriculture and forestry”*.
- 4.6 Paragraph 187 of the Framework states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by *‘protecting and enhancing valued landscapes’*.

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (2020)

- 4.7 The application site lies outside of any settlement boundary. As such, it falls within the category ‘Other Rural Areas’ as defined by Policy SS10. Policy SS10 states that Other Rural Areas “will provide only for development which has an essential need to be located in the countryside, supports the rural diversification and sustainability of the rural areas, promotes sustainable tourism or enhances the countryside”. One type of development which the policy identifies as acceptable in principle is “Supporting the diversification of existing farm enterprises”.

5 Planning Considerations

Principle of Development

- 5.1 The proposal involves the erection of an agricultural building within the Stoke on Trent Green Belt. Paragraphs 152 to 154 of the NPPF, together with Policy SS10 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan are therefore relevant.

- 5.2 Paragraph 153 of the NPPF resists inappropriate development in the green belt except for in very special circumstances.
- 5.3 Paragraph 153 continues to state that *“Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations”*.
- 5.4 Paragraph 154 of the NPPF states that new buildings in the Green Belt constitute inappropriate development, with certain exceptions. One of these exceptions is buildings for agricultural purposes.
- 5.5 Policy SS10 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan restricts development in the countryside to that which has an essential need to be located there. One type of development which the policy identifies as acceptable in principle is *“Supporting the diversification of existing farm enterprises”*.
- 5.6 The applicant has recently moved to Ivy House Farm having ‘downsized’ from a larger farm. He has kept much of his machinery, and intends to keep farming, albeit on a smaller scale. The holding at Ivy House Farm extends to approximately 7.5 acres of grassland which is cut for haylage. In addition, the applicant works as an agricultural contractor, using his machinery on nearby farms.
- 5.7 There are presently no agricultural buildings associated with the holding and space is required for storing tractors and implements used to farm the land and for contracting, as well as bales of hay. It is clear that housing machinery used on the applicant’s holding and storing hay bales taken from the land falls under the agricultural exemption to inappropriate development in the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. The Council’s case in considering the previous application was that storage of

machinery and implements used for contracting did not. However, the exemption set out in the NPPF is broad. It requires that buildings be used for “agriculture or forestry” with no reference to them being tied to any specific unit. The applicant’s machinery and implements are specifically designed for agricultural use, and a building to house them is therefore sufficiently related to agriculture to satisfy the exemption set out in the Framework. The proposals do not therefore constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

- 5.8 The exception for agricultural buildings set out in Paragraph 154 of the NPPF is unqualified. In *R (Lee Valley Regional Park Authority) v Epping Forest District Council*, the Court of Appeal held that appropriate developments, such as buildings for agriculture, were automatically regarded as not being harmful to the openness of the green belt and therefore did not need to be justified by very special circumstances. The openness considerations in Paragraph 153 are not therefore relevant in this instance.
- 5.9 The proposals therefore accord with Paragraphs 153 and 154 of the NPPF, together with Policy SS10 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan.
- 5.10 The proposals would bring about economic benefits associated ensuring the ongoing viability of the farm. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF assigns significant weight to the latter in the overall planning balance.
- 5.11 The proposals therefore constitute development appropriate in the countryside and the broad principle of the proposed development is compliant with Paragraphs 85 and 88 of the NPPF.

Landscape and Visual Impact

- 5.12 The landscape context of the application site is a relatively rural one, characterised by open countryside interspersed with farmsteads.
- 5.13 The proposed building is grouped with existing built development on the site. It will not therefore appear isolated or unduly prominent. The building would be screened from Leek Road by the applicant's dwelling and associated outbuilding, and views from the north would be filtered by the boundary hedgerow.
- 5.14 Following concerns raised by the local planning authority that the building appeared overly 'commercial', it has been redesigned. It is now clad in timber boarding rather than profile sheets, and the front elevation has been amended to reduce the number of openings.
- 5.15 The form of the building reflects its agricultural function. It would be viewed in the context of existing agricultural buildings of similar character and appearance to the north and south appearance and as such the proposals will not introduce an alien feature into their landscape context.
- 5.16 The proposals would not therefore unacceptably harm the character or appearance of their rural surroundings.

Impact upon Amenity

- 5.17 The proposed building is sufficiently distant from residential properties to avoid causing loss of daylight, overbearing impacts or increased noise and disturbance.

- 5.18 The proposals will not therefore compromise the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby residential properties.

Other Material Considerations

- 5.19 The proposals lie within Flood Zone 1 where there is a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of fluvial flooding. Flood risk is not therefore a constraint to development in this instance.
- 5.20 Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that *“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”*.
- 5.21 The proposals do not affect access arrangements to the farm and are unlikely to result in a material increase in vehicular movements to and from the site. The proposals will not therefore compromise the safe or efficient use of the highway network.

6 Conclusions

- 6.1 The proposals involve development on an agricultural holding for agricultural purposes. The proposal therefore constitutes development appropriate within the Green Belt and the countryside in general.
- 6.2 The form of the building reflects its agricultural function and it would be viewed in the context of existing buildings within the vicinity, including similar agricultural buildings to the north and south. The proposals would not therefore harm the character or appearance of the countryside.

- 6.3 The proposals will not give rise to unacceptable levels of additional noise or disturbance. The proposals therefore safeguard the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby dwellings.
- 6.4 The proposals therefore comply with Policy SS10 of the Local Plan and Paragraphs 85, 88, 153, 154 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It is therefore respectfully requested that this application be approved.