

Mr Ian Ankers
Ian Ankers Architecture
Ryecroft Farm
Macclesfield Road
Macclesfield
SK11 0RP

Mr M Heath
Heaton House Farm
Meerbrook Road
Rushton Spencer
SK11 0RD

Application no: DET/2025/0037

Determined on: 16.10.2025

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT)
(ENGLAND) (AS AMENDED) ORDER 2015**

**PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED AND DETAILS SUBMITTED
REFUSED**

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council hereby **REFUSE** approval for the siting and appearance of the development proposed for

**Application to determine if prior approval is required for proposed extensions
to two agricultural sheds and provision of a detached toilet block at Heaton
House Farm Meerbrook Road Rushton Spencer**

in accordance with the submitted application, details and accompanying plans listed as follows:

HHF – location plan
HHF – Barn 1 Elevations HS2-03 Rev A
HHF – Barn 2 elevations and toilet block HS2-04

for the following reasons:-

1. Existing barn 1 to which an extension is proposed was not present in April 2021. It is presumed to have been built since August 2022 when a Part 6 application for a mainly (save for the west end elevation) open sided building in that position was received. The building as now built is fully walled to all sides and includes a large and prominent doorway with roller shutter in the east elevation giving an industrial appearance in public views from nearby roads. This appearance did not form part of the 2022 submission and does not have the benefit of planning permission. It is understood, indeed it is expressly stated in the supporting statement that: “The extension is designed as a double-pitched shed attached to and open to the south side of the existing building, reusing the existing cladding from the south side of the existing building.”

In other words the barn 1 'extension' proposed under this new Part 6 would in effect create a new single larger building and incorporate the currently unauthorised appearance of the existing structure as part of this proposal. However the prior approval process cannot be used retrospectively. The proposal fails to meet the requirements of Part 6 on this count.

2. The proposed extension to the cattle shelter relates to a building erected following a 2011 consent (SMD/2011/0580). This building is about 380m from a 'protected building' (as defined under Part 6) named Beech Croft. The proposed extension would be positioned on the side closer to Beech Croft. This element of the application cannot succeed under Part 6 as it would amount to development not permitted as set out under Part 6 A.1 (i). The proposal therefore on this count also fails to meet the requirements of Part 6.

3. Whether more fundamentally the proposals are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture in the terms of Part 6 is unclear and gives rise to a third failing. The existing building appears underutilised and potentially to be accommodating non-agricultural 'entertainment' or 'event' type usage. That aside, the stated requirement expressed simply as "storage of straw and farm machinery" is wholly inadequate to explain the proposed increase in floor space from 360m² to 1160m², amounting to an increase of 220%. There is therefore insufficient information in the application to demonstrate that the proposals with regards to the Barn 1 extension and proposed barn 2 are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within the unit.

Siting, Design and Appearance

4. Had it not been for refusal on grounds 1 to 3 above the Council would go on to consider the Siting, Design and Appearance of the development and for completeness of this decision, the visual prominence as it would be seen from the nearby public roads including Rotten Hole to the east is found to be unduly prominent and more akin to an industrial unit than a building for agriculture and as a result harmful to the character and appearance of this highly rural location which is identified in the Council's Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2018) as a high quality landscape and one highly sensitive to landscape change. The proposal is thus found contrary to Local Plan Policies SS10, DC1 and DC3 and to the NPPF.

5. Whilst highly unusual to receive a proposal for a detached toilet block under a Part 6 application, the need for these facilities for farm workers can be understood. In terms of design however the proposal cannot be supported as there are no details as to how water would be connected and foul drainage treated. The proposal to install by way of a converted storage container is also not an appropriate design solution. A more preferable and perhaps more usual solution would be to house the facility within a larger building. The proposal for a detached toilet block as submitted is thus found contrary to Local Plan Policies SS10, DC1 and DC3 and to the NPPF.

X *J Curley*

Signed by: Jane Curley

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

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.