

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Development Control
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
Staffordshire
ST13 6HQ

Our ref: SV/2025/113344/01-L01
Your ref: DOC/2025/0097
Date: 16 December 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

**DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 5,7,8 & 9 IN RELATION TO APPLICATION
SMD/2018/0770 AT DYE HOUSE, DYE HOUSE LANE, RUSHTON SPENCER,
STAFFORDSHIRE, SK11 0RS**

Thank you for referring the above application which was received on the 26 November 2025. Based on the information submitted we are unable to recommend the discharge of conditions at this time and would offer the following comments for your consideration at this time.

For context we provided a response to this application on the 8 November 2021 (your ref: SMD/2018/0770) where we provided a suite of conditions, including some that the current application is now seeking to discharge. As stated in our response to the application the previous use of the as a chemical works presents a medium risk of contamination that could be mobilised during construction to pollute controlled waters. Controlled waters are particularly sensitive in this area since the site is located with an Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 1 for a public source of supply and above a principal aquifer. The site is also located within a Designated Safeguard Zone and is located adjacent to a main river.

We have reviewed the documents listed below:

- Dye House, Rushton Spencer – Phase 2 Ground Investigation Report Number: GSL3366 Version 1 Dated 19 November 2025 Final. Prepared by Groundsolve Ltd
- Ian Ankers Architecture, Drainage Strategy Drawing DH-01 RevA
- Construction Environmental Management Plan Demolition of Existing House and Construction of Replacement Dwelling at Dye House Dye House Lane Rushton Spencer Staffordshire SK11 0RS Issue No.1 30th August 2025 Prepared by JAD Consulting Risk Management

Environment Agency
Hafren House, Welshpool Road, Shelton, Shropshire, Shrewsbury, SY3 8BB.

Cont/d..

The Ground Investigation only has a single sample from the shallow groundwater, which does not show significant contamination, however further round of sampling should be undertaken to confirm this. The laboratory data has not been supplied with the report and this should be supplied. Groundwater level monitoring data should also be shown to mAOD so that groundwater flow directions can be inferred. We also have had conversations with the consultant explaining that there are plans for further investigation in the building area post demolition but we do not have any confirmation of this in the report or any indication of what this may entail.

For the drainage strategy we are satisfied that the discharge point is now outside of SPZ1 and in SPZ2 but we do have concerns around the pipework and we have no details about the new pipework construction. As previously stated, and detailed within Condition 7, we would expect in this location that the pipework be completed to upgraded standards because of the proximity to the SPZ1. We also note that permeable paving appears to be present in the we would object to this without a hydrogeological risk assessment in line with our position statement G13 in our guidance [The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection](#). We would encourage the developer to link this area to the wider surface water drainage network.

With regards Condition 9 (environmental permit) there does not appear to be a granted permit and there is no justification that it meets all general binding rules. We would request clarification on this point and confirmation particularly that the flows are within guidance and that it meets the rule. The new discharge should not be within 50 metres of any other exempt small sewage discharge of the [General binding rules: small sewage discharge to the ground - GOV.UK](#).

Finally, with regards the Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) we would request clarification on the location of the dedicated plant and materials storage compound. Specifically we would question whether this will be located on the hard standing area to the rear of the site and confirmation that this will be outside of SPZ1 if possible?

We would be happy to provide further comment upon receipt of further information to satisfy the above.

Yours faithfully

Mr. Graeme Irwin
Planning Specialist

