

PLANNING STATEMENT

**PROPOSAL : PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE APPLICATION FOR
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO FIVE DWELLINGS**

**ADDRESS : LAND TO THE SOUTH OF LONGLANDS, 312
CHEADLE ROAD, CHEDDLETON, ST13 7BL**

APPLICANT : MR C J SMYTHE

DATE : JUNE 2026 JOB No. : 2026-3113

CONTENTS:

1.0	INTRODUCTION
2.0	SITE DESCRIPTION
3.0	PROPOSAL
4.0	POLICY
5.0	ASSESSMENT
6.0	CONCLUSION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This statement has been prepared in support of a Permission in Principle (PIP) application for residential development on land to the south of Longlands, 312 Cheadle Road, Cheddleton. The application has been submitted by Sammons Architectural Ltd on behalf of Mr C J Smythe and seeks permission in principle for the erection of up to 5 residential dwellings (use Class C3). All other matters, including layout, scale, appearance, landscaping drainage, ecology and means of access are expressly reserved for consideration at the subsequent Technical Details Consent (TDC) stage, should permission in principle be granted.

1.2 This statement analyses the site and the proposals and demonstrates that the site is suitable for residential development in principle having regard to the limited scope of assessment at this stage, the policy context, both nationally and locally, within which the proposals are made and relevant appeal decisions and material considerations.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 The application site comprises of an irregular shaped parcel of land which extends to some 4,627 sq metres. It lies on the western side of Cheadle Road and comprises part of a larger parcel of land which is currently used for agricultural purposes. The plot has a roadside frontage of some 97.5 metres and is approximately 45m deep. A drystone wall interspersed with mature trees forms the boundary to the highway and returns alongside the northern boundary. A dense and mature hedgerow forms the boundary to the wider field to the west whilst the southern boundary comprises of a mixture of conifer hedging, the gable end of a building and timber post and rail fencing. Immediately to the north of the application site lies Longlands with sporadic development beyond whilst a more continuous row of residential development lies on the opposite side of Cheadle Road. Immediately to the south lies the Staffs Farmers site, a commercial site which was previously granted consent for residential development. Pointons Park, a community facility, lies to the south east of the site, on the opposite side of Cheadle Road with the access road to the Advanced Proteins site between. The application site falls away from the highway very gradually in an east to west direction with open countryside beyond. For the purposes of the development plan the application site lies outside of any designated settlement boundary within the North Staffordshire Green Belt where restrictive development plan policies apply.

3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 The application seeks Permission in Principle for residential development (use class C3) comprising of up to 5 dwellings. The plot which has a roadside frontage of 97.5 metres and is 45m deep extends to circa 4,627 sq metres. It is anticipated that any residential development would be provided in the form of ribbon development mirroring that on the opposite side of Cheadle Road.

3.2 In accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order, the application specifies

- Location
- Land Use: Residential (Use Class C3)
- Amount of development: Up to 5 dwellings

3.3 Determination of an application for permission in principle is limited to location, land use and amount of development. This is known as Stage 1. No approval is sought at this stage for layout,

scale, appearance, access details or landscaping. These matters will be fully addressed at the Technical Details Consent stage (Stage 2).

A grant of permission in principle (stage 1) is not within the scope of biodiversity net gain as it is not a grant of planning permission. However, the subsequent technical details consent (stage 2) as a grant of planning permission, would be subject to the biodiversity net gain condition.

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) was revised in December 2024. It is the Government's clear intention that the document should be considered as a material consideration and as such carries particular weight where development is not addressed by planning policies in the existing Development Plan.

4.3 The NPPF confirms that at the heart of the guidance is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (para 11) and that for decision making this means approving development proposals that accord with the Development Plan without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It goes on to seek to significantly boost the supply of new housing throughout the country and sets out requirements for Local Authorities to maintain a five year deliverable supply of housing at all times. It also sets out guidance inter alia in respect of making effective use of previously developed land, securing high quality design and assessing impacts on highway safety. The content of this document has been taken into account in the preparation of this application and the most relevant sections of the NPPF are considered to be:-

- 1 Introduction paragraphs 1-14
- 2 Achieving sustainable development
- 4 Decision making
- 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 9 Promoting sustainable transport
- 11 Making effective use of land
- 12 Achieving well designed places
- 13 Protecting Green Belt land
- 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

4.4 The Development Plan for the Staffordshire Moorlands comprises of Local Plan which was adopted in September 2020. The main policies of relevance to the determination of this application are as follows:-

- SS1 (Development Principles);
- SS3 (Future Provision and Distribution of Development);
- SS8 (Larger Villages Area Strategy)
- SS10 (Other Rural Area Strategy)
- H1 (New Housing Development);
- DC1 (Design Considerations);
- DC3 (Landscape and Settlement Setting),
- NE1 (Biodiversity and Geological Resources),
- NE2 (Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows) 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.

4.5 The following documents are also strong material considerations in the determination of this application:

- The National Planning Policy Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- The Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD (2018)
- SMDC Housing Land Supply Statement (2023)
- SMDC Annual Monitoring Report (2024-2025)
- SMDC Quantifying the Economic Benefits of Growth Report
- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008)

4.6 In terms of Supplementary Planning Guidance the Council's adopted Design Principles and Space About Dwellings publications are also important in the consideration of this application.

5.0 ASSESSMENT

5.1 Planning Practice Guidance confirms that the scope of Permission in Principle applications is limited to location, land use & amount of development. Issues relevant to these “in principle” matters should be considered at the permission in principle stage. All other matters are expressly reserved.

5.2 Where permission in principle is granted by application, the default duration of that permission is granted by application, the default duration of that permission is 3 years. Local Planning Authorities must specify the location of the site, the type of development and provide an indication of the amount of development the site has permission in principle for. The amount of residential development must be expressed as a range, indicating the minimum and maximum net number of dwellings (i.e. taking into account any existing dwellings on the site) which are, in principle, permitted. It is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle, and its terms may only include the site location, the type of development and amount of development.

Land Use

5.3 In its general approach the Council expects the development and use of land to contribute positively to the social, economic and environmental improvement of the Staffordshire Moorlands. When considering development proposals the Council will in accordance with policy SS1 take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. This means that planning applications that accord with the policies in Local Plan shall be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.4 Where there are no policies relevant to the application, or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision, including those circumstances where the Council can not demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether: (a) any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or (b) specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

5.5 Policy SS2 of the adopted development plan directs development to those locations or settlements where it is deemed most suitable, largely based on the availability and provision of various services. As part of this, the adopted development boundaries define towns, rural area

larger villages, rural area small villages and other rural areas and are the spatial representation of the District's overarching development strategy.

The appeal site lies 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.

6.2 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.

6.3 The preamble to Local Plan policy SS8 which relates to the Larger Villages Area Strategy states (at paragraph 6.57) that "outside of the [development] boundaries, limited infilling may be supported, subject to key criteria being met as set out in Policy H1. Policy SS8 of the Local Plan relates specifically to the 'Larger 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. For larger villages the policy aims at SS8 (2) to meet housing requirements by (amongst other things): Allowing for rural exceptions housing in appropriate locations on the edge of settlements (in accordance with Policy H1). This will be additional to the housing provision for the rural areas (fourth point); Giving consideration to limited infilling on the edge of settlement boundaries, subject to the criteria set out in Policy H1". 6.4 Policy SS10 of the Local Plan confirms that strict control will continue to be exercised over inappropriate development within the Green Belt, allowing only for exceptions as defined by Government Policy.

5.6 Local Plan Housing Policy H1 4) b) states that outside of development boundaries, limited infill residential development of an appropriate scale and character will be supported subject to certain criteria being met. These include the development being well related to the existing pattern of development of a smaller village, not creating or extending ribbon development or lead to sporadic development, not leading to a prominent intrusion into the countryside and not having a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the countryside.

5.7 In addition Local Plan design and landscape character policies DC1 and DC3 require all development to be well designed and to reinforce local distinctiveness by positively contributing to and complementing the special character and heritage of the area; and, to protect and, where possible, enhance the setting of settlements by resisting development which would lead to prominent intrusion into the countryside or have a significant adverse impact on the character or the setting of a settlement or important views into and out of the settlement.

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 appeal. 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 and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (para 153).

6.6 Paragraphs 154 and 155 of the NPPF set out specific exceptions by which certain forms of development can be considered as being not inappropriate in the Green Belt. One of the exceptions listed in the NPPF (para 154) is "limited infilling in villages" (paragraph (e)). The key question therefore is whether the proposed development constitutes limited infilling and whether the site is located within a village as both criteria need to be met in order for the development to be considered appropriate within the Green Belt and allowed under the exception criteria.

6.7 It is important to note that the terms “limited infilling” and “villages” are not defined either in the Framework or the Local Plan Policy. In order to assess the site's status as an infill plot, one must first, understand the established definition of “infill”.

6.8 A commonly used definition of this is small scale development that fills a gap in an otherwise largely built up frontage. Such a definition was accepted by the appeal Inspector who permitted two dwellings as infill development in the Green Belt at 26 Brickfield Street, Padfield, Glossop (see appendix 1).

6.9 Allied with this is the Oxford English Dictionary definition of infill as “Buildings constructed to occupy the space between existing structures”. Case law has established that an assessment of limited infilling must be a planning judgment based on the merits of the site and having regard to the nature and size of the proposed development, the location of the site and its relationship to other existing development.

The appeal site lies within a loose ribbon of built development on this side of Cheadle Road. Longfields, the applicant's dwelling, sits within a large curtilage which immediately abuts the northern boundary of the site whilst the Staffordshire Farmers site which contains a number of commercial buildings lies immediately to the south with dwellings further beyond. Several dwellings lie on the opposite side of Cheadle Road. The application site is therefore bound on three sides by significant development and on that basis the development can be considered to represent infilling.

In terms of limited the road frontage of the appeal site is about 97.5 m long, which is comparable to the site recently approved on the opposite side of the road at the rear of 403 Cheadle Road under application reference SMD/2023/0489 and significantly longer than the development which has been built out at The Oaks for four dwellings under application reference SMD/2014/0689. The application proposes a minimum of 1 dwelling and a maximum of 5 which can reasonable be considered as limited as set out in the recent appeal at Mill Lane, Wetley Rocks (appendix 2). The application site is clearly capable of providing small scale (up to 5 dwellings) infill development which has built development on three sides. The proposed development would be well related to the existing pattern of development. Having regard to the above it is considered that the proposed development qualifies as limited infill given that it seeks consent for up to 5 dwellings and the site's sustainable location in an established area of development having regard to its location adjacent to Cheddleton village and recent planning decisions by the Authority.

The final part to satisfy is that the development needs to be in a village. Whilst it may well be the case that the development boundary for Cheddleton is drawn much tighter around the main nucleus of the village paragraph 154(e) of the NPPF does not specify that a proposal would need to be limited infilling within a **defined** village (my emphasis). It is therefore contended that the fact that the site lies outside the confines of the perceived development boundary for the village as drawn in the Local Plan should not prevent development which is in accordance with the National Policy Planning Framework. It should also be noted that there is no reference in paragraph 154(f) of the Framework to a local plan, its designation of settlements or to settlement boundaries. In other words, the term “village” need not necessarily be the same as the settlement boundary given that local circumstances can vary and much depends on the situation on the ground.

Indeed the judgement in Julian Wood v SSCLG and Gravesham Borough Council (copy attached at appendix 3) confirmed exactly this point and stated that the boundary of a village defined in a local plan may not be determinative for these purposes (my emphasis) and is particularly relevant in this regard. Therefore, when considering whether a site is in a village, the decision maker should have regard to the situation on the ground, as well as any relevant policies. This approach has been reflected in several subsequent appeal decisions including one at Grove Road, Knowle (APP REF: APP/Q4625/W/17/3188046 attached at Appendix 4) and more recently at Byron Lane, Knowle (APP REF:APP/Q4625/W/17/3191758, also attached at Appendix 5). Similarly in determining an appeal within the District earlier this year the Inspector confirmed at paragraph 7 of their appeal decision

(APP/B3438/W/24/3354428 copy attached at 2) that “However a settlement boundary may not necessarily determine whether a site is within a village for Green Belt purposes. Rather, this is part of a wider consideration and is a matter of planning judgement including consideration of what is on the ground”.

Therefore whilst it is accepted that the village boundary as drawn within the Local Plan excludes the appeal site it is considered that it is functionally, visually and socially related to the village. The appeal site clearly lies within a clear continuum of development spreading out from the settlement and there is nothing to obviously separate the appeal site from the rest of the settlement.

Further weight is added to the case for the application site being within the village by recent developments with the council permitting a 4 bed detached dwelling on this side of Cheadle Road (application reference SMD/2022/0391) against officer recommendation with the minutes stating that “the proposed property was in keeping with the area and in their opinion, deemed to be within the development boundary of Cheddleton.”. It should be noted that the plot permitted under SMD/2022/0391, like others on this side of Cheadle Road, extends significantly further (72.7m, Staffordshire Farmers site 85.5m and Longlands 99m deep) than the application site proposed under this application (45m). If members considered the plot at 340 Cheadle Road to be within the village envelope it is therefore difficult to see how any different conclusion can be reached on this site.

5.12 In addition to the above it should be noted that since Dec 2024 the updated NPPF has included a ‘grey belt’ land exception at paragraph 155. Grey belt is defined for the purposes of the NPPF as land in the Green Belt that does not strongly contribute to any of the purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. These purposes are: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; and, to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

5.13 The application site is not adjacent or near to a large built-up area nor does it comprise land that lies to the edge of a town, or forms part of a gap between towns, historic or otherwise, where erosion of the land could result in merger or the loss of visual separation between the towns.

7.14 The site, therefore, is not land in the Green Belt that strongly contributes to any of the purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143 and it is therefore, considered to be grey belt land. However, to be provided for by the exception at paragraph at 155 the land must not only be grey belt but also the development must not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

5.14 The development would be confined to a tranche of roadside frontage which lies between existing development. Whilst the site is open and currently used for agricultural purposes it is enclosed by substantial and mature hedgerows meaning that its contribution to the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt is rather limited and contained. The provision of small scale residential development would not therefore result in any significant encroachment nor would it affect the ability of all the remaining Green Belt across the area of the Staffordshire Moorlands from serving all five of the Green Belt purposes in a meaningful way. Accordingly the requirements of NPPF paragraph 155 (a) are satisfied.

There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed. The proposal would deliver 5 new dwellings in a sustainable location at a time when the District Council’s housing supply has following a chronic and prolonged period of undersupply fallen further to just 2.95 years. years – far below the required 5 years. This provides significant weight in favour of the development. Overall, it is considered that the requirements of NPPF paragraph 155 (b) are satisfied.

The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; The site is considered to be in a sustainable location, in line with paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF and as evidenced by a number of recent approvals for Registered in England No 3775545

residential development within the vicinity. Accordingly the requirements of NPPF paragraph 155 (a) are satisfied.

This scheme does not comprise major development, as it provides a known number of dwellings which is less than 10, in line with the definition within the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (as amended). Therefore, this condition is not applicable to the proposed development. Accordingly the requirements of NPPF paragraph 155 (d) are not relevant in this instance.

5.15 The development, therefore, would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan; there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed; and the development would be in a sustainable location within a larger village and within easy walking distance of a bus stop, pub, primary school, and churches. All of the criteria at paragraph 155 would be met and the exception at paragraph 155 therefore applies.

7.17 For the purposes of current government Green Belt policy, the proposed development would be appropriate development as it comprises limited infill within a village and development of grey belt land.

6.21 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 decisionmaker 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.

6.22 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".

6.23 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".

6.24 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."

This is confirmed in more recent appeals within the district under appeal reference APP/B3438/W/21/3283569 & APP/B3438/W/25/367834 (copies attached at Appendixes 9 and 10). In the an outline application for residential development of a detached dwelling on land adjacent to Knott Inn, Station Lane, Rushton Spencer. In allowing the appeal paragraph 9 of the Inspector's decision concluded that "A finding of the acceptability of the proposed development on the openness

of the Green Belt and purposes of including land within it is implication in a finding of it not being inappropriate development. I am not therefore required to consider this matter further”.

Location

7.18 With consideration for the location and amount of the development proposed it is noted that all strands and elements of Local Plan policy converge to provide protection for the character and appearance of the locality and settlement setting through development that relates well to the form and pattern of existing development.

7.19 Specifically, Local Plan policy SS8 (larger villages) requires new development to reflect and enhance each village's special character and heritage by protecting and enhancing the setting of individual settlements.

7.20 Local Plan housing policy H1 states that all housing development should be at the most appropriate density compatible with the site and its location, and with the character of the surrounding area. Outside of the development boundaries, development considered to be infill of an appropriate scale and character will be supported, provided that the development is well related to the existing pattern of development of a larger village.

7.21 Local Plan design and landscape character policy DC1 and DC3 require all development to be well designed and to reinforce local distinctiveness by positively contributing to and complementing the special character and heritage of the area; and, to protect and, where possible, enhance the setting of settlements by resisting development which would lead to prominent intrusion into the countryside or have a significant adverse impact on the character or the setting of a settlement or important views into and out of the settlement.

7.23 From Cheadle Road the site provides a relatively limited outlook with the significant mature hedge on the western boundary obscuring views of the open countryside beyond. On the remaining three sides the application site is bound by significant built development. The amount of development proposed, up to 5 dwellings would provide a density and form of development that is in keeping with the grain and appearance of the surrounding development and the substantial plot widths of 19.5m would ensure that despite being developed the open and verdant character of the area could be retained.

7.26 In these regards, there would be no significant or demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area and the proposal therefore can therefore be considered to comprise of appropriate development as it meets both the criteria for limited village infilling and grey belt land. Local Plan

5.9 Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that development should provide a safe and suitable access for all users with paragraph 116 stating that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. This guidance is reflected in policy Local Plan Policies DC1 and T1 which requires, amongst other matters, for development to provide for a safe and satisfactory access and make a contribution to meeting the parking requirement arising from necessary car use.

5.10 At Permission in Principle stage, it is sufficient to establish that safe and suitable access is achievable in principle. Detailed highway design and visibility splays can be appropriately secured and assessed at Technical Details Consent stage. Having regard to the site frontage which extends to some 108m and the alignment of the road which is straight and has clear and unobstructed visibility in both directions it is considered that a safe and sufficient access could be provided to serve the dwellings proposed. Overall access does not present and in principle issues with the location of the proposed development and can be satisfactorily addressed at the Technical Details Consent stage.

5.12 In line with local plan policy DC1 and guidance contained within the NPPF development must achieve a satisfactory relationship to any nearby properties such that it does not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, overshadowing, overbearingness, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

5.13 The proposal would result in a change of use to residential (Use Class C3) land. Having regard to the location of the site and proximity to neighbouring land uses it is not considered that residential development in this location would give rise to any fundamental amenity issues that could not be resolved at the technical details consent stage.

5.15 Matters regarding ecology biodiversity net gain, arboricultural impacts and flooding issues shall be assessed in detail at the Technical Details Consent stage and lie outside the scope of this application. Notwithstanding this there are not considered to be any environmental constraints that would prevent development being deliverable in principle.

Amount

5.14 The proposal seeks consent for up to 5 dwellings. The application site has a roadside frontage of 97.5 metres meaning that each plot, if carved equally would measure 19.5m x 45m. This size of plot is comparable with others in the area and would be sufficient to provide 5 dwellings in principle along with any necessary infrastructure to support it i.e. car and cycle parking provision, turning space, access for emergency and delivery vehicles and refuse storage whilst still retaining an open and verdant character to ensure that the development can be quickly assimilated into its surroundings.

CONCLUSION

5.16 Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.17 Paragraph 11d of the NPPF, which sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development, states that: For decision-taking this means: approving development proposals that accord with an up to-date development plan without delay; or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of date, granting permission unless:

- i the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

5.18 Footnote 8 of the NPPF defines “out-of-date” to include, for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply (or four year supply if applicable) or where the Housing Delivery Test indicates the delivery of housing was below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years.

5.19 As stated above it is currently the case that the District Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. As there are not any strong reasons for refusing the development in relation to protected areas or assets in the Framework, the tilted balance applies as per paragraph 11d(ii) of the Framework.

5.20 Footnote 9 sets out relevant key paragraphs to refer to in applying the tilted balance. These are paragraphs 66, 84, 91, 110, 115, 129, 135 and 139. Paragraph 66 is not relevant as the proposal does not relate to major development. Paragraph 84 relates to avoiding the development of isolated homes in the countryside. In this case, the site is located within the village of Cheddleton – a larger settlement as defined in Policy S2 of the Local Plan. In this context, it is considered that the proposal would not result in the development of isolated homes in the countryside. The application site is location within a sustainable location as evidenced by recent planning approvals for residential development on neighbouring sites with good access to the services, facilities and employment opportunities provided within the village via a range of transport modes. Paragraph 91 is not relevant as this is not a town-centre use. Paragraphs 110 and 115 relate to the sustainability of locations on transport grounds, primarily for major or allocated development. In this regard, it is considered that the location is sustainable on transport grounds as set out above. Paragraph 129 requires planning decisions to support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account a range of factors such as need for housing types and associated land availability; market conditions; availability and capacity of infrastructure; desirability of maintaining character; and, the importance of securing well-designed places (paras 135 and 139). The site is greenfield land. As the scheme is for 5 dwellings, there is limited scope to provide a diverse mix of tenures. The site has good opportunities to facilitate access into the market town of Leek and the neighbouring city of Stoke on Trent.

The proposed development is acceptable in principle as it meets the criteria for both limited village infilling and grey belt land. The site would be a logical and linear extension of the village along this side of Cheadle Road with very limited impact on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt due to the site's enclosed nature. Spatially, the development would result in some encroachment into the countryside however visually the impact on the countryside would be negligible. As such it is considered that the development would maintain the character of the area in principle.

6.3 The proposal would also make a significant contribution to housing land supply in accordance with policy SS1 and SS8 of the Local Plan and the NPPF by delivering 5 new dwellings in a sustainable location at a time when the District Council's housing supply has following a chronic and prolonged period of undersupply which has fallen further to just 2.95 years. years – far below the required 5 years. This provides significant weight in favour of the development. The development would also bring some social and economic benefits by virtue of the construction works and the lifetime of the development, enabling employment and use of services and amenities in the local area.

Overall, it is not considered that there are any adverse impacts of the scheme that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and as such the scheme is considered to comply with Local Plan policies SS1, SS3, SS8, SS10, DC1, DC3, H1, H3, T1 and NE1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan and guidance contained within the NPPF. For these reasons it is therefore considered that the proposal is capable of being supported by the Council.