

David Johnson

Barnfield

Bradnop

Staffordshire

ST13 7NN

15 September 2026

My Ref.: WDJ/SMD/2026/0326/140926-01

For the attention of: Mr Ben Haywood

Head of Development Services

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

Moorlands House

Stockwell Street

Leek

ST13 6HQ

Dear Mr Haywood,

PADWICK WIND FARM – SMD/2026/0326

**OUTSTANDING RESPONSE TO MY SCOPING REPRESENTATIONS,
DEFICIENCIES IN THE SUBMITTED LAYOUT PLAN AND REQUEST FOR A
MEETING**

I am writing further to:

1. My detailed response to the Padwick Wind Farm EIA Scoping Request, submitted to Staffordshire Moorlands District Council on 28 July 2026;
2. The Council's Regulation 15 Scoping Opinion dated 14 August 2026;
3. My further letter dated 19 August 2026, headed "**Request for Written Clarification and Supplementary EIA Scoping Requirements**"; and
4. The Council's subsequent holding response.

This is therefore my third substantive representation concerning the EIA scoping process and the principal purpose of this letter is to highlight the fact that the submitted layout plan effectively excludes my property despite my representations.

I am concerned that the recent holding response indicates that I will not receive a substantive response to my letter of 19 August within one month of its delivery.

That letter raised a number of important matters which, as far as I am aware, remain unanswered. They included the identification and assessment of Barnfield as a primary property-specific residential receptor, my private borehole and the need for an appropriate hydrogeological assessment and Private Water Supply Risk Assessment, the treatment of

Public Rights of Way Ipstones 35 and 36, equestrian safety, and significant questions about the accuracy and usability of the submitted plans.

Nothing in this present letter withdraws, replaces or narrows any of those earlier requests.

The particular reason for writing again now is the continuing failure to resolve what I regard as a fundamental problem with the principal layout plan relied upon in the scoping process.

1. The principal layout plan does not identify Barnfield

The layout plan accompanying the Scoping Request is the obvious “go-to” plan for anybody wishing to understand the proposal because it identifies the positions and numbers of the individual turbines in relation to surrounding properties and features.

My original detailed response demonstrated, including through the photographs and montages at pages 9–14, that my property, Barnfield, is obscured on that plan by the label **WTG-04** to such an extent that the property itself cannot be seen.

This is particularly significant because Barnfield is exceptionally close to the proposed development and, from the information presently available, is closer to a proposed turbine than any other residential property on or immediately around the development.

I raised this point before the Council issued its Scoping Opinion and raised it again in my letter of 19 August.

In that letter I specifically asked the Council to require:

- Clean and legible plans at an appropriate scale;
- Identification of every potentially affected residential property and sensitive receptor;
- Labels to be offset or otherwise arranged so that no property, route or feature is concealed;
- Publication of corrected plans; and
- Consistent use of those corrected plans throughout preparation of the Environmental Statement.

I have still not received confirmation that this will be done.

The plan has nevertheless been accepted as part of the material associated with application **SMD/2026/0326**, following the earlier Screening Opinion process under **SMD/2025/0139**, without, so far as I can establish, the Council requiring the applicant to replace or correct it.

I find that difficult to understand.

2. Correct identification of Barnfield is not necessarily straightforward

For the avoidance of any possible doubt, my property is:

Barnfield

Bradnop

Leek

Staffordshire

ST13 7NN

It should not be confused with **Barnfield Farm, Porters Lane, Bradnop, Leek ST13 7NQ**, or with Barnfield Industrial Estate in Leek.

This is not merely a theoretical concern.

Over many years I have occasionally received correspondence intended for other similarly named properties and have also experienced correspondence going elsewhere. The Post Office has generally managed the situation, but difficulties can recur when personnel or records change.

Historically, there has also been confusion within address records. For example, since 1994 my Council Tax documentation has referred to Barnfields Farm and postcode ST13 7NQ rather than my actual property. I raised this with the Council over a number of years after moving to Barnfield in 1994. But it remains unresolved.

I mention this history because it demonstrates why it is particularly important that the planning process does not depend upon an assumption that an address search or database will necessarily identify my property correctly.

3. Concealing the property beneath WTG-04 compounds the identification problem

My concern is that obscuring Barnfield beneath the WTG-04 annotation has already been shown to affect AI-assisted interrogation of the submitted plan. I am aware of at least one independent review of the applicant's documents using an AI model in which Barnfield was not identified.

I cannot say precisely how any particular computer system or AI-assisted search will interpret the drawing. However, if the name and position of Barnfield are visually concealed by the turbine annotation, there is an obvious risk that somebody reviewing the plan electronically could fail to identify the property as a receptor at all.

That is the opposite of what an informative planning drawing should achieve.

It is particularly troubling in the case of a property situated at such an unusually short distance from one of the proposed turbines.

4. The turbine numbering itself remains defective

The problem is compounded because the same layout material identifies two turbines as WTG-04, while there is no turbine identified as WTG-08.

I raised precisely this issue in my letter of 19 August.

I asked the Council to require the applicant to:

- Identify each of the eight turbines uniquely;
- Provide a controlled drawing register and coordinate schedule;
- Reconcile the plans, figures and technical assessments;
- Confirm which turbine is actually nearest to Barnfield; and
- Establish whether any distances, assessment zones, models or conclusions require recalculation as a consequence.

I have received no substantive answer to that request.

I understand that the Council's response has referred to the discrepancy being identified within a schedule of errors prepared by Ipstones Parish Council.

With respect, recording an error is not the same thing as correcting it. I have no idea why amendment/replacement of the turbine location plan has not been requested. This would have been a completely neutral act while adding to the clarity and reliability of the Council's opinion.

If the principal development plan contains an incorrect turbine identification, the appropriate solution must surely be for the applicant to provide a corrected plan rather than for every person subsequently using the document to be expected to know that one WTG-04 should actually be read as something else.

This becomes particularly important if that drawing is subsequently used, directly or indirectly, as the basis for noise, landscape and visual, shadow flicker, hydrology, traffic, safety or other technical assessments.

5. Barnfield may also be missed by a simple site inspection

The existence and significance of Barnfield cannot safely be resolved by assuming that an officer or consultant will simply see the property when visiting the area.

Barnfield is approached by stone tracks across open fields. There is no through road past the property.

The house cannot readily be seen from the surrounding public roads and there is no normal "drive-by" route from which its existence or relationship with the proposed turbines becomes obvious.

This makes accurate mapping and explicit receptor identification all the more important.

6. My letter of 19 August remains substantively unanswered

I wish to emphasise that the mapping issues described above form only one part of my letter of 19 August.

That letter requested a point-by-point response concerning, amongst other things:

- Barnfield's status as a primary property-specific receptor;
- A property-specific Residential Visual Amenity Assessment;
- Barnfield-specific noise assessment and appropriate baseline/compliance monitoring;
- Shadow flicker;
- Population and human-health effects;
- Hydrogeological investigation of my private borehole;
- A dedicated Private Water Supply Risk Assessment;
- Baseline, construction and post-construction water monitoring and contingency arrangements;
- PRoW Ipstones 35 and Ipstones 36;
- Equestrian safety and appropriate stand-off considerations;
- Traffic, access and abnormal loads;
- Accident and disaster risk;
- Cumulative and combined effects;
- Corrected mapping and turbine identification; and
- Mechanisms through which mitigation and monitoring requirements will actually be secured.

I specifically asked the Council to cross-reference those matters against either:

- (a) the relevant part of the Scoping Opinion;
- (b) a requirement which the applicant will be expected to address within the Environmental Statement; or
- (c) a reasoned conclusion that the particular matter falls outside the required scope.

I have not received that point-by-point response.

7. I am not asking the Council to prejudge the eventual planning application

I want to be absolutely clear about the purpose of my correspondence.

I have no wish to promote the interests of my own property at the expense of neighbouring residents or other affected receptors.

Nor am I asking Staffordshire Moorlands District Council to prejudge any future planning application for Padwick Wind Farm.

I am asking for something much more fundamental.

I am asking the Council to ensure that a major development proposal proceeds through environmental assessment using plans and underlying information which are accurate, intelligible and not misleading.

I am now 80 years old and have been a Staffordshire Moorlands ratepayer and resident at Barnfield for more than 30 years.

I believe I am entitled to ask that a proposed development of this scale, exceptionally close to my home, is assessed using plans which show that home clearly and correctly and that the specific representations I have made to the Council receive a substantive response.

At present, the principal layout plan does not meet that basic standard.

I remain surprised that, having drawn these deficiencies to the Council's attention, the Council has not simply required the applicant to submit a corrected plan.

8. Request for a meeting

I understand that Mr Ben Hurst, the officer dealing with this matter, is currently away and is not due to return until 22 September.

Given the matters set out above, the length of time for which my letter of 19 August will by then have remained substantively unanswered, and the importance of resolving these issues before the applicant progresses too far with Environmental Statement surveys, modelling and documentation, I do not believe it would be appropriate simply to leave the matter unresolved pending his return.

I therefore respectfully request a meeting with you, as Head of Development Services, at the earliest reasonably convenient opportunity – preferably in the next few working days by arrangement. I can be contacted directly by email or on my mobile as shown at the end of this letter.

The purpose of the meeting would not be to debate whether planning permission should ultimately be granted or refused.

It would be to establish:

1. Whether and when I will receive the substantive point-by-point response requested in my letter of 19 August;
2. Whether the Council will require the applicant to issue a corrected principal layout plan showing Barnfield and all other affected receptors clearly;
3. Whether the duplicated WTG-04 / absent WTG-08 error will be formally corrected;
4. How the Council intends to ensure that Barnfield is correctly identified throughout the Environmental Statement and its technical assessments; and
5. How the other outstanding matters identified in my letter of 19 August are to be addressed following issue of the Council's Scoping Opinion.

I would be grateful if this letter could be placed on the planning file for SMD/2026/0326, together with my letter of 19 August, so that there is a clear record that these matters remain outstanding.

I would also be grateful if you could confirm whether you are willing to meet with me and my advisor and suggest a suitable date ASAP this week.

I hope a short meeting will enable these matters to be resolved constructively and avoid them becoming more difficult once the Environmental Statement has been substantially prepared.

Yours sincerely,

William David Johnson

Barnfield

Bradhop

Staffordshire

ST13 7NN

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]