



SAMMONS
rchitectural
LIMITED



Chartered Institute of
Architectural Technologists

10 Cawdry Buildings
Fountain Street
Leek, Staffordshire, ST13 6JP
Tel / fax 01538 386002
e-mail info@sammonsltd.co.uk

PLANNING, DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

**PROPOSAL : OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR A SINGLE
DWELLING AND DETACHED GARAGE WITH MEANS OF
ACCESS**

**ADDRESS : LAND ADJACENT TO HIGH VIEW, SUTHERLAND
ROAD, LONGSDON, STAFFORDSHIRE, ST9 9QD**

APPLICANT : MR L LEIGH

DATE : AUGUST 2025 JOB No. : 2025-2996

CONTENTS:

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION**
- 2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION**
- 3.0 PROPOSAL**
- 4.0 POLICY**
- 5.0 ASSESSMENT**
- 6.0 CONCLUSION**
- 7.0 DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT**
 - **USE**
 - **AMOUNT**
 - **LAYOUT**
 - **SCALE**
 - **LANDSCAPING**
 - **APPEARANCE**
 - **ACCESS**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Sammons Architectural Ltd have been appointed by Mr Leigh to prepare and submit an outline planning application for a single dwelling and detached garage on land adjacent to High View, Sutherland Road, Longsdon. The application is in outline with means of access sought as part of this application. All other matters relating to scale, appearance, layout and landscaping are reserved for subsequent approval. The application is accompanied by an existing conditions site plan (drawing number 2025-2996-02); outline planning proposal site plan (drawing number 2025-2996-03A); outline planning proposal location and block plan (drawing number 2025-2996-04A) and Ecological Appraisal undertaken by Liz Ecology (July 2025) all of which should be read in conjunction with this statement.

1.2 This statement analyses the site, the proposal and the policy context within which it is made. Thereafter it provides justification for approval of the proposed development primarily on the basis that the scheme would be in accordance with adopted Development Plan policies as it represents an appropriate form of infill development within a sustainable village location without harm or detriment to the openness or visual amenity of the Green Belt or the character and appearance of the wider surrounding area. Furthermore, it is not considered that the proposed development would be prejudicial to residential amenity or any neighbouring land uses nor would it be detrimental to highway safety.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 The application site comprises of an irregular shaped parcel of land extending to some 988 sq metres which lies on the eastern side of Sutherland Road. Immediately to the north of the site lies a detached single storey building which is used as a domestic garage by Lyndhurst, a property which lies on the western side of the highway. Beyond that is Stone Barn Farm with seven properties further north leading up to the junction with the main A53 Leek to Endon road. On the same side of Sutherland Road, to the south, lies High View a detached dwelling which sits in a substantial plot with a number of residential dwellings beyond and along Wood Road. Immediately opposite the site is Limes Avenue which runs more or less due west from Sutherland Road for circa 100m with a row of 10 properties aligned on its northern side. Residential properties on this side of the road run in a ribbon along Sutherland Road from Micklea Lane to the south to the main A53 to the north.

2.2 Access to the application site is by means of a gated entrance with brick pillars, aside the entrance to the neighbouring dwelling, High View. A stone wall leads into the site with a tarmac surface on the ground for a short distance. The ground level of the site rises steadily from the front to the rear, steepening around halfway back. There are maintained grass areas towards the front, with a vegetable patch to the centre, and unmaintained ground to the steeper slope at the rear. A thick hedge stands on the roadside boundary, with another to the side boundary. The site is surrounded to the side and rear by steeply rising ground covered in dense woodland, protected by Tree Preservation Order (TPO), which prevents views out of the site in these directions.

2.3 For the purposes of the Development Plan the application site lies within the North Staffordshire Green Belt but in a location that is considered sustainable in terms of its proximity to services and public transport.

3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 This is an outline application which seeks consent for the erection of a single dwelling and detached garage. Means of access is sought as part of the application with all other matters reserved for subsequent approval. The submitted layout plan shows the provision of a modest dwelling which would have a predominately simple rectangular plan form with small projecting front gable that would be positioned towards the front of the site following the building line of the buildings to the north and south. Access would be taken from the existing arrangement in the south eastern corner of the site with off road parking spaces and manoeuvring space to the side. Gardens would be provided to the front and rear of the proposed dwelling with all existing boundary treatments retained.

4.0 POLICY

4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taking into consideration any material considerations relevant to the determination of the application.

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in March 2012 and most recently revised in February 2025 is an important material consideration in determining planning applications. It introduces a presumption in favour of sustainable development and paragraph 8 states that development proposal that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay.

4.3 National Planning Practice Guidance in the NPPG sets out that a thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities. The NPPG states that "all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas, and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence. The National Planning Policy Framework seeks to secure the delivery of sustainable development, and sets out guidance, inter-alia, in respect of safeguarding the green belt, and significantly boosting the supply of housing. The content of the NPPF has been taken into consideration in the preparation of this application.

4.4 Whilst the recently published NPPF does not change the statutory status of the Development Plan which in this area comprises of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan as the starting point for decision making it does provide guidance to LPA's and is a material consideration in determining planning applications. The NPPF confirms that at the heart of the guidance is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that for decision making this means approving development proposals that accord with the Development Plan without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

4.5 The most relevant policies of the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan are considered to be SS1 (Development Principles); SS3 (Future Provision and Distribution of Development); SS9 (Smaller Villages Area Strategy); H1 (New Housing Development); DC1 (Design Considerations); NE1 (Biodiversity and Geological Resources) and T1 (Development and Sustainable Transport). For the sake of brevity these policies are not quoted in full but they are referred to where appropriate in the following section.

4.6 In addition to the above the application has had regard to the council's Housing Land Supply Statement (April 2023) and subsequent appeal which sets out the Local Authority's performance in

respect of the delivery of new housing and confirms that the Council has a deliverable housing land supply of 2.95 years.

5.0 ASSESSMENT

5.1 As set out above this application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of a single dwelling and detached garage on land off Sutherland Road, Longsdon.

Principle of development

5.2 For the purposes of development the site is within the North Staffordshire Green Belt. As such there are tighter controls on what form of development can be permitted and new build residential development is considered to represent inappropriate development unless very special circumstances apply or it is one of a number of exceptions.

5.3 The Local Plan's vision for the Rural Areas is that they will have viable, attractive villages and smaller settlements which will continue to foster appropriate, sensitive growth and vitality to support rural living and work.

5.4 Policy SS9 of the Local Plan relates to the 'Smaller Villages Area Strategy' and states that these settlements shall provide only for appropriate development which enhances community vitality or meets a social or economic need of the settlement and its hinterland. This will be achieved by a number of actions, including enabling limited new housing development, including small infill schemes in accordance with Policy H1.

5.5 As the NPPF is more up to date than the current adopted Local Plan the policies contained therein should be afforded more weight in the consideration of the application. National planning policy states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is "inappropriate" and that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt unless it is one of the exceptions listed in the NPPF or unless very special circumstances apply.

5.6 One of the exceptions listed in the NPPF (para 154(e)) is "limited infilling in villages." It is important to note that the terms villages and infilling are not defined either in the Framework or the Local Plan Policy. Longsdon is identified as a smaller village under policy SS9 of the adopted Core Strategy Document. Whilst it is accepted that the smaller villages have a more limited role as service centres they are recognised as being vital to the rural areas particularly in terms of providing for local housing and rural employment needs. The loss of local population through lack of housing opportunities is recognised and the strategy for the smaller villages therefore seeks to allow an appropriate level of sensitive development which amongst other things meets a local social or economic need of the settlement and its hinterland.

5.7 The key question therefore is twofold. Firstly whether the proposed development constitutes limited infilling and secondly whether the development site lies within a village. If both of the qualifying criteria are met then the proposal would constitute appropriate development which is acceptable in the Green Belt under one of the permitted exceptions.

5.8 Both of these questions have already been considered during a previous application for residential development on the site back in 2017 under application reference SMD/2017/0694. Whilst this application was refused and subsequently dismissed in November 2018 it is considered that there are significant and material considerations which would lead to a different conclusion being reached on this occasion. A copy of the case officer delegated report and appeal decision letter are attached to this statement as appendices 1 and 2 respectively. Rather helpfully both the

council and the appeal Inspector considered the application site to lie within the village. There have been no policy or site specific changes which would lead to a different conclusion now being reached and the application site is therefore considered to meet this part of the criteria. Notwithstanding this however neither the council nor the Inspector considered the application at the time to represent infilling. This is a point which is disputed by the applicant as discussed below.

5.9 Paragraph 10 of the appeal decision states that the council consider that “the siting of the dwelling would not amount to limited infilling, due to the extent of the gap between the site and Stone Barn Farm, the next property to the north.” As the appeal Inspector correctly acknowledged in paragraph 11 “there is no definition of infill within national policy or any local policy” however a straightforward interpretation of the term would indicate that the development would occupy a gap between two buildings or developments”. The Inspector went on to acknowledge that “in this case, there is an existing dwelling to one side, High View, whilst to the north is a plot of land undeveloped and open except for a small, single storey garage to the front. Beyond this is a tall outcrop of land covered in woodland trees, and then an open field until Stone Barn Farm is reached. Whilst I accept the outcrop acts as a physical and visual barrier within the space between the appeal site and Stone Barn Farm, the gap between the two is nonetheless significant, and an expanse of open countryside clearly separates built development on this side of Sutherland Road. Therefore, I would not regard this gap in the built form as limited in extent or scale.” In reaching this conclusion the Inspector (para 12) “acknowledged that there is a concentration of development to the opposite side of the road on Sutherland Road itself and leading down Limes Avenue. However, despite the proximity of this, the adjacent side is more sporadically developed around the appeal site. Despite features such as entrance gates, a hedgerow, maintained grass and a vegetable patch, which give the site a quasi-domestic appearance from the road, the steep slope and imposing backdrop of the woodland nevertheless give an overall impression of the appeal site forming part of the countryside, and not a natural extension of the built form to the other side.” In coming to this view consideration was also given by the Inspector in para 14 that the “appeal site is confined by the topography and the gap to Stone Barn Farm is interrupted by the outcrop and trees immediately beyond the adjacent land”. Despite this the Inspector concluded in para 14 that “the proposal would not infill a gap but would extend the built form into the countryside on this side of Sutherland Road.” He goes on to state that “Large gaps are frequent between dwellings on these roads, wherein views of the open countryside can be experienced. To interpret ‘limited infilling’ to apply to gaps such as that existing around the appeal site would potentially be to permit extensive housing development over long frontages, and effect significant change in the scale and character of the village. To my mind, this is not the purpose of exception e) of paragraph 145 of the Framework.”

5.10 It is considered that the above assessment is however fundamentally flawed and that the decision letter is somewhat contradictory. Firstly the Inspector acknowledges that “the surrounding topography substantially encloses the site from long range views on approach from either direction on Sutherland Road (para 17) and that it “would not harm longer views through or across the village into the countryside (para 18). Secondly and perhaps more importantly, with the exception of the site description, no mention is made at all of the existing built development (garage serving Lyndhurst) which lies on the northern side of the application site and is located within the gap between the application site and Stone Barn Farm further north. In fact in assessing whether the application site constitutes infilling the adjacent development is completely disregarded.

5.11 As stated above there is no defined definition of “infilling” either within the development plan itself or the recently modified NPPF. The Inspectors view of what constitutes infill development is akin to the approach adopted by the Inspector in the Court of Appeal case of R(Tate) v Northumberland County Council [2018] civ 1519. However a different view of infilling has been adopted by an Inspector colleague in a more recent appeal Ref APP/W4223/W/19/3227776 (copy attached at appendix 3). The Inspector in this case did not confine the concept of infill to that of a gap in an otherwise built up frontage. Rather, she accepted that a wider interpretation may be

possible, i.e. development within the confines of a group of buildings. She went on to accept that “infilling suggests the development of land that is surrounded by existing development on at least two sides within reasonable proximity”. Aligned with this is the Oxford English Dictionary definition which describes infill as “Buildings constructed to occupy the space between existing structures”. Assessment of limited infilling must be a planning judgment based on the merits of the site and its context on a case by case basis.

5.12 In the absence of any definition or criteria pertaining to infill development in the areas development plan, the concept of infill development referred to in paragraph 154 of the NPPF may be wider than simply development occupying a gap in an otherwise built up frontage, it could include development within the confines of a group of buildings. As stated above the application site is bounded by development and buildings on three sides and it is contended that adoption of the above definition of infill development would result in the site being found as meeting the criteria.

5.13 In determining a recent appeal (REF: APP/B3438/W/24/3354279 – copy attached at appendix 4) on the opposite side of Sutherland Road at The Firs the Inspector held (para 7) that “its front boundary runs along the road and the plot lies between the side of the house at The Firs and the side boundary of a neighbouring dwelling called Selwyn. The width of the site is similar to the properties on either side and only a single house is proposed. Also, the plans indicate the dwelling would be positioned between the flank walls of the neighbouring residences. Therefore, the proposal would represent limited infilling and so it would accord with the exception at sub-paragraph 154(e) of the Framework provided the site lies within a village.”

5.14 Nonetheless the specific circumstances of the site still need to be borne in mind. The application site in this case is located within the established built up area of Longsdon Village and is contained on three sides by development, the garage building to the north, a ribbon of residential development to the south and a linear row of development to the west. The proposed development will form a continuation of the existing pattern of development on the eastern side of Sutherland Road and be read as infilling perhaps the last remaining gap on this side of the highway. The contained nature of the application site, topography and landscaping were all accepted by the council and the previous Inspector as resulting in the application site not being read as part of the surrounding countryside but as a separate parcel of land. The proposal will infill a gap which is comparable in width to those of surrounding plots and that recently approved by the Inspector on land adjacent to The Firs. Furthermore, the proposed quantum of development, a single dwelling with detached garage obviously amounts to a limited amount of development.

5.15 On the basis of the above it is concluded that the proposed development amounts to limited infilling in a village and accordingly constitute an appropriate form of development within the Green Belt in accordance with paragraph 154 (e) of the NPPF and policy SS9 of the Local Plan.

5.16 Whilst it is acknowledged that the above assessment directly contradicts the previous findings of the council and appeal Inspector it is important to note that a number of changes both to development plan policies and site circumstances exist to allow a different conclusion being reached on this occasion.

5.17 Firstly both the application and the appeal decision were determined under the policies of the Council's former Core Strategy document which predates the currently adopted Local Plan (September, 2020). The previous scheme was considered under Policy SS6b of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Development Plan Document which was adopted in March, 2014. Furthermore both the application and appeal decisions were considered under the first publication of the NPPF (March 2012). This document has been revised on no less than 9 occasions since the appeal dismissal with the latest being issued on 7th February 2024.

5.18 In addition whilst the council has historically tried to resist infill development along Sutherland Road it should be noted that this approach has not been supported by appeal Inspectors with appeals being allowed recently on land to the north of The Firs and to the north of Prospect House Farm since the refusal of the previous permission (copies attached at Appendix 4 and 5). The reluctance of the council to accept infill plots along this section of Sutherland Road and their subsequent overturning at appeal also represents strong and material consideration which should be afforded significant weight.

5.19 With regard to the current policy context, it is also significant that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing. The Local Authority has a long history of housing under-supply and consequently the social benefits of this proposal in contributing towards that housing land supply carry further weight in favour of the proposed development. The Council has a considerable undersupply, currently estimated at 2.95 years. In these circumstances paragraph 11 of the NPPF is clear that the development plan policies that are most important for determining the application should be considered out of date and that planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance [such as the Green Belt] provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole.

5.20 Whilst only a single dwelling the proposed development will make a very valuable contribution towards meeting the Local Authority's shortfall in housing land supply. The proposal will also derive benefits of to the local economy, both to local tradesmen during the construction phase, and though the expenditure associated with the creation of one additional household. The Local Authority's 'Quantifying the Economic Impact of Development' Report confirms that each new house constructed in the District generates 4.3 jobs within construction or the associated supply chain. The same report also confirms that for each new dwelling constructed within the District, there will be a minimum initial one-off spend (in addition to the construction of the dwelling) of £5,000, with a subsequent annual spend of £9.388 per year. Such economic benefits lend further significant weight in favour of the proposed development.

5.21 This application falls to be considered under the planning policy context that prevails today, and as set out within the preceding paragraphs the proposal is considered to be consistent with the provisions of the recently revised NPPF as it amounts to limited infilling within a village. The proposal therefore comprises of an appropriate form of development within the Green Belt in accordance with paragraph 154 (e) of the NPPF and policy SS9 of the Local Plan.

5.22 Notwithstanding the above assessment if the council consider that the proposal still represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt then it is considered that the proposal would find favour with the latest revision of the NPPF and the introduction at paragraph 155 of a new exception relative to areas of the Green Belt that can be considered as 'grey belt land'. In these respects, development should also not be regarded as inappropriate where: the development would utilise 'grey belt land'; there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed; the development would be in a sustainable location; and, where applicable, the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements ('Golden Rules' requirements are not applicable to housing proposals that would not result in 'major' development).

5.23 'Grey belt' is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143 of the NPPF. The land is previously developed, as defined by the NPPF, because it provides the curtilage to existing development. Considering the three purposes, the land provides a gap between existing dwellings constrained on three sides by buildings, it does not make a strong

contribution to the purpose of: checking unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area; preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another; or, preserving the setting and special character of an historic town. In these, regards, the development would utilise 'Grey Belt' land.

5.24 As set out above and demonstrated by the council's most recent housing land supply position there is clearly a demonstrable unmet need for housing development in the district.

5.25 The development would be within walking distance of the village centre pub, village hall and church. It is also located within close proximity of a bus route that serves village passengers and provides access to nearby towns. The sustainability of the application site was previously considered and accepted by the Inspector in the appeal decision at para 29 which confirmed that "the site is close to some village facilities at the top of Sutherland Road, and a bus route providing access to Leek and Endon. In these respects the development would be relatively sustainable for a rural location".

5.26 The 'Golden Rules' requirements are applicable only to major development and therefore are not for consideration in this case.

5.27 The proposed development, therefore, should not be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt. All the relevant tests are met, and the development is provided for by the new exception at paragraph 155 of the NPPF.

Openness

5.28 Legal precedent is clear that where development is found not to be inappropriate, it should not be regarded as harmful to openness. This was established by the judgment in Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, R (on the application of) v Epping Forest District Council & Anor (Rev 1) [2016] EWCA Civ 4040 (see Appendix 6) which found that

"The distinction between development that is "inappropriate" in the Green Belt and development that is not inappropriate" (i.e. appropriate) governs the approach a decision-maker must take in determining an application for planning permission. **"Inappropriate development" in the Green Belt is development "by definition, harmful" to the Green Belt - harmful because it is there - whereas development in the excepted categories in paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF is not (my emphasis).**

5.29 It continues:-

"The difference in approach may be seen in the policy in paragraph 87. It is also apparent in the second sentence of paragraph 88, which amplifies the concept of "very special circumstances" by explaining that these 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".

5.30 This finding has since been applied in determining appeals. An example is provided in the appeal decision at Snitterfield where the Inspector (APP REF: J3720/W/16/3167715 Appendix 7); resolved that:

"Case law has established that, if development is found not to be inappropriate, it should not be regarded as harmful either to openness or to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Hence there is no need for me to consider the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt".

5.31 A further example is provided by the Inspector in the case at Timber Ridge, Woburn Lane, Aspley Guise (APP REF: APP/P0240/W/17/3185864 - Appendix 8) which relates to an infill development at Here the Inspector noted

"Although the Council states that the development would compromise the openness of the Green Belt, case law has determined that where development is found to be "not inappropriate" when applying paragraphs 89 or 90 of the Framework, it should not be regarded as harmful either to the openness of the Green Belt or to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. In view of this there is no need for me to consider the effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt."

5.32 It is contended that the proposal is not inappropriate in accordance with the exceptions set out in Paragraph 154(e) and 155 of the Framework and, as such, inherently respects the purposes of the Green Belt. It should be noted that the council came to a similar conclusion in terms of openness when considering other applications for infill development along Sutherland Road (SMD/2018/0231 and SMD/2018/0145). These sites lie no more than a few metres away from the current application site within the North Staffordshire Green Belt. Approval for these dwellings was granted on the basis that they were accepted as infill sites. The same parameters which were considered to define those sites as an infill plot are clearly exhibited on the application site. The extant permission on a neighbouring site represents a significant and material consideration in terms of precedent and in the interests of fairness and consistency it is respectfully requested that the application site is also judged on the same criteria and accepted as an infill plot.

Effect on landscape character

5.33 Paragraph 24 of the appeal decision previously considered that "the development, in principle, would not have a harmful effect on the character of the landscape due to its confined location and limited visibility beyond its immediate setting of high woodland and nearby residential development. I also note the similarities in terms of landscape setting with the dwelling south of High View, where the Council considered it to be acceptable in respect of its effect on landscape character. Whilst the application was made in outline, and the scale and design of the dwelling would be more fully addressed at reserved matters stage, in view of the surrounding topography, I consider that, in principle, a dwelling in this location would not have a harmful effect on the landscape character of the area. Notwithstanding the policy changes during the intervening period, it is not considered, that a different conclusion would be reached on this occasion. Accordingly it is considered that in these regards there would be no material harm to the character and appearance of the area or conflict with local plan policies SS9, DC1 and DC3.

Residential Amenity

5.34 No objection was raised by the Council in respect of the effect on neighbours' living conditions during the consideration of the previous application and subsequent appeal. Given that there has been no material changes to the site or adjoining plots in this regard it is considered that the proposal would be compliant with policies HC1 and DC1 and wider guidance as set out in the NPPF in this regard.

Highway Safety

5.35 The proposed development would utilise the existing access point. This is the same arrangement as that proposed as part of the previous application and subsequent appeal. Neither the council nor the Inspector raised any issue in this respect and on that basis the proposal is consequently held to meet the requirements of policy T1 of the Local Plan in this regard, along with guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 The NPPF states that local planning authorities should approach decision taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development. It goes on to state that local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems and decision takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

6.2 It is considered that the proposal represents appropriate development on not one but two counts. Firstly it is considered that the proposed development represents appropriate infill development within a sustainable village location and secondly it is considered that it meets the requirement for grey belt redevelopment. No significant demonstrable harm would arise in respect of the proposal in relation to the openness or visual amenity of the Green Belt or the character and appearance of the wider area. Furthermore satisfactory access and parking arrangements can be provided for the new dwelling with adequate provision also being retained for the host dwelling. The proposed dwelling would not therefore be detrimental to highway safety. The proposal will not be prejudicial to the reasonable enjoyment of any of the surrounding residential dwellings or adjoining land uses. Whilst the application seeks outline permission at this stage the indicative plan submitted with the application demonstrates that an acceptable level of amenity can be provided for future occupiers of the dwelling. The Local Authority's policies for the supply of housing are out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged. In addition to the benefit the proposal would bring by contributing positively to the housing deficit in the District numerous other social, environmental and economic benefits will be derived and no adverse impacts will occur which would significantly or demonstrably outweigh those benefits. The Local Planning Authority is therefore respectfully requested to approve outline planning permission for a single dwelling and detached garage with means of access on land adjacent to High View, Sutherland Road subject to any planning conditions it may feel are necessary.

7.0 DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

USE

The application proposes the use of the application site for residential purposes. The application is in outline within means of access considered. All other matters are reserved for subsequent consideration. This form of development is considered to reflect the nature and character of existing development which surrounds the site.

AMOUNT

The application site is modest in size extending to some 988 sq metres and therefore will constrain the amount of development. Whilst the application is in outline it is anticipated that the proposed development would be for a single dwelling with detached garage as shown on the indicative plan submitted with the application.

LAYOUT

Whilst layout is not for consideration at this stage the submitted site plan shows the provision of a dwelling which would have a largely rectangular shaped plan form set towards the front of the plot with a detached garage to the rear, access to the side and private amenity space to the front and rear.

SCALE

Whilst scale is a matter which is reserved for later consideration it is considered that the development would be two storey in nature order to respond and reflect the form and character of the neighbouring development.

LANDSCAPING

The site is located within a semi-rural setting and benefits from substantial existing mature landscaping and it is not considered that any additional landscaping over and above that appropriate to a domestic setting will be required. Landscaping is a matter for subsequent consideration and will be dealt with accordingly at a later date in any subsequent application.

APPEARANCE

Appearance is a reserved matter that would be appropriately dealt with in a detailed application although it is anticipated that any dwelling would be constructed from a simple palette of natural materials which would be informed by those on the surrounding dwellings.

ACCESS

The proposed development would be served by the existing access directly off Sutherland Road with adequate parking and manoeuvring space provided within the site. The application site is located within the village of Longsdon and public transport links are easily accessible to the Staffordshire Moorlands as well as the neighbouring city of Stoke on Trent.