

[REDACTED]

From: Jane Curley
Sent: 26 May 2026 14:09
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: FW: Objection to applications NMA 2026/0006 and 7/ Moneystone quarry

Jane Curley Principal Planning Officer

Planning

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

Mob: [REDACTED]

www.highpeak.gov.uk | Follow HPBC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)

www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk | Follow SMDC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)



From: SheilaWalters <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 11 May 2026 09:50
To: Jane Curley <[REDACTED]>; Andrew Stokes <[REDACTED]>;
Wilkinson, Peter (CLLR) <[REDACTED]>; James Aberley (Cllr)
<[REDACTED]>
Subject: Objection to applications NMA 2026/0006 and 7/ Moneystone quarry



Dear Mrs Curley

Objection to applications NMA 2026/0006 and 7

CVCS object to the applications for the discharge of conditions with reference to NMA/2026/0006 and NMA/2026/0007 on the grounds that they are material changes to the earlier outline planning decision (SMD/2016/0378) and upon which the reserve matters have since been based eg RMA ref SMD/2019/0646 and SMD/2023/0532.

Also in the latter regard, the 2024 Planning Inquiry into the earlier refusal of SMD/2023/0532 was based upon the existing conditions and as a result of the evidence produced and heard at that Public Inquiry, the Appeal was upheld. For example the inspector concluded that there was no change in the 2016 EIA and on that basis the outline permission was sufficiently unaltered and embedded for him to proceed to his decision.

Lack of evidence

The applicant has not produced any significant evidence to justify the discharge request being proved as non material intervention or to disprove that it is material.

We consider there has been no justifiable evidence produced by the applicant at all to warrant consideration of a discharge of the conditions.

Nothing has altered at the site itself or within the peripheral areas affected by and incorporated within the 2016 conditions, to indicate or prove the need for such discharges.

The application form itself is inadmissible as it is contradictory in its presentation being redacted and therefore not open and transparent as required for scrutiny.

File evidence of a material change that would ensue if permitted to happen

CVCS on the other hand would also draw your attention to the following evidence to substantiate its objection using as an important example the agreed conditions with regard to the road safety and traffic that were attached to the original 2016 outline permission.

We would argue that the historical and current significance and relevance of these particular conditions were intended to be a permanent feature in the landscape and considered as essential for the original outline application SMD/2016/0378 to be approved.

There is clear evidence in the planning record that by their ongoing nature and intent these conditions had to be maintained permanently and therefore discharging them and undermining the road safety and traffic management measures would amount to a highly important material change to the original permission and to the RMA arising from it.

Earlier precedent

You will recall that the original outline application SMD/2014/0682, which was an earlier iteration of SMD/2016/0378 (which was designated as a re-submission of 0682 both on the case officer's report to the PAC and upon the notice of consent issued later) was refused because of (inter alia) concerns over traffic management issues and highway safety (reason 2)

On the file record we can see that the close similarity between the two applications with regard to the highway measures at the junction of Whiston Eaves Lane with the A52 in the village of Whiston for a very important and obvious reason that the increased traffic generated by the development would result in a very large exponential increase in traffic using the junction where visibility is poor currently in both direction exiting and accessing the turn into Eaves Lane.

The current situation was acknowledged as in need of improvement if the application was successful and even more traffic usage of the junction had to be accommodated.

To combat that risk and increased vehicular usage, very early on in the formulation of the planning strategy that was to be agreed in consultation with the highways authority, the developers /applicant, employed various surveys and inspections of the hazards and came to the conclusion that was to be later agreed with County Council's highway officers, that it was prudent and essential to reduce the traffic speed to allow more time and spaces for turning manoeuvres. By widening the carriageway markings and signage so that a refuge zone to aid turning in from the A52 could be facilitated was also considered. That safety provision by slowing the traffic using the A52 would allow exiting vehicles from Whiston Eaves Lane to have more time to join the respective east or west flows of the A52 and draw away safely into the flow lane from Whiston Eaves Lane and accelerate away.

This was particularly essential for those turning out to the right of Whiston Eaves Lane as it provided a little more time to cross the refuge space in the middle where there could be cars waiting to turn into Whiston obscuring the view of the uphill traffic flowing from Froghall, and negotiate merging into the vacant space for the traffic flow heading north.

Such measures were highlighted by the applicant's own traffic experts Royal Haskoning prior to the 2014 0682 application and endorsed by the County Highways Surveyors and both parties endorsed the same provisions for the 0378 outline application that was approved in 2016.

These conditions were carefully considered and agreed to be implemented along with other recommendations from SCC highways in order to improve road conditions around the junction or obviate the risk of increased dangers arising from the extra usage by people who would be unfamiliar with the local road network.

They were agreed to be permanent features not just transitory in order to achieve permission for the holiday park. It is part of the argument for sustainability eg more cars = more risk = greater need for increased safety measures to counter that threat or to mitigate the danger.

To guarantee the achievement of the latter these conditions were to be in place **before** any site development works started or occupancy on site . These applications before you are therefore not acceptable as **no** preliminary highway safety measures have been agreed or carried out as directed in the planning consent .

To emphasise the concerns surrounding the safety measures prior to the submission of the outline applications in both instances, we include below extracts from the developers own traffic consultants Royal Haskoning's reports and statements, as well as those views and recommendations of the SCC highway officer James Long .

All agree upon the permanence of the traffic conditions stipulated in the decision notice and in no area is the idea of a temporary arrangement, or a time limit to the conditions agreed specified other than to ensure that the required traffic measures are planned, approved and implemented ie in active physical operation **before** site works start at the quarry leading to occupation.

Once that is implemented then, and only then, should the requirements that are intrinsic to the conditions upon the developer to carry out be brought forward for potential discharge.

Yours sincerely

David Walters

Secretary

CVCS

Appendix of extracts from original documents

As part of its submission the Royal Haskoning documents pleaded its case as shown in the following extracts below:-

9.5.4 in addition to the works associated with the proposed means of access, the following junction improvements would be proposed.

9.6 Road Safety Audit/Quality audit

9.6.1 as agreed with SCC a stage one road safety and quality audit has been undertaken for both options and are included in appendix J and H respectively

9.6.2 the road safety audit raised a number of issues that would be taken into account when the agreed option is progressed to the detailed design stage such as drainage service boxes signage lining and lighting 9.6.3 both lateral and forward visibility was raised as an issue. As it can be seen from plan 10 and has been highlighted previously in the TA the existing junction layout has a visibility splays of 2.4 m x 30 m to the left and 2.4 m x 34 m to the right in comparison both propose solutions would improve the existing situation.

Option one:- plan 8 would increase visibility splays from a distance of 2.4 m back from the carriageway to 49 m to the left and maintain 34 m to the right.

Option two -plan nine would improve the existing situation further with 2.4 x 45 m visibility splays on the left and 2.4 x 53 meter visible display to the right.

Option plan nine would improve the existing situation further with 2.4 x 45 m visibility splayed to the left and a 2.4 m x 53 m visibility splay to the right option two would be a significant improvement in comparison with the existing situation

9.6.4 In terms of the visibility the road safety audit highlights that an existing wall on the south side of the a 52 E. of the junction with Whiston Eaves Lane restricted visibility for drivers travelling south bound along the A 52 .Option one would not improve existing situation. However the full visibility would be significantly increased with option two due to the build out proposed at the junction

9.6.5 The quality audit also considers both options and concludes that the build out option, option two ,would be preferable in comparison with widening the a 52 to accommodate a right turn ghost island facility.

Highway infrastructure improvements

2.3 .12 Further to discussions with SCC it is proposed to implement improvements at the existing junction of Whiston Eaves Lane with the A 52 .Two options are being considered.

Option one- the provision of gate way traffic calming features on the A52 approaches to Whiston in either direction to slow traffic down and to raise awareness of drivers in the presence of the village and traffic turning into and out of Whisotn Eaves Lane. The provision of a ghost island lay out at the junction of Whiston Eaves Lane on the A52 in order to provide a right turn waiting area for inbound vehicles from the west the proposed option one is shown in plan eight.

Option two -iTo introduce local narrowing along the A 52 in the vicinity of the junction in order to provide improved lateral visibility. The proposed option two is on plan nine

10.2.5 The travel plan framework and the associated management mechanisms will be secured by a planning obligation set out in a section106 agreement between the key stakeholders i.e. the developer the local planning authority and the local highway authority in this case.

10.3 Conclusions

10.31 The traffic and transport impact analysis presented in this transport assessment demonstrates that the outline application proposals will be capable of being accommodated safely by the local highway network

Schemes are therefore proposed to further mitigate potential residual traffic impacts relating to highway safety as follows: one the provision of a ghost Island layout at the junction of western eaves Lane and the a 52, in order to provide a right turn waiting area for inbound vehicles from the west; and to the provision of gateway traffic calming features on the A52 approaches to Whiston in both directions to slow down traffic and raise awareness of drivers to the presence of of the village and traffic turning into and out of Whiston Eaves Lane the improvements described above are considered to be sufficient to mitigate the impact of the additional traffic generated by the Moneystone Park proposals, accompanied by an effective travel plan.

The County Highways Report Jim Long in June 2016 included the following

The existing access to the development from the A52 will be upgraded and different proposals for this improvement have been considered. It is also considered that transport mitigation measures can be secured through the TPF.

As this application is similar to the previous application (SMD2014/0682) the conditions included will be the same.
Conditions

1 The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until full details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- layout of the site including disposition of buildings and provision of parking, turning and servicing within the site curtilage;
- layout of the site to include the parking provision for staff parking.
- means of surface water drainage from all areas intended to remain in private ownership;
- full road construction including longitudinal sections and a satisfactory means of draining roads to an acceptable drainage outfall

2 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of the offsite highway works at the junction of Whiston Eaves Lane and the A52 have been submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This work may include such things as a speed reduction on the A52, a ghost island or road narrowing.

3 The Travel Plan which is hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable set out in that plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reports demonstrating progress in promoting sustainable transport measures shall be submitted annually on each anniversary of the date of the planning consent to the Local Planning Authority for approval for a period of fifteen years from first occupation of the development permitted by this consent

4 The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a signage scheme detailing the permitted routeing for all traffic accessing and leaving the Park has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved signage scheme shall thereafter be implemented prior to first use of the development access to the site has been completed.

NB The county highways report and assessment by James Long approved the development but with appropriate conditions attached and informatives below

It also has an informative statement thus a condition to the above requiring that offsite highway works shall require a major works agreement with Staffordshire County Council and the applicant is therefore requested to contact Staffordshire County Council in respect of securing the agreement the link below provides a further link to a major works agreement information back and an application form for the major works agreement

Also the proposed traffic management scheme referred to in conditions for above requires an essential traffic regulation order to introduce a 30 mph speed limit for road safety mitigating works. The recommendation of approval should not be construed as though the county council is prejudging of the order making progress process.

The developer should note that the order will be made on behalf of the developer by Staffordshire County Council at the developers expense and has to be secured before development commences as it is an essential component of the required mitigating measures associated with the proposed development.

In case the order is not already being processed, the developer is requested to contact SCC with immediate affect to enable the order to be secured at the earliest convenience to avoid delays in implementation of the planning consent.

Please note that there is no guarantee that the order will be successful. Condition four also requires implementation of a signage strategy to advise the permitted routing of the traffic access

in the park which will require the approval of the highway authority The applicant is therefore requested to contact network management unit of staff to county council to gain the relevant approval

Although SCC highways have stipulated a number of requisites there is no evidence provided in the discharge applications before you that they have done the necessary work to obtain the above .

The conditions attached to the permission SMD/2016/0378 specified as follows

Condition 20 the development here by permitted shall not be commenced until details of the offsite highway works at the junction of western East Lane on the a 52 indicated on drawing PB1608/SK001 rev C here by approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority the highway works shall be completed prior to the first occupation of any part of the development here by approved and in full accord ants with the approved details

Condition 24 no development shall commence until details of a traffic management scheme to reduce speed levels on the a 52 at the junction with the sea 0165 Western East Lane l've been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority the approved traffic management scheme shall thereafter be completed prior to the first use of any part of the development here by approved quest condition 25 the development here by permitted shall not be commenced until a signage scheme detailing the permitted rerouting of all traffic entering and exiting the site has been submitted and approved in writing with the local planning authority the approved signage scheme shall be completed prior to the first use of any part of the development here by approved and maintained for the life of the development

The development here by permitted should not be commenced until a construction travel traffic management plan brackets CTMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority the CTMP shall be based on the mitigation measures set out in paragraph 13.71 and 13.73 of chapter 13 of the environmental statement the approved city MP should be implemented prior to the commencement of construction and thereafter be adhered to for the full period of construction reason to comply with the policy is contained within the national planning policy framework the principles contained within money for streets and policies contained within the Staffordshire moorlands core strategy development plan 2014

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/YourData>
