

Dear Members

Planning Committee

A meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on **Wednesday 30 September 2026** at **6.30pm** in the **Craddock Room, Civic Centre, Riverside, Stafford** to deal with the business as set out on the agenda.

Please note that this meeting will be recorded.

Members are reminded that contact officers are shown in each report and members are welcome to raise questions etc in advance of the meeting with the appropriate officer.



Head of Law and Governance

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 30 SEPTEMBER 2026

Chairman - Councillor B McKeown

Vice-Chairman - Councillor S N Spencer

AGENDA

- 1 **Minutes**
- 2 **Apologies**
- 3 **Declaration of Member's Interests/Lobbying**
- 4 **Delegated Applications**

Details of Delegated applications will be circulated separately to Members.

		Page Nos
5	Planning Applications	3 - 66
6	Planning Appeals	67 - 82
7	Enforcement Matters	-

MEMBERSHIP

Chairman - Councillor B McKeown

B M Cross	B McKeown
P C Edgeller	A R McNaughton
A D Hobbs	D M McNaughton
J Hood	A J Sandiford
R A James	S N Spencer
P W Jones	

ITEM NO 5

ITEM NO 5

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 30 SEPTEMBER 2026

Ward Interest - Nil

Planning Applications

Report of Head of Economic Development and Planning

Purpose of Report

To consider the following planning applications, the reports for which are set out in the attached **APPENDIX:-**

		Page Nos
25/40885/OUT	Land Between Trent Canal and Old Road, Barlaston	4 - 52
The application was called in by Councillor E G R Jones		
Officer Contact - Richard Wood, Development Lead Telephone 01785 619324		
26/41994/HOU	The Malthouse, Church Lane, Gayton	53 - 66
The application was called in by Councillor F Beatty		
Officer Contact - Elaine Harvey, Planning Validation Officer Telephone 01785 619537		

Previous Consideration

Nil

Background Papers

Planning application files are available for Members to inspect, by prior arrangement, in the Development Management Section. The applications including the background papers, information and correspondence received during the consideration of the application, consultation replies, neighbour representations are scanned and are available to view on the Council website.

Application:	25/40885/OUT
Case Officer:	Ed Handley
Date Registered:	3 September 2025
Target Decision Date:	3 December 2025
Extended To:	1 October 2026
Address:	Land between Trent Canal and Old Road, Barlaston
Ward:	Barlaston
Parish:	Barlaston
Proposal:	Residential development for up to 72 dwellings with access considered
Applicant:	Inglewood Investment Company Limited
Recommendation:	Approve, subject to conditions and to the applicant entering into a s106 agreement

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

This application has been called in by Councillor E G Jones (Ward Member for Barlaston) for the following reasons:-

- Development outside of the Barlaston Plan
- Development in the Green Belt.

CONTEXT

1.0 Site and surroundings

- 1.1 The application site comprises a parcel of land measuring approximately 3.85ha. The site is immediately north of Brookhouse Drive and to the east of Old Road. To the west of the site is the Trent and Mersey Canal. To the north, the boundary abuts a residential property and agricultural land under separate control. The site extends to the Trent and Mersey Canal by virtue of a proposed pedestrian link to the towpath.
- 1.2 The site lies outside of, but adjacent to, the settlement boundary of Barlaston and is within the North Staffordshire Green Belt.

- 1.3 The site is in an area classified as being 'low risk' by The Mining Remediation Authority and within a green impact risk zone for great crested newts.
- 1.4 The site is also within the impact risk zone of the Kings and Hargreaves Woods SSSI (site of special scientific interest). The Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area encompasses the canal and associated towpaths to the east.
- 1.5 The application site has a gently undulating topography with levels rising slightly from west to east in the southern part and sloping down to the northern boundary. The site is bound by hedgerows to the north, west, and east and the southern boundary varies as it abuts the rear gardens associated with dwellings off Brookhouse Drive.

2.0 Proposed development

- 2.1 This application seeks outline consent (with details of access provided) for residential development of the site. Initially submitted for up to 81 dwellings, the application has been amended during the course of consideration to restrict development to no more than 72 dwellings.
- 2.2 A single vehicular access is proposed off Old Road with footways either side. The footway along Old Road would be widened to 2m between the proposed access and Brookhouse Drive to the south.
- 2.3 A single pedestrian access is proposed to the east to link to the Trent and Mersey Canal towpath.

The application is supported by the following technical reports:

- Biodiversity net gain assessment / metric
- Design and access statement
- Flood risk assessment
- Heritage statement
- Planning statement
- Preliminary ecological assessment
- Preliminary arboricultural assessment
- Transport Assessment
- Agricultural land classification statement

- Landscape visual appraisal

3.0 Background

- 3.1 An earlier application, reference 21/33687/FUL, for 42 affordable dwellings was refused in July 2022, however national and local planning policy has changed significantly since that time with the introduction of 'grey belt' and changes to the way housing land supply is calculated resulting Stafford Borough Council no longer being able to demonstrate such provision.

4.0 Legislative framework

- 4.1 Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, require decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 4.2 The development plan for the purposes of this application comprises The Plan for Stafford Borough (TPSB) 2011-2031 Parts 1 and 2 and the Barlaston Neighbourhood Plan.
- 4.3 The following policies and guidance are relevant to the consideration of this application:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2026

Policies: DM3; DM6; DM7; S3; S5; S6; CC2; CC3; HO7; HO8; L3; GB6; GB7; GB8; DP3; DP4; TR3; TR4; TR6; HC3; P2; P3; P5; F4; F5; F7; F8; N2; N3; N6; HE4; HE5; HE6; HE9

The Plan for Stafford Borough (Part 1)

Policies: SP1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development; SP3 Stafford Borough sustainable settlement hierarchy; SP6 Achieving rural sustainability; SP7 Supporting the location of new development; E2 Sustainable rural development; C1 Dwelling types and sizes; C2 Affordable housing; C5 Residential proposals outside the settlement hierarchy; C7 Open space, sport, and recreation; N1 Design; N2 Climate change; N4 The natural environment and green infrastructure; N5 Sites of European, national and local nature conservation importance; N8 Landscape character; N9 Historic environment; T1 Transport; T2 Parking and manoeuvring facilities; Appendix B - Car parking standards I1 Infrastructure delivery policy

The Plan for Stafford Borough: Part 2

Policies: SB1 Settlement boundaries

Barlaston Neighbourhood Plan

Policies: D1 Design of new development; BE1 High-speed connectivity; LNE1 Natural environment

Supplementary planning documents

Design SPD (2018)

OFFICER ASSESSMENT - KEY CONSIDERATIONS

5.0 Principle of development

- 5.1 Notwithstanding the latest publication of the NPPF (2026), since the publication of the NPPF in December 2024 and, with it, new mandatory housing targets, Stafford Borough has not been in a position whereby it can demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and, consequently, settlement boundaries for the purposes of new residential development no longer carry less weight.
- 5.2 Policy S3 of the NPPF states that decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that, in all locations, development which accords with both an up-to-date development plan and the decision-making policies within the NPPF should be approved without delay. This means that, outside of settlements, policy S5 of the NPPF is engaged. However, policy S5(5) (NPPF) states that proposals within the green belt should be determined in accordance with national policies HC8, GB6, GB7, and/or GB8 as appropriate. HC8 relates to local green space and is, therefore, not applicable in this instance.
- 5.3 Section 13 of the NPPF states that the government “attaches great importance to Green Belts, the essential features of which are their openness and permanence”.
- 5.4 Policy GB2 (NPPF) sets out the five purposes of the green belt:
 - a) Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
 - b) Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.
 - c) Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
 - d) Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
 - e) Assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

- 5.5 GB6 (NPPF) states that development in the green belt is inappropriate unless it falls within one of the categories in policy GB7 and continues to state that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the green belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Such circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the green belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm resulting from the proposed development, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. GB6 attaches substantial weight to harm to the green belt in such a balance.
- 5.6 GB7 sets out categories of development which are not inappropriate in the green belt and which, therefore, are not regarded as harmful to the green belt; these categories include (g) development where all of the following apply:
- i. The development 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.
 - ii. There is an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed.
 - iii. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to policy TR3.
 - iv. In the case of major development involving the provision of housing, the development proposed complies with policy GB8 (the golden rules).

GB7 (i) - (Grey belt and GB2 purpose (a))

- 5.7 The glossary to the NPPF defines 'grey belt' as:

"For the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, 'grey belt' is defined as land in the green belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in policy GB2."

- 5.8 For clarity, the site does not comprise previously developed land.
- 5.9 Barlaston is defined within The Plan for Stafford Borough as a key service village; it is not large by comparison to the county town of Stafford or the market town of Stone. Planning Practice Guidance confirms that purpose (a) of including land within the green belt does not apply to villages. The application site does, therefore, not strongly contribute to checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.

GB7 (i) - (Grey belt and GB2 purpose (b))

- 5.10 Similarly, as Barlaston is defined as a village and does not adjoin the urban area of any town, it is not considered that the application site makes any strong contribution to preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

GB7 (i) - (Grey belt and GB2 purpose (d))

- 5.11 The application site does not adjoin a historic town and, furthermore, Planning Practice Guidance is clear that this applies to towns and not other locations (i.e. villages). The site, therefore, does not make a strong contribution to the preservation of the setting and special character of any historic town.
- 5.12 With regard to annex 2 to the NPPF, the site is not considered to make a strong contribution to purposes (a), (b), or (d) of policy GB2 of the NPPF and, consequently, it is considered that the application site comprises grey belt land.
- 5.13 It is not considered that the development of the application site would fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining green belt land across the Borough.

GB7 (ii) - unmet need

- 5.14 With regard to footnote 41, it is acknowledged that the proposed development would assist in meeting an unmet need for residential development.

GB7 (iii) - sustainable location

- 5.15 Barlaston is defined within The Plan for Stafford Borough as a key service village, which is considered to constitute a sustainable location and to which the plan directs new development. On the basis that the application site abuts the settlement boundary for Barlaston it is considered to be in a sustainable location. Furthermore, the proposed link into the canal towpath offers a genuine traffic free alternative for future occupants to travel into Barlaston and beyond.
- 5.16 With regard to policy TR3 (NPPF) as set out in section 8 of this report, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any significant adverse impacts on the transport network, the site is within walking distance of local facilities and public transport routes, and opportunities would be taken to improve pedestrian connectivity in the area.

GB7 (iv) - (Golden Rules)

- 5.17 As this application relates to a major residential scheme, it must also comply with the golden rules, set out in policy GB8 (NPPF). In the case of major development involving the provision of housing, the development proposed complies with policy GB8 (the golden rules) which requires the following contributions to be made:
- a) Affordable housing, at a contribution which is 15 percentage points above the highest existing affordable housing requirement which would otherwise apply to the development, subject to a cap of a 50%.
 - b) Necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure.

c) The provision of new green space, or improvements to existing green space, which is accessible to the public. This provision should:

- i. Make a positive contribution to the landscape setting of the development;
- ii. Support nature recovery; and
- iii. Meet local standards for green space provision where these exist in the development plan. Where no locally specific standards exist, development proposals should meet national standards relevant to the development (these include Natural England's standards on accessible green space and urban greening factor and Green Flag criteria). Where land has been identified as having potential for habitat creation or nature recovery within Local Nature Recovery Strategies, proposals should contribute towards these outcomes.

- 5.18 The highest existing affordable housing requirement which would apply to this site is 40% given its location outside, but adjoining the settlement boundary for Barlaston; when applying an uplift of 15%, the cap of 50% is therefore met. The proposed development is for up to 72 dwellings and, therefore, any approval should be subject to a s106 agreement to secure that 50% of dwellings (up to 36 dwellings) are affordable.
- 5.19 With regard to policy GB8 (1)(b), it is considered that there are necessary improvements to local infrastructure with regard to the highway network, public transport provision, open space, sports provision, and healthcare provision.
- 5.20 The Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent ICB (integrated care board) request a contribution of £72,622 to support the provision of local health infrastructure, to comprise additional space requirements within their existing estate based on the likely population increase and subsequent demand on facilities.
- 5.21 No contributions are considered necessary, at this time, with regard to education provision.
- 5.22 In this regard, subject to the applicant entering into a s106 agreement to secure the appropriate contributions, it is considered that the proposal would comply with policy GB8 (1)(b) of the NPPF.
- 5.23 The drawings submitted in support of this application indicate the provision of public open space and play facilities; subject to their provision, it is considered that the proposal would comply with policy GB8(1)(c) of the NPPF. It is considered that any approval should be subject to a condition to secure details demonstrating compliance with the requirements of GB8(1)(c) as part of the appropriate submission in pursuance of approval of reserved matters.

- 5.24 Consequently, it is considered that the proposed development would meet the golden rules and, therefore, would comply with policy GB7 (g)(iv). It is not, therefore, considered that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the green belt.
- 5.25 Policy S5(5) of the NPPF requires that where development is not inappropriate, it should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies within the NPPF, and applying S5(2).
- 5.26 The principle of development is considered to be acceptable, subject to other material considerations.

6.0 Heritage, character and appearance

- 6.1 Policy N1 of the TPSB sets out design criteria including the requirement for design and layout to take account of local context and to have high design standards which preserve and enhance the character of the area.
- 6.2 The application site lies to the north of Barlaston, immediately abutting the edge of the built-up area (Brookhouse Drive to the south), bound to the west by Old Road, to the east of the Trent and Mersey Canal (Conservation Area), with agricultural land extending to the north, adjacent to and beyond a small development of bungalows.
- 6.3 The Council's Design Advisor, whilst acknowledging that the site would sit between two developed areas which would likely constitute itself a relatively rational infill to the existing urbanised settlement, initially raised concern with regard to the design parameters demonstrated within the application documents. Specific concerns related to the lack of detail regarding the likely density of the development, building heights, and overall layout which cumulatively would likely result in a development which would fail to provide a sensitive response to the underlying character of the site and its context.
- 6.4 Revised plans were submitted to reduce the maximum height to two-storeys and provide detail with regard to the pedestrian connection to the canal towpath and, subsequently, to reduce the number of dwellings proposed to (up to) 72 supported by revised design details to include an illustrative masterplan showing a greater provision of detached dwellings in the northwestern part of the site, reducing the density of development to approximately 33dph which would constitute a more appropriate response to the edge of settlement context of the site.
- 6.5 In response to the latest submission, the Council's Design Advisor states that the proposal would result in a potentially more contextually sensitive interface and relationship with the adjacent development, and that the pedestrian connection is considered to be acceptable.

- 6.6 Whilst it is considered that further modification of the built form parameters (to include single or 1.5 storey buildings in the most sensitive locations) would substantially benefit the overall character of the scheme, and the urban grain and structure of the layout should be revised and loosened to provide more generously apportioned street scenes as well as the provision of a more centralised provision of public open space, it is considered that these elements would fall within the consideration of a detailed scheme to be submitted under an application for the approval of reserved matters. The Design Advisor notes this, stating that the amendments made to the submission have resulted in the overall design being at a point where there is confidence that further modifications to the detail could result in the achievement of an appropriate response to the site and its local context.
- 6.7 With regard to the comments of the Council's Design Advisor, the following concluding comments of the supporting landscape and visual appraisal are accepted:
- "...the site has an existing relationship with the developed edge of Barlaston and the residential areas surrounding the site to the south. On balance the proposed development will, whilst wholly replacing portions of the landscape character at the site level, sit within the existing retained landscape character elements at the site level and the landscape character at the regional and district level. The proposed development of this land forms a logical expansion to the settlement and is visually well contained."*
- 6.8 The application site abuts the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area. Whilst no objection, on heritage grounds was raised with regard to a similar (albeit smaller) residential scheme submitted under application 21/33687/FUL, the Council's Conservation Officer raises concern with regard to the current submission, noting that there was insufficient information available to fully assess the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the conservation area - in particular in relation to form, massing, and architectural treatment. It is noted that the proximity of the site to the conservation area and its semi-rural context heighten the importance of sensitive design and landscape integration and that development previously considered to not cause harm to the setting of the conservation area may do now due to changes in proximity, density, massing, and height, etc.
- 6.9 It is noted that the heritage assessment, submitted in support of the application, dismisses harm to the setting of the grade II* listed Barlaston Hall stating that the proposed development would be "consequentially irrelevant to the setting of this asset"; that the "value of the site within the setting is trivial"; and that neither the immediate nor the intermediate setting, both of which are crucial to the significance of Barlaston Hall, include the application site. However, the Conservation Officer considers that views from Barlaston Hall, on an elevated position on higher ground, would be impacted by development in this location.

- 6.10 Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the Conservation Officer concludes that further assessment would be required at reserved matters stage to ensure that the proposed development would respond appropriately to local character, avoids over-development, and maintains a high standard of design. Furthermore, the initial representation from the Conservation Officer states that conditions would need to be applied to any approval to ensure that special regard is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is considered that this view indicates that the proposed residential development of the application site could be achieved, subject to appropriate detailed design which would come forward at reserved matters stage.
- 6.11 Following the submission of updated information, including a revised design and access statement, the Conservation Officer acknowledged the reduction in the number of units proposed yet clarified that the reduction would not materially alter the overall nature of the development in heritage terms.
- 6.12 Policy HE4 of the NPPF states that “any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification” which must be in accordance with the policies in chapter 20.
- 6.13 Policy HE6 states that “when considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be)” and, furthermore, that “where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal”.
- 6.14 It is acknowledged that the Council’s Conservation Officer raises concern with regard to the impact upon the setting of designated heritage assets; this is considered to be on the basis that harm cannot be ruled out rather than a substantial objection being made to the principle of development on this site.
- 6.15 Further to this, it is considered that, subject to appropriate treatment, the proposed pedestrian link onto the canal towpath would likely result in better accessibility for people to experience the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area.

- 6.16 The principle of residential development on site (with regard to heritage impacts) was accepted during consideration of application 21/33687/FUL. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale of development is to be reserved for future consideration and that the illustrative masterplan shows significant space within which structural landscape planting could be secured in order to provide a high level of screening between the proposed development and the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area as well as assisting in loosening the urban grain of development to minimise impacts in views from Barlaston Hall. Consequently, it is considered that there would be significant opportunity to minimise harm to the setting of these designated heritage assets.
- 6.17 Consequently, it is considered that appropriate mitigation could be considered and secured during any future application for the approval of the reserved matters as, at that stage, detailed design would be assessed and any necessary architectural design and screen planting would be considered. One such method of mitigation would be a sensitively designed scheme of external illumination; a condition should be attached to any approval to ensure that details are submitted in support of any application for approval of the reserved matters.
- 6.18 Considering the likelihood of being able to minimise impacts and secure appropriate mitigation, it is considered that the significant public benefits arising from the provision of up to 72 dwellings which would assist in meeting the evidenced unmet need for housing in the area would outweigh the likely harm resulting upon the setting of the designated heritage assets.
- 6.19 With regard to the comments of the Council's Design Advisor and the amendments made to the application during the course of consideration, it is considered that the submission demonstrates sufficient compliance with policy D1 of the Barlaston Neighbourhood Plan in that parameter plans indicate that the development would be of an appropriate height, scale, and density; and provide convenient access to community services and facilities. It is considered that other criteria set out within policy D1 would be considered in detail if a further application for the approval of reserved matters was made should this outline application be approved.

7.0 Residential amenity

- 7.1 Policy N1 requires the design and layout of development to take account of noise and light implications and the amenity of adjacent residential areas. The Design SPD then provides further guidance on amenity standards and separation distances.

- 7.2 The application seeks outline consent (with details of access only) for the development of up to 72 dwellings. Whilst it is considered that the site could, in principle, be developed in a manner whereby there would be no undue harm with regard to residential amenity, details of the design and layout would need to be considered at reserved matters stage.
- 7.3 It is, however considered appropriate to attach a condition to any approval to ensure that development is carried out in accordance with a site-specific CMP (construction management plan) as requested by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that any concerns with regard to the burning of materials on site during development would be better controlled under separate environmental health legislation.

8.0 Access, parking, and the local highway network

- 8.1 Policy T2 requires development proposals to provide adequate means of access and sufficient car parking provision in accordance with the parking standards as set out in Appendix B of the TPSB.
- 8.2 This application seeks outline consent with details of access only.
- 8.3 The application site is currently accessed off Old Road via a field gate to the northwestern corner of the field; a new vehicular access is proposed off Old Road in a more central location along the western boundary. Pedestrian access is proposed to the canal towpath to the east.
- 8.4 In this location, Old Road is restricted to 30mph and is unlit; there is a 1.2m footway, set behind a 3.0m grass verge.
- 8.5 The local highway authority raise no objection to the proposal acknowledging that the proposed development would not result in a major impact on the surrounding highway network as per the conclusions of the supporting transport assessment. Furthermore, it is noted that there are facilities within the recommended walking distance - health centre, primary school, village hall, and shop. Furthermore, there are bus stops on Old Road adjacent to the southwestern boundary.
- 8.6 The local highway authority note that a new T-junction with Old Road would be provided with a 5.5m internal access road and 6m entry/exit carriageway. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 59m would be achieved to match the traffic speed at this location. Furthermore, a new bus stop would be provided to serve southbound buses; a brick shelter and flag post sign exists for northbound services.
- 8.7 The highway authority recommend that a residential travel plan is secured by condition prior to first occupation, along with a monitoring fee of £6,000 via s106 agreement. A travel plan would ensure that sustainable transport objectives would be delivered, monitored, and managed.

- 8.8 A condition is recommended to ensure that development is carried out in accordance with a detailed construction transport management plan (CTMP) which shall first have been approved.
- 8.9 Conditions are also recommended to ensure that the vehicular access is provided prior to any further works on site; that off-site highway works, to include the provision of a 3.0m cycle/footway and street lighting along the Old Road frontage, are completed prior to first occupation;
- 8.10 Furthermore, the highway authority recommend that the segregated footways to be provided to connect both sides of the proposed vehicular access road along Old Road are to be 3.0m in width as a shared cycle/pedestrian path along the entire site frontage to Old Road and include improvements to street lighting. It is considered that the provision of such off-site highway works should be secured via s106 agreement.
- 8.11 Further contributions are requested towards the provision of a new bus shelter on Old Road for southbound buses (£11,000) and towards the enhancement of gateway signage and road markings on Old Road (£8,000).
- 8.12 With regard to the proposed pedestrian access to the canal, it is noted that the Canal and River Trust have raised concern with regard to the structural integrity of the canal retaining embankment and embankment trees and hedgerows which provide an element of visual screening between the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area and later development. Notwithstanding this, the Trust advise that should the Council consider that sufficient information is provided at this stage, a condition is recommended to ensure that the towpath access ramp is informed by site-specific investigations to include:
- a) Detailed topographical survey.
 - b) Tree survey to identify areas requiring protection and to inform the layout of the proposed towpath access ramp.
 - c) Cross sections to show the earthworks in relation to the existing levels of the canal embankment and the gradients of the proposed ramp.
 - d) Drainage arrangements for the embankment and access ramp.
 - e) Construction materials plan at a scale of 1:200 for the proposed access ramp.
 - f) Surfacing materials and landscaping to delineate different parts of the ramp, steps, junction, etc. to include 1:20 drawings of the surface material build-up and steps.

- g) Construction management method statement, to include specific measures to prevent damage to the canal embankment from heavy plant machinery, and vehicle movements, and for the protection of utility cables beneath and adjacent to the towpath.
- h) Long-term maintenance and management arrangement details for the proposed towpath access ramp.

- 8.13 It is considered that these details should be secured at this stage by condition requiring them in support of the relevant application for reserved matters as they would inform the layout of any circulation route to the towpath and the nature of any access ramps.
- 8.14 Further to this, the Canal and River Trust request an undefined contribution towards upkeep of the canal towpath and signage. This request is not supported by any evidence of need or justification of other sorts and there is no specific scheme to which any payment would contribute to. It is, consequently, not considered that such a request would be compliant with the Community Infrastructure Levy regulations and it would unreasonably penalise the applicant. It is, therefore, not recommended that any contribution be secured via s106 agreement in this regard.
- 8.15 An informative should be attached to any approval to bring to the attention of the applicant the requirement for further consent from Staffordshire County Council and guidance relating to travel plan submission and monitoring.

9.0 Flood risk and drainage

- 9.1 Notwithstanding a significant number of representations made by local residents regarding flood risk and existing concerns, it is acknowledged that the application site is within flood zone 1 which by definition is land having a less than 0.1% annual probability of river flooding and, furthermore, the Lead Local Flood Authority raise no objection to the proposed development with regard to flood risk. The principle of residential development on this site in this regard is therefore acceptable.
- 9.2 Notwithstanding the above, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) acknowledge that the Environment Agency's flood zone 1 does not include watercourses with a catchment of less than 3 square kilometres and that to the east of the site there is a large area of high-risk surface water flooding. Observations on the scheme as initially submitted included there being a pipe on the site which was not identified in the flood risk assessment (FRA), acknowledgement of neighbours' comments relating to sewer capacity, and the presence of high groundwater levels. The initial submission was considered to be supported by insufficient information to fully assess flood risk on the site.

- 9.3 Two further objections were received from the LLFA during the consideration of the application, requesting additional information relating to the flood risk mechanisms of the site.
- 9.4 The latest representation, following the submission of further supporting information relating to flood risk and drainage, removes the objection from the LLFA, subject to conditions being attached to any approval to secure a detailed drainage design, a surface water management plan for the construction phase, and a management and maintenance plan. It is considered that such conditions are necessary in order to make the development acceptable in this regard.
- 9.5 Furthermore, an informative should be attached to any approval to bring to the attention of the applicant the need for land drainage consent for any structures or works proposed within a watercourse.
- 9.6 In their initial representation, the Canal and River Trust noted that the eastern part of the field is excluded from the developable area due to wet ground conditions and that SUDs are proposed in the northeastern corner of the site which would discharge to the northern boundary ditch course, downstream of culvert 48 beneath the canal. The Canal and River Trust recommended a condition be attached to any approval to ensure that obstruction of the adjacent watercourse does not occur during construction, due to silty surface water runoff from the site; such a condition is considered to be acceptable and it is considered that this would be covered within the surface water management plan requested by the LLFA.

10.0 Ecology and biodiversity

Biodiversity Net Gain

- 10.1 In accordance with Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021 and Article 7 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (DMPO), the proposed development is subject to the “biodiversity gain condition” which means that it should deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value.
- 10.2 In accordance with Article 7 of the DMPO, the application is accompanied by a completed biodiversity metric calculation tool which confirms the biodiversity value of the onsite habitat for the purpose of the biodiversity gain plan required to be submitted under paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the 1990 Act.
- 10.3 The Council’s Biodiversity Officer confirms that the application documents show that BNG units for habitat, hedgerows, and watercourses are achievable on site by adopting the key design principles outlined in the report; the details required for the matters of layout and landscaping would need to demonstrate that the requirements for on-site biodiversity net gain can be accommodated within the proposed development layout.

Ecology

- 10.4 The application is supported by preliminary ecological appraisal which sets out recommendations for precautionary methods of working.
- 10.5 The Council's Biodiversity Officer recommends a condition to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to include the precautionary methods of working as set out at 5.1.1.4 of the preliminary ecological appraisal.
- 10.6 Furthermore, the Biodiversity Officer recommends conditions to ensure that external lighting is designed to avoid light spill on the canal corridor and hedgerows, that 15 integrated swift bricks and five bat boxes are installed in appropriate locations within the proposed housing, and that the proposed SuDS area is multi-functional, providing clear benefits for wildlife. It is considered that conditions to secure details of the external lighting proposals as part of any reserved matters submission, and the provision of swift bricks and bat boxes prior to first occupation would be reasonable. It is considered that the detail of the SuDS area should be considered as part of any forthcoming application for the approval of reserved matters.
- 10.7 Whilst the Biodiversity Officer recommends that wild birds be protected via a condition to ensure works are carried out in accordance with a method statement detailing appropriate avoidance and/or protection measures, it is considered that they are better protected under separate legislation. Consequently, an informative to bring this to the attention of the applicant would be appropriate.
- 10.8 The Newt Officer concludes that the proposed development is not likely to result in any impact upon great crested newts (GCN) as the site offers no suitable habitat and is separated from any nearby ponds in the landscape both by distance and significant physical barriers for newt dispersal. A condition is, however, recommended to further reduce the likelihood of impact upon GCN to ensure that the following practices are implemented during construction: provision of a means of escape from trenches; storage of building materials on pallets; and the storage of demolition materials in skips or similar containers. Furthermore, it is considered that an informative should be attached to any approval to bring to the attention of the applicant the protected status of GCN.

Trees

- 10.9 Policy N3 (NPPF) acknowledges the benefits which trees can provide for biodiversity, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and the character and quality of the built environment; it continues to state that streets should be tree-lined and trees should be incorporated in other suitable locations; that the selection of species and placement must be compatible with infrastructure requirements and the needs of users, and be effective in delivering environmental benefits; and that maintenance is ensured for both existing and newly-planted trees. It is considered that these are matters to be addressed in consideration of the reserved matters should this application be approved.
- 10.10 Policy LNE1 of the Barlaston Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure that established hedgerows and trees are retained and that particular attention is given to additional planting; those which must be lost should be replaced within the site.
- 10.11 It is noted that some trees need to be lost to facilitate the provision of the vehicular and pedestrian access points. Adequate levels of planting must, therefore, be secured as part of the landscaping of the site.
- 10.12 The Council's Tree Officer raises no objection to the proposed development, noting that the tree report is acceptable, albeit preliminary and that, consequently, further information would be required at reserved matters stage to include arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) and tree protection plan (TPP). Conditions should be attached to any approval to ensure the appropriate submission to facilitate consideration of the relevant applications.
- 10.13 It is noted that T2 would be lost, but that this is a low-quality Ash tree with the onset of Ash dieback and which is unlikely to thrive long-term. Furthermore, the Tree Officer notes that the loss of some of the boundary hedge to facilitate the proposed vehicular access would result in minimal impact. Similarly, whilst the Tree Officer has not provided any comment in this respect, it is considered that limited loss of hedgerow to facilitate the pedestrian access onto the canal would also result in minimal impact, and less so in an arboricultural sense given the shorter length to be removed.
- 10.14 Concern was raised by the Tree Officer with regard to supporting drawings indicating the provision of vehicular circulation routes in the vicinity of G5, however it is acknowledged that this relates to an indicative plan and it is considered that consideration of any impacts or need to avoid development in this area would be informed by an appropriate AIA and TPP to be submitted in support of any application for the approval of reserved matters.

- 10.15 With regard to comments from the Canal and River Trust relating to impacts upon trees and hedges, it is considered that there is sufficient information in order to make a robust consideration of this application. The Trust raise no objection in principle and, therefore, acknowledge that some loss is necessary and acceptable. Furthermore, the supporting tree report references significant trees and groups within the site and on the boundary; the proposed pedestrian connection and access ramp would not impact upon these specifically referenced trees. Appropriate levels of mitigation planting could be secured within the wider site landscaping by condition.

11.0 Obligations

- 11.1 Any approval of the application should be subject to a s106 agreement to secure the following obligations:
- Provision of 50% affordable housing.
 - £6,000 towards Travel plan monitoring.
 - £11,000 towards a new bus shelter on Old Road for southbound buses.
 - £8,000 towards the enhancement of gateway signage and road markings on Old Road.
 - Provision of 3.0m wide footway/cycleway along the Old Road frontage of the site.
 - £74,161.45 capital contribution to open space.
 - £9,643.47 maintenance contribution for open space.
 - £38,395.62 contribution towards swimming pool provision.
 - £35,030.07 contribution towards sports courts/halls provision.
 - £5,296.59 contribution towards artificial turf pitch provision.
 - £72,622 contribution towards local health infrastructure.
- 11.2 Staffordshire County Council confirm that they do not wish to request any contribution towards first, middle, high, or post-16 education provision at this time.
- 11.3 As set out in section 8 of this report, it is not considered that the applicant should be obliged to make any contributions towards the maintenance of the canal towpath as requested by the Canal and River Trust.

12.0 Other

- 12.1 The site is in an area classified as being 'low risk' by The Mining Remediation Authority where development of this nature is considered to be acceptable, subject to their standing advice relating to encountering unrecorded coal mining features. An informative should be attached to any approval to bring to the attention of the applicant the Mining Remediation Authority's standing advice.

- 12.2 Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service raise no objection to the proposed development, advising that provision should be made for appropriate vehicular access and water supplies, and that domestic sprinkler systems should be installed within the dwellings. It is considered that all of these recommendations could be achieved, however, they relate to building regulations requirements and should, therefore, be secured under the appropriate legislation. An informative on any approval would bring this to the attention of the applicant.

- 12.3 Whilst noting that the proposed development would have a 'large' impact on the village of Barlaston, Staffordshire Police raise no objection to the proposal. Comments are made with regard to accessibility, parking provision, lighting, boundary treatments, public open space, and security. Most of the comments made should be considered by the applicant in forming a detailed scheme and an informative to bring these comments to the attention of the applicant would be appropriate. However, it is considered, as set out earlier in this report, that a full lighting plan should be submitted in support of any application for the approval of reserved matters for purposes of public safety, heritage conservation, and ecological protection.

- 12.4 Policy BE1 of the Barlaston Neighbourhood Plan requires that new residential development incorporates open access ducting to industry standards to enable all homes to be served directly by fibre optic broadband technology. A condition should be attached to any approval to ensure such provision.

- 12.5 Given the location of the application site and the nature of the proposed development, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any significant effects upon Habitats sites or impacts to Sites of Special Scientific Interest.

13.0 Conclusion and planning balance

- 13.1 It is considered that the provision of residential development in this location would be acceptable in principle in light of the Council's lack of a five-year housing land supply constituting an evidenced unmet need. In this context, and subject to the appropriate provision of affordable housing at 50%, the proposal does not constitute inappropriate development on land which for the purposes of the proposed development is considered to represent grey belt and which is in a sustainable location in transport terms.

- 13.2 It is considered that likely harm to the significance of heritage assets (The Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area and Barlaston Hall) through development within their setting could be minimised and mitigated through sensitive layout, design, and landscape mitigation forming a high-quality design scheme.
- 13.3 Concerns relating to flood risk, highways matters, the arboricultural value of the site, and the structural integrity of the canal embankment structures could be resolved via conditions.
- 13.4 Subject to the applicant entering into a s106 agreement to secure the necessary obligations, as set out in section 11 of this report, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable and should, therefore, be approved subject to conditions.

CONSULTATION

Planning Policy Manager

(Comments 3 October, updated 23 January 2026):

NB. Reference is made to paragraphs of the NPPF (2024)

- The proposal comprises major development.
- As of 31 March 2025, the Council can only demonstrate a housing land supply of 3.37 years - consequently, paragraph 11 of the NPPF applies.
- The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Barlaston and within the green belt.
- The proposal would comprise a 10.5% increase in the size of the settlement.
- The application site comprises grey belt land and it is clearly not previously developed land and it does not strongly contribute to purposes (a), (b), or (d) of paragraph 143 of the NPPF with regard to including land within the green belt.
- The lack of a five-year housing land supply indicates that there is a demonstrable unmet need for the development proposal.
- Barlaston is a key service village and, therefore, is inherently acknowledged as being a sustainable location for new development.
- If the scheme meet the golden rules (NPPF paragraph 155), the proposal should not be regarded as inappropriate.
- The policy position is not to support the proposal unless education, affordable housing, open space, and highway contributions are addressed by the applicant.

Health and Housing Services:

No objection.

- The proposed scheme of 81 dwellings would deliver a minimum 30% affordable housing (24 homes). Early conversations are recommended to ensure a willingness to take on this number of units and whether there is a demand.
- Stafford has an annual shortfall of 210 dwellings - 154 general needs units and 55 older persons' accommodation.
- Affordable housing should be provided at a ratio of 80% social rent and 20% intermediate affordable housing which, in most cases, is delivered as shared ownership.
- A mix of homes (size and number of bedrooms) would be expected on site and affordable housing must meet relevant standards.
- Affordable housing should be spread across the development in clusters of approximately 8 units. They should appear indistinguishable from open market housing on the site.

Highway Authority:

(Comments dated 2 April 2026):

No objection.

- Old Road in this location has a 30mph speed limit but has no street lighting; it is approximately 6m wide with a 1.2m segregated footway to the application site side, set behind a 3.0m grass verge.
- Access is proposed from a new T-junction off Old Road with a 5.5m internal access road carriageway and 6m entry/exit.
- Visibility splays of 2.4m x 59m are to be provided to match the speed of the traffic on Old Road in this location.
- The applicant would contribute to enhancing gateway signage and road markings on Old Road.
- 2.0m segregated footways are proposed to connect both sides of the main site access road; it is recommended that they connect to a 3m wide cycle/footway along the whole site frontage to Old Road, to include improvements to street lighting.

- To the south of the application site, a continuous footway links along Old Road into Barlaston village centre. The health centre, primary school, shop, and village hall are all within the recommended walking distance.
- Bus stops are located on Old Road, adjacent to the southwestern boundary of the site; the number 100 bus service provides seven buses per day in each direction. The applicant agrees to provide a new bus stop on Old Road to serve southbound bus services.
- A travel plan must be submitted and appended to the s106 agreement, to include measurable targets to reduce car trips. A travel plan co-ordinator must be funded for a minimum of five years.
- Development should be carried out in accordance with a construction transport management plan (CTMP) to be secured by condition.
- Conditions are recommended to secure the following:
 - i. Specific detail in pursuance of the reserved matters.
 - ii. Provision of access prior to other development works.
 - iii. Off-site highway works prior to first occupation.
 - iv. Travel Plan to be implemented prior to first occupation.
 - v. Development to be carried out in accordance with a CTMP.
- The following should be secured by s106 agreement:
 - i. £6,000 towards residential travel plan monitoring.
 - ii. £11,000 towards the provision of a new bus shelter on Old Road for southbound services.
 - iii. £8,000 towards the enhancement of gateway signage and road marking on Old Road.

Design Advisor:

(Comments dated August 2026):

- The scheme is amended to reduce the overall number of dwellings to 72 and the submission is supported by an illustrative masterplan showing a greater provision of detached dwellings to the north-western part of the site.
- The alterations would reduce the overall density from 37dph to approximately 33dph which is a more appropriate response to the edge of settlement condition.

- The reduction in numbers and altered disposition of detached dwelling types across the (illustrative) layout would provide a more contextually sensitive interface and relationship with the existing adjacent development to the north and to the Nursery Gardens development.
- The design and access statement now includes more detailed sectional information in relation to the pedestrian connection to the canal towpath and, in this respect, previous concerns are resolved.
- Further modification of the built form parameters to include notable number of single and/or 1.5 storey dwellings in the most sensitive locations would substantially benefit the overall character of the scheme in respect to how sensitive its response is to the character and quality of its locality and context.
- The urban grain and structure of the layout should be revised and loosened to provide more generously apportioned street scenes, parking arrangements, and the relocation of the play area to a more central, village green type space which provides a clear, open view through the site between the main site entrance and the canal corridor.
- Some concern remains regarding the character of the open space and the previous recommendation that a more wooden approach or orchard may provide a more appropriate function and character to this key feature of the site still stands.
- The retention of the hedge, at its current height, to the principal (Old Road) frontage would visually isolate the development from functioning as an active element in the Old Road street scene and preclude it from being easily read as an accordant and sensitive extension of the prevalent pattern of development which characterises the Old Road corridor and it remains recommended that the hedge is maintained at a height which provides clear and open views between the Old Road street scene and the new development frontage.
- Whilst there are clear concerns remaining in relation to several design aspects, the latest adjustments to the scheme move the overall design to a point where the further modifications required to achieve a design that may be considered an appropriate response to the site and local context could now be secured at reserved matters stage.

(Comments dated March 2026):

Objection.

- Whilst the modification of the height parameters to a maximum of 2 storeys, together with the submission of greater detail for the treatment of the pedestrian connection to the canal towpath, is welcomed and broadly supported, these changes are not sufficient in themselves to overcome the wider concern that the scheme would not be a sensitive enough response to the underlying character of the site and its wider context.

- Concern remains with regard to density of development within the developable area and that the scheme would be too intensive in its overall design to be sensitive to the underlying character and qualities of the locality.
- The scheme should be a natural transition between different development patterns on either side of the site. This would likely require a notable reduction of the density and number of dwellings as well as a loosening of the urban grain and structure of the layout to provide a more generously apportioned street scene arrangement, parking provision, and layout.

(Comments dated November 2025):

Objection.

- Even where a tilted balance is applied in favour of sustainable development, a proposal must also demonstrate and provide good design places.
- The site sits between two developed areas and would likely constitute a relatively rational infill to the existing urbanised settlement and would (if the built form was sufficiently sensitive to the qualities of place) be unlikely to stand out as intrinsically out of keeping with the underlying character of the area.
- By extrapolating the information from the D&A statement and illustrative layout the following observations are made.
- The overall density would be approximately 37dph (based on a 2.2ha developable area). This, in combination with the alluded-to mix of house types, plot arrangements, street design, and built form parameters would likely be too dense and intensive in its overall design.
- The scheme should act as a natural transition between the different development patterns and visual characteristics of the two adjacent developments (traditionally arranged semi-detached development on Brookhouse Drive and single-storey, low density bungalow development on Nursery Gardens. This would likely entail a notable reduction in density and overall number of dwellings via modification of the parameters to include a significant number of single and 1.5 storey dwellings in the most sensitive locations, particularly to the frontage of Old Road and other development edges, and the removal of the 2.5 storey dwellings as they would be out of keeping with the wider context.
- The urban grain and structure of the layout should be revised and loosened to provide more generously apportioned street scenes, parking arrangements, and a layout that is more responsive to the distinctive qualities of the site (including the relocation of the play area to a more central, village green type space/arrangement which provides a clear, open view through the site between the main site entrance and the canal corridor beyond.

- Further detail would be required regarding the connection to the canal towpath.
- The inherent character of the open space needs further consideration and development; consideration of a more wooded or orchard approach is recommended. The SuDS features should be a more integrated and complementary element of the functionality and character of the open space.
- The hedge to the Old Road boundary, at its current height, would visually isolate the development from functioning as an active element in the street scene and from it being read as an accordant and sensitive extension of the prevalent pattern of development which characterises Old Road to the south. The hedge should be maintained at a height which allows clear and open views between Old Road and the proposed development.

Lead Local Flood Authority:

(Comments dated 23 June 2026):

No objection.

- Earlier objections can be removed, subject to conditions.
- Conditions are recommended to ensure that a scheme to manage flood risk and drainage on site is implemented; that a construction surface water management plan is in place during construction; and that a management and maintenance plan is in place for the lifetime of the development.
- An informative should be attached regarding land drainage consent.

(Comments dated 7 April 2026):

Objection.

- Insufficient detail has been provided to assess flood risk on site regarding fluvial and surface water drainage.
- Further information is required regarding post-development issues and sensitivity testing.
- Proposals should be updated to demonstrate compliance with updated national SuDS standards.

(Comments dated 28 January 2026):

Objection.

- Insufficient detail has been provided to assess flood risk on site. Specific issues include:
 - i. A single model should be provided.
 - ii. Post development modelling to understand the impact on integrated flood mechanisms.
 - iii. Survey details of drainage pipe.
 - iv. Details/clarification of SuDS provision.
 - v. More detail on exceedance.
 - vi. Further drainage calculations required.

(Comments dated 28 October 2025):

Objection.

- The site is in flood zone 1. There is a large area of high-risk surface water flooding in the east which can reach depths of 1.2m in climate change events.
- The site has high groundwater levels and moderate risk of groundwater flooding with standing groundwater reported on site.
- The site is split into two catchments, flowing north and south.
- An unnamed ordinary watercourse which takes overflow from two fishing lakes to the east of the site tracks the northern boundary of the site. It flows through several culverts and beneath bridges within the vicinity of the site.
- The Trent and Mersey Canal is adjacent to the eastern site boundary.
- Neighbouring residents report frequent garden flooding from the ordinary watercourse to the north of the site and from surface water overflowing from the site and Parish Council minutes appear to describe blocked culverts and gullies causing flooding on Old Road.
- There is a pipe on site, believed to have been installed in 2016, which is not identified in the FRA. It crosses the site and enters the proposed building area, discharging into the ordinary watercourse to the north of the site.
- There is insufficient detail provided to assess flood risk on site; a better understanding of the flood risk mechanisms on site is required, and the following should be provided:
 - i. An integrated hydraulic model.

- ii. Post-development modelling.
- iii. Further consideration of the impact of blockages of structures along the watercourse.
- iv. Further investigation into the drainage pipe on site.
- v. Consideration of gravity-led drainage.
- vi. Evidence on impact of groundwater issues.

Canal and River Trust:

(Comments dated 24 June 2026):

No objection.

- The latest comments should be read in conjunction with previous advice which covered matters and conditions related to wider landscaping, disposal of surface water, ecology, play areas, offsite contributions, and informatives.
- It remains unclear how earthworks to achieve the change in height between the site and the elevated towpath could impact the canal retaining embankment structure and the embankment trees and hedging as an important part of the heritage and landscape mitigation measures for the proposed development.
- The towpath access would require a separate commercial agreement with the Canal and River Trust - an informative is requested.
- The preliminary arboricultural assessment does include some trees along the eastern canal embankment but is not comprehensive and does not include the trees located around the proposed towpath access point or the area within the applicant's control.
- It is important for the LPA to understand the impacts of the earthworks with the ramped towpath access proposed to ensure that the canal embankment along with trees and hedging are protected from a build-up of ground levels. Such build-ups could alter inspection regimes for the existing canal structure and impact the long-term health of trees/hedges and potentially change the existing conclusions reached within the heritage statement and the LVIA. An indicative cross-section of the embankment has now been provided to assist the LPA in understanding the space needed for this feature between the canal embankment and the SuDS pod. Unfortunately, whilst this is to scale it does not appear to include existing and proposed levels. A revised arboricultural assessment does not appear to be available to consider the impact of the ramp of the canal side trees and vegetation.

- If the LPA consider that sufficient information has been received to determine the application, a condition is recommended to consider, in more detail, at reserved matters stage, the towpath access point, its ramp, the impact of that structure on the canal embankment and associated trees/vegetation which forms an important part of the canal conservation area and is essential the landscape mitigation strategy of the proposed development.

(Comments dated 5 February 2026):

Objection.

- Insufficient information is provided to demonstrate how earthworks to achieve a change in levels of 2.6m between the application site and elevated towpath may impact:
 - i. The existing canal retaining embankment structure.
 - ii. The embankment trees and hedging as an important part of the heritage and landscape mitigation measures for the proposed development.
- The Preliminary Arboricultural Assessment (PAA) is not sufficiently comprehensive with regard to trees around the proposed towpath access point beyond the site boundaries but within the applicant's control.
- An indicative cross-section of the canal embankment with the mid-way point of the ramp earthworks should be provided to assist in understanding the space required for this feature between the canal embankment and SuDS point.
- A revised PAA is required to inform the determination of the application and to define if conditions may be required.

(Comments dated 21 October 2025):

Objection.

- The site lies on the towpath side of the Trent and Mersey Canal; the canal corridor is designated as a conservation area and there is a listed milepost adjacent to the site's eastern boundary.
- The canal is on a non-principal embankment so the towpath is approximately 2-3m higher than the adjacent levels of the site. there is a strong back of towpath hedgerow and trees along the embankment which visually concentrate views along the canal corridor and out over the offside bank to wider eastern views rather than towards the site.

- The application should be supported by a comprehensive arboricultural assessment which includes trees around the proposed towpath access point beyond the site boundaries.
- Insufficient information is provided with regard to the access to the towpath with regard to its design and its impact upon trees and hedges.
- A ramped access would require significant space and may result in the opening up of a substantial gap in the existing vegetation along the embankment which has the potential to change the existing conclusions of the heritage statement and LVIA.
- Means of access covers accessibility for all routes to and within the site, as well as the way they link up to other roads and pathways; therefore further information on the proposed design of the towpath access is required at outline stage.
- Other land may be required within the red edged application site (and notice served on the Trust) to fully consider the proposed towpath access point and whether it involves potential engineering operations/structures that need to be included within the scope of this application.
- There is a mismatch in the extent of the LVIA and heritage statement; the heritage statement takes account of longer views from the towpath south of Wedgwood Drive but the LVIA has not. The impact of the creation of a towpath access point has not been assessed in either document.
- Post and wire fencing to boundaries should be supplemented by native tall hedgerow and orchard trees within the wider landscape setting.
- The development should not rely on existing landscaping beyond the site boundaries to achieve appropriate levels of landscaping for the development to be acceptable.
- Close-board fencing or boundary walls to the eastern plot boundaries would be visually intrusive in this location and would fail to integrate the built form of the development into this rural setting. This would be detrimental to views from the conservation area.
- The FRA indicates that the eastern part of the site is excluded from development due to wet ground conditions and proposes SuDS in the northeastern corner of the site, discharging to the northern boundary ditch course. It would be important to prevent silty surface water runoff from the site. A method statement should be secured by condition.
- Native landscaping in the area set aside for surface water drainage would be welcomed to enhance the green/blue infrastructure of the canal corridor. Further habitat enhancement could be achieved over and above the installation of bird and bat boxes.

- The location of the LEAP and the natural surveillance afforded to these areas by the proposed development and the accessibility to the canal water space from the LEAP should be considered in accordance with paragraph 102 of the NPPF.
- The towpath access point would enable better pedestrian/cycle connectivity. The towpath has recently been resurfaced using self-binding stone; however it is reasonable to assume that the residents' use of the towpath would increase maintenance liabilities for the surface and wayfinding would be appropriate. Such matters would be best dealt with through a planning obligation to ensure the provision of wayfinding across the wider site as part of the proposed towpath access and for a proportionate and index-linked contribution to the upkeep of the towpath.
- There are buried utilities in the towpath which would need to be protected during the proposed works.

Conservation Officer:

(Comments dated 5 June 2026):

The submission of updated information is noted.

- The reduction in the number of dwellings to 72 units is acknowledged, however the proposal remains significantly larger in scale than the previous scheme of 42 dwellings and this reduction does not materially alter the overall nature of the development in heritage terms.
- Whilst additional illustrative detail has been provided, this is not supported by sufficient evidence to enable a robust assessment of the likely visibility and perceptibility of the development within the wider landscape, including from the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area and the setting of nearby designated assets, including Barlaston Hall.
- The introduction of a connection to the canal towpath is noted, however the implications of this element for the character and experience of the canal corridor are not yet fully understood. In addition, the comments of the Canal and River Trust will be an important material consideration, particularly in relation to the canal interface and proposed access.
- Insufficient information has been provided to conclude that the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area or avoid harm to the significance of designated heritage assets. The potential for harm therefore cannot be ruled out at this stage.

(Comments dated 10 November 2025):

Objection.

- The majority of the development is expected to be two-storey housing with some three-storey buildings at key junctions.
- In the absence of detailed design proposal, it is difficult to fully assess the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the conservation area, particularly in relation to the lack of information on form, massing, and architectural treatment.
- The proximity to the Trent and Mersey Canal and the location within a semi-rural context heightens the importance of sensitive design and landscape integration. Given the change in proximity, increase in density, design, massing, height etc. may be considered detrimental to the setting of the heritage asset where there was no harm previously (21/33687/FUL).
- The heritage assessment dismisses harm to the setting of the grade II* listed Barlaston Hall. Given its elevated position on higher ground, photographs demonstrate the extent of view that can be seen from its elevated position to the rear and that the addition of a large development eradicating a large swathe of green belt within its view would be cumulatively detrimental to its wider setting, regardless of the distance and other development which may exist between it and the application site.
- Further assessment will be required at reserved matters stage to ensure that the development responds appropriately to local character, avoids overdevelopment, and maintains a high standard of design.
- Further information will also be required with regard to concerns raised by the Canal and River Trust (which are shared by the Conservation Officer) relating to boundary treatment, access points, etc.
- Conditions are recommended to ensure that special regard is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

Natural England:

- The impact risk zones for SSSIs (sites of special scientific interest) indicate that, at this location, the proposed development is unlikely to have a harmful effect on terrestrial SSSIs and site which they underpin. No consultation is necessary.

Biodiversity Officer:

(Comments dated 9 October 2025):

No objection.

- Urban Green undertook a preliminary ecological appraisal during June 2025. Recommendations for precautionary methods of working, including those listed in paragraph 5.1.1.4, should be adopted within a Construction Environmental Management Plan. The CEMP should include measures due to the proximity of the canal.
- Wild birds should be protected via method statement for protection/avoidance measures.
- The application documents show that BNG units for habitat, hedgerows, and watercourses are achievable on site by adopting the key design principles outlined in the report: the details required for the matters of layout/landscaping shall demonstrate that the requirements for on-site biodiversity net gain can be accommodated within the proposed development layout, through submission of a draft BNG Plan.
- Lighting plans must be designed to avoid light spill on the canal corridor and hedgerows.
- 15 integrated swift bricks and 5 bat boxes should be installed in appropriate locations on the new housing, under the guidance of a qualified ecologist.
- The proposed SuDS area should be multi-functional, demonstrating clear benefits for wildlife.

Newt Officer:

(Comments dated 1 October 2025):

No objection.

- The development is not likely to have any impact upon great crested newts (GCN) or their habitat. The site offers no suitable habitat and is separated from any nearby ponds in the landscape by both distance and significant barriers for newt dispersal (canal and road).
- A condition is recommended to further reduce the likelihood of impact upon GCN to secure an appropriate working methodology:
 - i. Means of escape from trenches.
 - ii. Storage of building materials on pallets.
 - iii. Storage of demolition materials in skips or similar containers.
- An informative should be attached to any approval to bring to the attention of the applicant the protected status of GCN.

Tree Officer:

No objection.

- The tree report is acceptable; however it is a preliminary report. Further works would be required at reserved matters stage.
- The indicative road layout would require the removal of T2 (low-quality Ash with onset of Ash dieback).
- The impact of the removal of part of the boundary hedge should be minimal.
- The proposed driveway to the south sits within the RPAs of the offsite G5; whilst these are of low quality they sit offsite under third party ownership. It would be preferable to ensure that the road in this area sits clear of these RPAs.
- The east and north parts of the site are shown to be retained as green space and for use as a SuDS area - this is where most trees are located. This layout would be preferable as it would prevent damage to the trees and safeguard screening, particularly along the canal towpath.
- The area is large with scope to develop without impact to trees.
- The green space to the east would provide an opportunity to undertake new tree planting.
- The following information should be submitted at reserved matters stage (to be secured by condition):
 - i. Arboricultural impact assessment.
 - ii. Tree protection plan
 - iii. Revised access layout avoiding the RPAs of G5.
 - iv. Landscape plan and specification detailing proposed planting across the site.

Environmental Health Officer:

No objection, subject to conditions to secure the following:

- No burning on site during development.
- Development to be carried out in accordance with a site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
- Dust and emissions from the site should be controlled in accordance with best practice.

Sport and Outdoor Leisure Officer:

No objection.

- Financial contributions are requested for the provision of open space:
 - i. £74,161.45 (capital).
 - ii. £9,643.47 (maintenance)
- The following contributions are requested with regard to sports facilities:
 - i. £38,395.62 (pools)
 - ii. £35,030.07 (sports courts/halls)
 - iii. £5,296.59 (artificial turf pitches)

County Schools Organisation:

No objection.

- Staffordshire County Council would not seek an education contribution from this development for first, middle, high, or post-16 education provision at this time.

Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service:

No objection.

- Appropriate vehicle access and supplies of water for firefighting should be provided at the site.
- It is recommended that sprinklers are provided within dwellings.

Staffordshire Police:

No objection.

- A high level of physical security should be incorporated into the proposals.
- The village is a community speed watch area which indicates they have experienced speeding issues in the past.
- House types and tenures should be varied.
- Sufficient parking should be provided for residents and visitors.
- Streetlights or additional private security lights should be installed. A lighting plan should be submitted with further applications.

- Vulnerable areas should have robust defensive barriers - 1.8m brick walls are recommended where boundaries face public realm.
- Any private access onto public space should be lockable from both sides and appropriate lighting.
- Suitable electric sockets should be provided for charging of motability scooters and e-bikes and appropriate storage should be provided for bicycles too.
- Dwellings should meet Building for Life 2020 standards.
- Public open spaces should have appropriately surfaced circulation routes. Landscaping should be informed by reducing the fear of crime.
- Benches should be provided along circulation routes.
- The proposed play area should have natural surveillance from adjacent properties and pedestrians.
- The LEAP should be vandal proof and safe for young children.
- Provision should be made for storage associated with community gardens/orchards.
- Site security should be considered during construction.
- The development should be built to Secured by Design standards.

Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent ICB:

No objection.

- The site is within the influence of primary care service providers in both South Stoke West and Stone and Eccleshall PCNs, albeit the site is in close proximity of the Barlaston branch site of the Brinsley Avenue Practice.
- Clinical space is challenged across both networks, with premises considered insufficient against current standards.
- Both PCNs have a higher-than-average number of patients aged over 65.
- A contribution of £72,622 is requested to support the development of estate infrastructure.

Mining Remediation Authority:

- Refer to standing advice.

Barlaston Parish Council:

(Comments dated 8 October 2025):

Objection.

- Inappropriate development in the green belt.
- The site is not previously developed land and there are not very special circumstances in which development should be allowed.
- Precedent for further inappropriate development in the green belt.
- Challenge the viability of vacant allocated housing sites within Barlaston.
- Site outside the settlement boundary and is not a rural exception site.
- Contrary to policies H1 and H2 of the Barlaston Neighbourhood Plan as it is outside of the settlement boundary and not an allocated site.
- Harm to character of the area.
- There is no housing need.
- Any affordable housing should deliver new homes to meet an identified need.
- Site is at risk of flooding.
- Development could have a severe impact on highway safety at the vehicular access onto Old Road.
- Commuted sums should be made towards existing local play facilities.
- Provision should be made to install a new bus shelter on Old Road.
- Contributions should be made towards the improvement or purchase of local recreation space and enhancement of existing meeting facilities.

(Comments dated 24 September 2025):

Holding objection.

Swynnerton (adjacent) Parish Council:

(Comments dated 7 October 2025):

Objection.

- The site is in the green belt and not allocated in the Barlaston Neighbourhood Plan.

- Previously developed land should be given priority.
- The site is not grey belt land - development would undermine the continuity of green belt between Stone and Stoke-on-Trent.
- There is no evidence to demonstrable unmet need for housing in the area cannot be met by utilising non-green belt sites.
- The development would be harmful to the green belt and there are no very special circumstances.
- The proposal is not infill within the village - it would redefine the settlement boundary.
- The proposal does not comprise limited affordable housing for community needs.
- There is a high groundwater flood risk.
- There is high surface water flood risk.
- The proposal would increase congestion on the local highway network.
- Road safety at the Tittensor Road / A34 junction should be assessed.

MP for Stoke-on-Trent South:

(Comments dated 18 June 2026):

Objection.

- Development would harm the North Staffordshire Green Belt.
- Site is not grey belt land.
- There is no comprehensive plan to manage ecological impacts.
- There is no further housing need in Barlaston.
- There is inadequate assessment of flood risk.
- Insufficient local facilities and services.

(Comments dated 18 September 2025):

Objection.

- The site is high-quality agricultural land within the green belt and is prone to flooding.
- The proposal raises concerns regarding traffic generation and necessary mitigation measures.

- Barlaston has a shortage of health care and education provision as well as public transport services.
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of Barlaston.

County Councillor for Stone Rural North Division:

Objection.

The concerns raised by Barlaston Parish Council are supported.

Neighbours:

Number of representations received	Comments summarised
150 in objection	- Inappropriate development in the green belt - Site is not grey belt - Urban sprawl - No very special circumstances - Would result in Barlaston and Trentham merging - Increased flood risk - Inadequate foul drainage - Attenuation pond(s) would be unsafe for children - Drainage must be managed appropriately - Drainage details are not accurate - Assessment should be made during winter months - Insufficient local facilities and services - No capacity at local schools - Inadequate utilities capacity - Insufficient capacity on local road network - Unsafe access - Impact on highway safety - Insufficient public transport - Insufficient parking provision - Poor integration with surrounding area - Insufficient pedestrian facilities in area - Development would be car-dependent - Harm to setting of listed buildings, including Barlaston Hall (grade 1)

Number of representations received	Comments summarised
	- Harm to conservation area and its setting - Harm to character of area - Development should be limited to bungalows - Development is too dense - Disproportionate addition to Barlaston - Harm to biodiversity - Harm to protected species - Loss of trees and hedgerows - Insufficient mitigation for ecological harm - Natural features would not be sufficiently retained or integrated into the development - BNG not demonstrated - Contrary to development plan - Greater harm than previous scheme for 42 which was refused - There are other, more suitable, development sites in Barlaston - Sites allocated in the BNP remain undeveloped - No need for houses in Barlaston - No need for affordable homes in Barlaston - Increased noise pollution - Increased air pollution - Increased light pollution - Increased anti-social behaviour - Disturbance during development - Loss of privacy to occupiers of existing dwellings - Loss of BMV land - Inadequate open space and play facilities
0 in support	- N/A
0 neutral	- N/A
☐ No neighbour representations received	

PUBLICITY

Site Notice	
Yes	No
Expiry date: 10 October 2025	☐

Press Advert	
Yes	No
Expiry date: 22 October 2025	☐

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

21/33687/FUL - Rural Exception Housing Development for the erection of 42 affordable dwellings including access onto Old Road, a SUDS attenuation basin and equipped children's play area - Refused 22 July 2022

Recommendation

Approve, subject to the following conditions and to the applicant entering into a s106 agreement

1. This is a grant of outline permission in respect of access only and before the development is commenced, details of the layout, scale of the buildings; the appearance of the buildings including materials to be used on the external surfaces and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called the "reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
2. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
3. The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
4. This outline permission relates to the submitted details and the following drawings, except where indicated otherwise by a condition attached to this consent in which case the condition shall take precedence: -

UG_3021 01 (Location plan)

J000600-SK1010 (Proposed highway access - general arrangements)

5. Notwithstanding any description / details within the application documents the following details of all external lighting shall accompany the relevant reserved matters application(s) submitted pursuant to condition 1 of this outline permission:
 - a) Location, design, height, and materials of the lighting fixtures
 - b) Luminance levels
 - c) Light spread and any mitigation features, e.g. cowls.
6. Notwithstanding any description / detail within the application documents the relevant reserved matters application(s) submitted pursuant to condition 1 of this outline permission shall be supported by the following details with specific regard to the towpath access and associated ramp:
 - a) Topographical survey;
 - b) Cross sectional drawings of the earthworks in relation to existing levels of the canal embankment and the gradient(s) of the access ramp;
 - c) Drainage arrangements for the canal embankment and access ramp;
 - d) Construction materials plan of the access ramp (at a scale of 1:200);
 - e) Surfacing materials and landscaping details;
 - f) Construction management method statement; and
 - g) long-term maintenance and management arrangements.
7. Notwithstanding any description / details within the application documents, relevant reserved matters application(s) submitted pursuant to condition 1 of this outline permission shall be supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan.
8. Notwithstanding any description / details within the application documents, relevant reserved matters application(s) submitted pursuant to condition 1 of this outline permission shall be supported by details of the provision of a minimum of 15 integrated swift bricks and 5 bat boxes to be installed.
9. No development shall commence unless and until a scheme to manage flood risk and drainage on site have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of any part of the development and shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

The scheme to be submitted shall demonstrate:

- a) Full detailed drainage design.
- b) No increase in either flood extent or depth (from any source of flooding) to third party land.
- c) No development within any of the modelled fluvial flood risk outlines (including blockage scenarios).
- d) No built development within the surface water extents (from the EA flood map for planning) within the eastern portion of the site.
- e) A hydrogeological risk assessment, informed by winter ground investigations, setting out mitigation measures to ensure that:
 - the development shall not be at risk of groundwater flooding
 - drainage infrastructure are designed to account for groundwater levels, including where permanent or seasonally high groundwater may influence SuDS features.
 - there will be no increase in the risk of groundwater flooding to third party land.
- f) A surface water (direct rainfall) model developed to demonstrate that proposals shall not increase surface water flood risk to third party land, including demonstrating no additional surface water routing towards the existing eastern flood storage area.
- g) Retention of the existing surface water overland flow route between the eastern flood storage area and the ordinary watercourse to the north (as identified by the Environment Agency's Probable Overland Flow Pathways dataset), unless it is demonstrated that diversion can provide betterment outcome in flood risk terms.
- h) Limiting the surface water run-off generated by the 100yr + 40% climate change critical storm so that it will not exceed 2l/s and the drainage network shall contain all surface water in all events up to and including the 100yr + 40% climate change event.
- i) Provision of a minimum of 902m³ attenuation flood storage to a 1 in 100yr + 40% climate change standard.
- j) Rainwater harvesting storage shall be provided for each property for full non-potable following a detailed evaluation of non-potable water demand with optimal storage volumes calculated in line with BS EN 16941 standards.

- k) Evidence shall be provided to demonstrate that the runoff from each positively drained surface, for at least 5mm of rainfall, is either collected for use, infiltrated into the ground, or else captured, conveyed and stored within SuDS features.
 - l) Any drainage strategy shall provide a water management train to treat surface water using at least two stages.
 - m) Finished floor levels shall be set the higher of:
 - 300mm above the 100year + 29% climate change fluvial modelled level.
 - 300mm above the 100year + 29% climate change fluvial modelled level + blockage
 - 300mm above modelled levels from the surface water modelling exercise
 - any recommendations of the groundwater mitigation risk assessment
 - 150mm above surrounding ground levels.
 - n) A detailed levels and exceedance plan shall be provided to demonstrate the site levels are designed to direct water away from all building entrances.
 - o) An assessment of high-water levels in the receiving unnamed ordinary watercourse on the operation of the proposed drainage network and any mitigation required shall be implemented into the drainage strategy.
 - p) Intrusive site investigation shall be undertaken to establish the exact location, condition and capacity of the pipe(s) from the eastern flood storage area to the ordinary watercourse to the north of the site and an appropriate easement (based on pipe width) to ensure it is not damaged / can be accessed for maintenance for the lifetime of the development. Where there is damage to the existing pipe(s) repair shall be undertaken prior to completion of the approved drainage scheme.
10. No development shall commence unless and until a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The CSWMP shall set out measures to manage surface water runoff and prevent pollution during construction, including interception, treatment, storage, and controlled discharge of runoff associated with temporary works; and shall include the name and contact details of the party or parties responsible.

11. No development shall commence unless and until a Construction Transport Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The CTMP shall include details relating to construction access; hours of construction; routing of HGVs; delivery times; the location of the contractors' compounds, cabins, material storage areas, and contractors parking; and a scheme for the management and suppression of dust and mud from construction activities, to include the provision of a vehicle wheel wash. All site operations shall then be undertaken strictly in accordance with the approved CTMP for the duration of the construction programme.

12. No development shall commence unless and until a site-specific construction management plan (CMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The CMP shall include the following details and shall be adhered to for the duration of the development phase:
 - a) Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation, and liaison.
 - b) Arrangements for liaison with the Council's Environmental Services.
 - c) All works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary shall be carried out only between the following permitted hours:
 - i. 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday
 - ii. 08:00 and 14:00 on Saturdays
 - iii. at no time on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays.
 - d) Deliveries to, and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from, the site must only take place within the permitted hours detailed above.
 - e) Mitigation measures to reduce noise disturbance from construction works.
 - f) Procedures for emergency deviation of the permitted working hours.
 - g) Control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants.
 - h) Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes.

13. No development shall commence, except for works to provide the vehicular access from Old Road, unless and until that access has been provided in accordance with details (to be substantially in accordance with drawing J000600-SK101) which shall first have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

14. All works shall be undertaken in accordance with a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) which shall first have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The CEMP shall be informed by the recommendations for precautionary methods of working as detailed in paragraph 5.1.1.4 of the preliminary ecological appraisal, dated June 2025, by Urban Green.
15. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following reasonable avoidance measures with regard to great crested newts:
 - a) Any trenches left overnight shall be covered or provided with ramps to prevent newts from becoming trapped.
 - b) Any building materials such as bricks, stone, etc. shall be stored on pallets to discourage newts from using them as shelter.
 - c) Any demolition materials shall be stored in skips or similar containers and not in piles on the ground.
16. Prior to the construction of any dwellings, a strategy to facilitate high speed broadband for future occupants of the site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The strategy shall ensure that, upon occupation of a dwelling, either a connection or ducting to facilitate the provision of a broadband service to that dwelling from a site-wide network is in place, unless evidence is otherwise provided to demonstrate that technological advances for the provision of a broadband service for the majority of potential customers would no longer necessitate below ground infrastructure. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy.
17. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until a plan for the management and maintenance of the drainage scheme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The management and maintenance plan shall be implemented and thereafter retained for the lifetime of the development. The plan shall include a schedule of activities and their frequency, covering all elements of the approved drainage scheme, including the land drainage system (pipe(s) and flood storage area) within the eastern part of the site; and the name and contact details of the party or parties responsible for implementation and ongoing maintenance.
18. The development shall not be brought into use unless and until a travel plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The travel plan shall set out proposals (including a timetable) to promote travel by sustainable modes and it shall be implemented and monitored in accordance with the targets and timescales contained therein.
19. No dwelling shall be occupied unless and until the pedestrian access onto the Trent and Mersey Canal has been provided.

The reasons for the Council's decision to approve the development subject to the above conditions are:

1. This is a grant of outline planning permission only.
2. To comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
3. To comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
4. To define the permission.
5. In order to avoid and mitigate harm to the setting of the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area and to ensure that the development does not result in damage or harm to legally protected species or their habitat/roost. (Policy N9 vii of The Plan for Stafford Borough and policy N2 of the National Planning Policy Framework).
6. To ensure the structural integrity of the Trent and Mersey Canal embankment and to protect the setting of the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area. (Policy N9 of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
7. To enable the Local Planning Authority to consider the scheme of development and the landscaping proposals in relation to the existing trees and hedges. (Policy N4 of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
8. In order to ensure that the development results in an enhancement in biodiversity within the site. (Policy N2 of the National Planning Policy Framework).
9. To prevent the increased risk of flooding both on and off site (Policy N2 of the Plan for Stafford Borough).
10. To prevent the increased risk of flooding both on and off site (Policy N2 of the Plan for Stafford Borough).
11. In the interests of the safety and convenience of users of the highway. (Policy T1c of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
12. To safeguard the occupiers of nearby residential properties from undue noise and general disturbance. (Policy N1e of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
13. In the interests of the safety and convenience of users of the highway. (Policy T1c of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
14. In order to ensure that the development does not result in damage or harm to legally protected species or their habitat/roost. (Policy N2 of the National Planning Policy Framework).

15. In order to ensure that the development does not result in damage or harm to legally protected species or their habitat/roost. (Policy N2 of the National Planning Policy Framework).
16. In order to ensure that all homes may be served directly by fibre optic broadband technology. (Policy BE1 of the Barlaston Neighbourhood Plan).
17. To prevent the increased risk of flooding both on and off site (Policy N2 of the Plan for Stafford Borough).
18. In order to promote the use of sustainable transport modes and reduce the impact of traffic from new development on the road network. (Policy T1 (b, d, and g) of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
19. In order to promote the use of sustainable transport modes and reduce the impact of traffic from new development on the road network. (Policy T1 (b, d, and g) of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

Informatives

- 1 In accordance with the requirements of Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Order) 2015, as amended, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2026, the Council has worked in a positive and proactive way in determining the application and has granted planning permission.
- 2 The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments of the local highway authority, Lead Local Flood Authority, Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service, and Staffordshire Police. All comments can be viewed online through the planning public access pages of the Council's website (www.staffordbc.gov.uk).
- 3 The applicant's attention is drawn to the protected status of nesting birds and the requirement that they are not disrupted during the nesting season (March to August).
- 4 The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Mining Remediation Authority on 0345 762 6846 or if a hazard is encountered on site call the emergency line 0800 288 4242. Further information is also available on the Mining Remediation Authority website at: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/mining-remediation-authority

- 5 There is a low risk that great crested newts (GCN) may be present at the application site. It is considered to be unreasonable to require the applicant to submit a survey because this could be considered disproportionate to the scale and the likely impacts of the development, however, the application site lies within the **** impact zone as per the modelled district licence map which indicates that there is highly suitable habitat for GCN within the area surrounding the application site. Therefore, anyone undertaking this development should be aware that GCN and their resting places are protected at all times by The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Planning permission for development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this legislation or substitute the need to obtain a protected species licence if an offence is likely. If a GCN is discovered during site preparation, enabling, or construction phases, then all works must stop until the advice of a professional/suitably qualified ecologist and Natural England is obtained, including with regard to the need for a licence.
- 6 The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments of the Canal and River Trust dated 21 October 2025 with regard to the need for further consents and commercial agreements with the Canal and River Trust, and the Trust's code of practice for works affecting the Canal and River Trust. All comments can be viewed online through the planning public access pages of the Council's website (www.staffordbc.gov.uk).

25/40885/OUT
Land Between Trent Canal And Old Road
Barlaston



Application: 26/41994/HOU
Case Officer: Ian Lunn
Date Registered: 26 May 2026
Target Decision Date: 21 July 2026
Extended To: 6 October 2026
Address: The Malthouse, Church Lane, Gayton, Stafford, Staffordshire, ST18 0HL
Ward: Milwich
Parish: Gayton
Proposal: Erection of building for ancillary domestic storage purposes and for the garaging of private motor vehicles including Classic tractors (Part Retrospective)
Applicant: Mr Trevor Street
Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

This application has been called in by Councillor Beatty (Ward Member for Milwich) for the following reasons:-

'For members to consider:

The purpose of this commercial unit. The already erected building cannot be for agricultural purposes, as the applicant is not a farmer. Under the ownership certificates and land declaration, the applicant 'has declared that the land does not relate to an agricultural holding' This is a case of retrospective development misrepresentation.

The owner is running an illegal motor vehicle business from the premises. The enforcement officer has identified that fact in her request to him 'to reduce the activity'.

There are other outbuildings for domestic use: to store a tractor for garden use.

In knowledge that the operation is not agricultural the application is:-

- *Inconsistent with local character and planning policies. In a rural village and narrow residential lane, with private homes in close proximity, it is impacting the character and appearance of the neighbourhood;*
- *Causing loss of privacy and neighbours' amenity;*
- *Inappropriate development in a residential neighbourhood; - (NPPF - planning policies and decisions should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, appearance and amenity of the neighbourhood) (TPSB policy E2 - it is not in accord with residential amenity;*
- *Set forward of the applicant's property, its height and size are overbearing.*
- *Its use as a workshop is causing grave traffic problems and noise issues.*

That an order for its demolition is essential.'

Context

1.0 Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The property known as 'The Malthouse' is a detached house constructed of red brick, for the external walls, under a brown clay tile pitched roof. It lies approximately 325 metres northwest of the junction of Vicarage Bank and Church Lane on the western edge of the village of Gayton.
- 1.2 An outbuilding within the curtilage of the property has recently been extended but without the necessary planning permission (see Section Two below). The premises have also recently been the subject of a Council investigation regarding alleged vehicle repairs.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 A freestanding red brick/clay tile outbuilding located within the curtilage of this property has recently been extended but without the necessary planning permission. Planning permission is required in this instance because the extension:-
 - a) has been constructed on land that stands forward of the principal elevation of the 'original house', and
 - b) has a dual pitched roof that is more than four metres high.

- 2.2 The extension is not yet complete, but the internal walls and roof frame have been constructed. This application seeks planning permission to retain the works that have been carried out to date, to complete the building, and to allow it to be used both for ancillary domestic storage purposes and for the garaging of private motor vehicles including classic tractors.
- 2.3 Members should be aware that this is a 'householder' application and that it is being assessed as such. The applicant has confirmed that the building is to be used for the purposes identified in paragraph 2.2 above and all of these would fall within the remit of such an application. Members should therefore determine the application on this basis. If the development is approved and the building is subsequently used for another purpose for which it does not have planning permission, the Council can pursue enforcement action against the alleged breach if it considers it expedient to do so. In addition, a condition is recommended restricting the use of the building to the purposes applied for, at not for any commercial use.

Officer Assessment - Key Considerations

3.0 Planning policy framework

- 3.1 Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, require decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 3.2 The Development Plan for the purposes of this application comprises The Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031 Parts 1 and 2 (TPSB).

4.0 Principle of Development

- 4.1 This property is located within the village of Gayton. However, this is a rural settlement located outside of Stafford and Stone, and it is not one of the identified Key Service Villages. For the purposes of determining this application therefore the property is deemed to be located outside of any identified settlement limit and in the countryside.
- 4.2 Given the above, policies SP7 and C5 of TPSB are relevant to the consideration of this proposal. The former sets out general principles for development outside of the identified settlement hierarchy. Section (c) of the latter requires that where dwellings are located outside of the defined settlement limits extensions and/or alterations to them should not normally cumulatively increase the size of the 'original property' by more than 70%.

4.3 It is considered that this development reasonably meets the requirements of both of these policies for the following reasons:-

- a) it can reasonably be viewed as sustainable and as promoting rural sustainability in that it involves the creation of ancillary domestic storage/garage space for use in connection with the host established dwelling. As such it can reasonably be seen to be meeting the requirements of section (x) of Policy E2 of TPSB.
- b) it will reasonably conserve and enhance the appearance and setting of the host dwelling and the surrounding area (for reasons set out in Section Five below). As such it is considered that it can also reasonably be seen to be supporting the rural sustainability of the area by protecting and enhancing its environmental assets - in accordance with the requirements of Policy SP6 of TPSB.
- c) the development will not conflict with any of the environmental protection and nature conservation policies of TPSB (for reasons set out in Section Eight below).
- d) it is not envisaged that the development will give rise to any other form of potential harm. No other mitigating or compensatory measures are therefore considered necessary.
- e) the building is an outbuilding. It will not be physically attached to the main house standing almost ten metres away from it, and it is to be used as a garage/store i.e. for housing classic tractors, parking private motor vehicles and for general domestic storage purposes. It is therefore considered that it will be exempt from the requirements of Policy C5.

4.4 In view of the above it is considered that, despite concerns to the contrary, the proposal will be acceptable in planning policy terms in this instance.

Policies and Guidance:-

The Plan for Stafford Borough

Policy SP7 - Supporting the location of new development

Policy SP6 - Achieving Rural Sustainability

Policy E2 - Sustainable Rural Development

Policy C5 - Residential Proposals outside the Settlement Hierarchy

The Plan for Stafford Borough: Part 2

Policy SB1 Settlement boundaries

5.0 Character and Appearance

- 5.1 Policies N1 and N8 of TPSB, Sections 14 and 19 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026) and the Council's adopted Design SPD 2018 collectively require that development should be of a high standard of design, should be sympathetic to landscape character and quality, should have regard to the local context and should add to the overall quality of an area. It is considered that the building the subject of this application will satisfy these requirements in this instance and will therefore be acceptable in visual amenity terms despite concerns to the contrary. The reasons for this are as follows.
- 5.2 The completed building will stand within approximately 13 metres of Church Lane and will be visible from certain vantage points on the road. However, its prominence in the street scene is significantly reduced by substantial boundary hedges that lie along the site frontages of this, and adjoining, properties. This aside, it is considered that it will be acceptable in both design and scale terms in this case. It is quite large, measuring approximately 5.2 metres (length) x 6.4 metres (width) x 5 metres (height to ridge), and is positioned forward, both of the outbuilding to which it is to be attached and the main house. Nevertheless, it will:-
- appear in scale with, and subservient to, both in so far as it will be a single storey structure having a lower ridge line than either building,
 - incorporate a 'gabled' pitched roof that will match/reasonably harmonise with the roofs of the adjoining outbuilding and main house,
 - be constructed of suitable materials namely horizontal Waney Edge timber cladding under a clay tile roof with Waney Edge timber clad sliding doors, materials that are considered appropriate for a rural area such as this and that will both match and suitably harmonise with those used in the construction of the adjoining outbuilding and host dwelling.
 - generally relate in a satisfactory manner to the existing house and outbuilding and to its overall surroundings.
- 5.3 The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in visual amenity terms and there are no reasonable grounds for requiring its demolition.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework (2026)

Section 14 - Achieving well-designed places

Section 19 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

The Plan for Stafford Borough

Policy N1 - Design

Policy N8 - Landscape Character

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – Design

6.0 Amenity

- 6.1 Policy N1 of TPSB, Section 17 of the NPPF and the Council's adopted Design SPD 2018 collectively require, in part, that development should safeguard the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties. It is considered that this development will reasonably satisfy these requirements.

a) Light

- 6.2 It is not envisaged that the building will adversely affect the level of light currently received by the surrounding properties despite concerns to the contrary. It will stand approximately 25 metres from 'Yew Tree House' which lies to the south of the site with a substantial detached garage in between, approximately 27 metres from 'The Croft' which lies to the north with a substantial hedge in between, and a minimum of 22 metres away from the nearest property to the west ('Church Lane Cottage') again with a substantial hedge in between.
- 6.3 It is not envisaged that the building will appear unduly overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties either despite concerns to the contrary. As indicated above it will stand a minimum of 22 metres away from the nearest of these and it will be at least partly screened from all of them by a combination of the detached garage and substantial hedges referred to above. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the development will appear unduly dominant or oppressive when viewed from any of those properties.

b) Overlooking

- 6.4 The proposal will not lead to the unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring properties despite concerns to the contrary. No windows are proposed within the new building.

c) Overdevelopment

- 6.5 The development will occupy considerably less than 50% of the defined application site. Consequently, the proposal will not lead to the overdevelopment of the land.

d) Noise

- 6.6 It is not envisaged that using the building for ancillary domestic storage purposes, including the garaging of private motor vehicles and 'classic' tractors, is likely to generate a significant level of noise despite concerns to the contrary.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework (2026)

Section 17 - Pollution, Public Protection and Security

The Plan for Stafford Borough

Policy N1- Design

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - Design

7.0 Highway Safety

- 7.1 Policy T2 of TPSB requires, in part, that development proposals should not impair highway safety or traffic movement. Appendix B sets out the normal parking requirements for development in the Borough. It is considered that this development will reasonably satisfy these requirements despite concerns to the contrary. Following the completion of the development sufficient space will remain within the site for the satisfactory 'off-street' parking and 'on-site' turning of vehicles in conjunction with the dwelling. The existing access serving the property from Church Lane will not be affected and it is not envisaged that this proposal will lead to any significant increase in its current vehicular use or to the use of the adjoining highway.

Policies and Guidance:-

The Plan for Stafford Borough

T2 - Parking and Manoeuvring Facilities

Appendix B - Car Parking Standards

8.0 Ecology

- 8.1 Policy N4 of TPSB seeks to protect the Borough's natural environment. This is reflected, in part, in Section 19 of the NPPF. Policy N6 of TPSB states that development will not be permitted where it would lead directly or indirectly to an adverse impact on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (a European Protected Site for nature conservation) and the effects cannot be mitigated.
- 8.2 The property lies within an identified amber risk zone where great crested newts may be present. The development has also commenced. However, it lies more than 50 metres from the nearest pond or standing water and aerial photos of the site taken before works commenced appear to show that the land was previously hard surfaced/laid to gravel. In view of this it seems highly unlikely that the development will have impacted upon newts or their habitats in this case.

- 8.3 The site lies within 15 kilometres of the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC). However, given that this is a 'householder' application it will not lead to any increase in visitors to the SAC. The Council is not, therefore, required to carry out an appropriate assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations in this case.
- 8.4 The site is not known to be occupied by any other protected flora or fauna.
- 8.5 In view of the above it is concluded that the development is unlikely to have or to have had any significant impact upon the ecological value of the site. It is therefore considered acceptable in ecological terms reasonably satisfying the requirements of Policies N4 and N6 of TPSB and Section 19 of the NPPF in this regard.

Policies and Guidance:

National Planning Policy Framework (2026)

Section 19 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

The Plan for Stafford Borough

Policy N4 - The natural environment and green infrastructure

Policy N6 - Cannock Chase special area of conservation

9.0 Flood Risk

- 9.1 The property lies within Flood Zone Two, as identified by information supplied by the Environment Agency, and it is therefore at medium risk of flooding. Given the nature of the proposed development however, and the way that it is likely to be used, it seems unlikely that the risk to future users will be especially great. Nevertheless, the applicant has submitted details of the measures that they propose to undertake to reduce this. These include raising the finished floor level of the building to match that of the adjoining outbuilding; positioning any electrical sockets 1.5 metres above that floor level and introducing seals around the new outer doors. It is considered that if these measures are implemented as part of the scheme users of the building should reasonably be safeguarded from flooding in this case. A condition to this end is therefore recommended.
- 9.2 It is not envisaged that a development of this scale is likely to significantly exacerbate problems of flooding elsewhere.
- 9.3 With the above in mind, it is considered that there are no reasonable flood risk grounds for opposing this development reasonably satisfying, as it does, the requirements of Policy N2 of TPSB and Section 18 of the NPPF in this regard.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework (2026)

Section 18 - Managing Flood Risk and Coastal Change

The Plan for Stafford Borough

Policy N2 - Climate Change

10.0 Other Issues

- 10.1 Local residents have raised a number of concerns about the proposal, and these are set out in the 'Publicity' section below. These have been assessed but they are not, in this case, considered to represent sufficiently compelling reasons for refusing the scheme for reasons given earlier in this report and below: -
- a) a planning application cannot reasonably be refused because of concern that the development may subsequently be used for another purpose for which it does not have planning approval. It can only be determined on the basis of what is actually proposed which, in this case, is for ancillary domestic garaging/storage purposes. Should the development subsequently be used for another purpose without approval the alleged breach can be pursued through the Council's planning enforcement procedures. For the record planning permission has not been sought to use this building for the purposes of commercial car repairs. In addition, a condition is recommended restricting the use of the building to the purposes applied for, at not for any commercial use.
 - b) the applicant does not need to demonstrate a 'need' for this development in this instance. It is considered that the proposal as submitted will accord with the relevant planning policies for the reasons outlined in Section Four above.
 - c) concerns about loss of view (outlook), the structural integrity of the building and whether the applicant pays business rates and/or has the relevant insurance and fire and safety certificates for running a commercial business from the property cannot currently be taken into consideration when determining a planning application. This is because these are not deemed to be recognised 'planning matters' under the terms of the current planning legislation. These issues can, of course, be relevant in the wider context of a proposal but they would need to be dealt with outside of the planning arena.
 - d) it is considered that sufficient information has been submitted with this application to enable the implications of the proposal to be fully and properly judged.

11.0 Conclusion

- 11.1 The development is considered acceptable in principle as it is to be used for an appropriate purpose in connection with an established dwelling. It is also considered that it will be acceptable in design and scale terms, that it will reasonably safeguard the residential amenities currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties, that it will not give rise to any undue highway safety or ecological concerns, and that it will not put future users at undue risk of flooding subject to the implementation of specified measures. The development is therefore considered to be in accordance with the requirements of Policies SB1, SP6, SP7, E2, C5, N1, N2, N4, N6, N8, T2 and Appendix B of the adopted Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031, Sections 14, 17, 18 and 19 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and the relevant provisions of the Council's adopted Design Supplementary Planning Document 2018.

CONSULTATIONS

Weston with Gayton Parish Council:

No comments received.

PUBLICITY

The application has been advertised in this instance solely by sending individual letters to the occupiers of the surrounding properties. These were initially sent on 29 May 2026 giving 21 days for public comment. The initial publicity period expired on 19 June 2026 and five objections (including three from the same household) were subsequently received along with objections from the Local Ward Councillor. The objections at that time were:-

- a) that the description of the application did not accurately reflect how the building would be used. There is no need for a store for tractors or agricultural equipment here as the applicant is not a farmer and does not have a farm. Instead, the building would likely to be used in connection with their alleged unauthorised vehicle repair business.
- b) that a development of this nature would be inappropriate for this residential area.
- c) that a building of this size and design, located in this position, would unduly detract from the appearance of the surrounding area. The building should therefore be demolished.
- d) that the development would disturb the occupiers of neighbouring properties through noise generated.
- e) that the development would adversely affect the level of light and privacy currently received/enjoyed by neighbouring properties and would appear unduly overbearing when viewed from them.

- f) that the view currently enjoyed by some of the neighbouring properties would be/has been lost as a result of the construction of this building.
- g) that an approval of this proposal would not be in the best interests of highway safety in the area. It would lead to an unacceptable increase in the vehicular use of Church Lane which is narrow, lacks passing places and affords poor visibility for drivers in places.
- h) that even if the building was to be used solely for storage purposes there would be no need for it as the applicant already has another outbuilding that they can use for this purpose.
- i) that information submitted with the application was inaccurate.

Complainants also asked:-

- i) if the footings of the building had been inspected, and the structural integrity of the building assessed,
- ii) whether the applicant had applied for planning permission to operate a vehicle repair business from their property,
- iii) whether the applicant had insurance and the relevant fire and safety certificates for running a commercial business from the property, and whether they paid business rates.

The description of the application has recently been amended to more accurately reflect the development being proposed (see description given above). As a result of this, surrounding residents and anyone who has previously commented on the scheme, Councillor Beatty and the Parish Council have been re-consulted giving them a further 14 days in which to comment. The re-consultation letters were sent out on 29 July 2026 with this second publicity period expiring on 12 August 2026. Two further objections have since been received from local residents who had previously commented. These query why the description has been changed but do not otherwise raise any new issues over and above those already outlined above. The reason for the change of the application description is explained at the beginning of this paragraph.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

This property has been the subject of the following relevant planning history:-

- i) 89/24486/OUT - Conversion of redundant agricultural buildings to dwelling - Approved 18 April 1990.
- ii) 00/38902/FUL - First floor extension to form bedroom and shower room - Approved 5 May 2000 - Built.

- iii) 17/25789/LDCPP - Lawful Development Certificate - proposed porch - Certificate granted 29 March 2017 as porch deemed to be 'permitted development' and therefore lawful.

Recommendation

Approve, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the following drawings and documents, except where indicated otherwise by a condition attached to this permission, in which case the condition shall take precedence:
 - i) Submitted Application Form
 - ii) Drawing No: - RMS-02-2026-001 - Location Plan, Proposed Block Plan, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations
 - iii) Document entitled 'Flood Risk for the Malthouse'
2. The flood alleviation measures set out in the submitted document entitled 'Flood Risk for the Malthouse' shall be carried out as part of the development before the building is first brought into use, and shall thereafter be satisfactorily retained at all times.
3. The building hereby approved shall be used solely for the garaging of private motor vehicles, including 'Classic' tractors, and for general domestic storage purposes in connection with the dwelling known as 'The Malthouse' and for no other purpose whatsoever. For the avoidance of doubt, it shall not be used for any commercial purpose.

The reasons for the Council's decision to approve the development subject to the above conditions are:

1. To define the permission.
2. In order to safeguard future users of the building from flood risk, in accordance with the requirements of Policy N2 of the adopted Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031 and Section 18 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).
3. In order to ensure that the future use of the building is appropriate for this rural residential area and to safeguard the residential amenities of the surrounding residents, in accordance with the requirements of Policy N1 of the adopted Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031, Section 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026) and the relevant provisions of the Council's adopted Design Supplementary Planning Document 2018.

Informatives

- 1 In accordance with the requirements of Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Order) 2015, as amended, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2026, the Council has worked in a positive and proactive way in determining the application and has granted planning permission.

26/41994/HOU
The Malthouse
Church Lane
Gayton



 PLANNING COMMITTEE - 30 SEPTEMBER 2026

Ward Interest - Nil**Planning Appeals***Report of Head of Economic Development and Planning***Purpose of Report**

Notification of new appeals and consideration of appeal decisions. Copies of any decision letters are attached as an **APPENDIX**.

Notified Appeals

Application Reference	Location	Proposal
26/42087/FUL Non determination appeal	Valley Northern, Unit 2, Carver Road	Variation on Condition 2 (approved plans) on 22/36403/FUL
25/40886/LDC Delegated refusal	Squirrel Barn, Sandon Lane, Milwich	Lawful Development Certificate - Demolition of former agricultural building and erection of residential building in similar form; subsequent extensions and alterations to include orangery, lean-to shed on eastern gable, and front porch; erection of timber gates to access track; erection of timber outbuildings; and erection of garden fencing and patio
25/41639/PAR Delegated refusal	Concrete Framed Barn, Hollywood Farm, Uttoxeter Road	Prior Approval - Conversion of redundant agricultural building to three dwellings
25/40917/HOU Condition appeal	22 Wolverhampton Road, Stafford	Rear single storey extension to main house, refurbishment of coach house and replacement windows.

Application Reference	Location	Proposal
26/41787/HOU Delegated refusal	17 Castle Bank, Stafford	Demolish existing garage, Two-story side extension

Decided Appeals

Application Reference	Location	Proposal
26/41654/ANX Appeal Dismissed	Fernbank Cottages, 69 Longton Road, Barlaston	Replacement of previous garage with new Annex above
24/39718/LDCPP Appeal Dismissed	64 Lichfield Road, Stafford	Carrying out of works that were the subject of application 23/38495/OUT which will comprise of the demolition of the existing outbuilding, along with the erection of 2no. two- bedroomed apartments and a detached dwelling
25/41298/FUL Appeal Dismissed	The Ferns, 6 Broc Hill Way, Brocton	Replacement of existing stables with new building and construction of vehicular access.
25/41603/FUL Appeal Dismissed	Land East of Lichfield Road, Little Haywood	Change of use to dog walking field and associated works

Previous Consideration

Nil

Background Papers

File available in the Development Management Section

Officer Contact

Sushil Birdi, Development and Policy Manager, 01543 464326



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2026

by **K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6011046

Fernbank Cottages, 69 Longton Road, Barlaston, Stoke on Trent. Staffordshire ST12 9AU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Laura Sherrat against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 26/41654/ANX
 - The development proposed is the replacement of previous garage with new annex above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Reference is made to amended plans in relation to garage sizes and a reduced height of the building. I note that the Council did not invite these plans and these are not before me in any event. I shall accordingly make my decision on the basis of the plans considered by the Council.
3. The first reason for refusal detailed on the decision notice states that the proposed development cannot be considered to be householder development, However the Council validated the application on this basis, considered its planning merits and issued its decision. I have accordingly determined it on this basis in my decision below.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is (i) whether the proposed building amounts to ancillary residential accommodation (ii) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and (iii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, Nos 67 and 71 Longton Road by way of loss of privacy.

Reasons

Ancillary Accommodation

5. The appeal property (No 69) is a semi-detached dwelling with a modest rear garden in a row of properties located in a residential area. Located to the rear of the row of properties is a narrow access road leading to a single storey garage sited at the rear of the garden of No 69. It is proposed to demolish the existing single storey garage and replace with a two storey building accommodating two garages and office/garden room and living accommodation above. It is intended that the proposed annex would be used for inter-generational living but no further details in

this regard are given. The Council has concluded that the proposal constitutes a new independent unit of residential development.

6. Notwithstanding the proposed ancillary use, it would nonetheless be of substantial size, and the Council's concerns regarding it being occupied independently are understandable. However, even if the accommodation provides facilities for independent day-to-day living, it would not necessarily become a separate planning unit. It is a matter of fact and degree in each case.
7. Limited details of the internal layout of the annex are given; however, it would be of a size and scale capable of providing self-contained living accommodation and independent living would be possible without requiring access to the main house. By virtue of its scale and siting, it would not appear subservient to its host dwelling and the division of the overall curtilage into two distinct plots would also be easy to achieve. There is also no information before me to demonstrate the ancillary and functional use of the proposal in regard to the host dwelling, nor have I been presented with any information as to how the host dwelling at No 69 is configured. However, whilst access could be obtained independently from the main dwelling, the front elevation of the garage/annexe and bifold opening doors serving the office/garden room would face the small rear garden of No 69 with which it would be shared. Given its siting, layout and the resultant size of the garden, a reasonable degree of privacy for the occupiers of both No 69 and the annexe would not be afforded. Such sharing arrangements would therefore be unlikely to be satisfactory for the residents of No 69 if there was no familial connection between them and the occupants of the annex.
8. On this basis I am satisfied that there would be a functional relationship between No 69 and the annex. I acknowledge the Council's concern that the building could be used as a separate dwelling, but that is not the proposal before me. If the annex building is not built or used as proposed, or if there is a material change of use in the future to create a separate dwelling, then a separate grant of planning permission would be required and the building would be at risk of enforcement action if such permission were not granted. Moreover, the use and occupancy of the building could be controlled by a suitably worded planning condition, which would ensure the use of the annex would be ancillary to the main dwelling, or in the event of different ownership of part of the appeal site as referred to, a planning obligation so that there is in addition to the required ancillary use of the annex a further level of control to prevent the creation of a separate dwelling.
9. In any case I must determine the case on the planning merits and as applied for, namely a garage with annex above and on the basis of the information before me I conclude that the building would be capable of amounting to ancillary accommodation. It is therefore appropriate to assess the scheme on the basis of the reasons for refusal given by the Council in relation to design and privacy concerns.

Character and Appearance

10. The proposed garage/annex would occupy almost the full width of the rear garden at No 69 and would extend significantly into its rear garden. By virtue of its width and height it would appear disproportionately large and oversized relative to the host dwelling and plot. As a result, it would appear as a cramped form of

development unduly prominent in the area and would substantially diminish the semi-rural character and appearance of the site and area.

11. The appellant refers me to an extant permission for a detached two storey garage but only a reference to the difference in dimensions is before me. Be that as it may, even on these dimensions such a garage would be smaller in length and height to the scheme before me. It would therefore have a less visual impact than the proposal. Reference is also made to the proposal enabling the clearance of the site however the clearance of land that is untidy would not represent justification to allow a building in a location that would otherwise be unacceptable.
12. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area, contrary to Policy N1e, N1g and N1h of the Plan for Stafford Borough (2011-2031) (LP). These policies seek to ensure a high standard of design taking into account the amenity of adjacent residential areas, and the local character and context.

Living Conditions

13. Nos 67 and 71 Longton Road adjoin the appeal site separated by close boarded fences. The garage/annex would have first floor windows facing towards the rear garden of No 69. Whilst therefore not directly facing the windows of the neighbouring properties, Nos 67 and 71, due to its height and the separation distances involved, the garage/annex would afford its users a more open and elevated view over the neighbouring properties and rear gardens. Whilst in the case of No 71 this would be screened to some extent by existing boundary treatment this would not be the case in relation to the potential for overlooking into the rear garden area of No 67. Given the separation distances between the garage/annex and the neighbouring properties, the elevated views would mean that an acceptable level of privacy would be compromised. I accept that the obscure glazing, in the rear elevation of the new dwelling to the north of the appeal site, would mean any overlooking from the rear elevation of the proposed garage/annex towards this building would not compromise privacy of the occupiers of this dwelling.
14. However, the proposal would introduce an unacceptable level of overlooking and as such would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 67 and 71 Longton Road. It would therefore be contrary to Policy N1e of the LP which requires development to respect the amenity of adjacent residential areas.

Other Matters

15. The proposal has been made on the basis that the garage/annex would be occupied by family members/inter-generational living. I recognise the advantages of the development to family circumstances however limited information is before me to show what these needs are, or that they can only be met by the proposed development. I note too the lack of objections to the proposal, but this in itself does not indicate a lack of harm arising from the proposal. These factors therefore carry limited weight and do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
16. I note the appellant's reference to the Council's assessment and handling of the application, but this is not a matter before me, nor does it alter my findings.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, having regard to the harm the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and the residential amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 August 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/X/25/3367279

64 Lichfield Road, Stafford, Staffordshire, ST17 4LW

- The appeal is made under section 195 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant a certificate of lawful use or development (LDC).
 - The appeal is made by Byatts Platt Sipp against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application ref 24/39718/LDCPP, dated 1 October 2024, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2024.
 - The application was made under section 192(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The development for which a certificate of lawful use or development is sought is the carrying out of works that were the subject of application 23/38495/OUT which will comprise of the demolition of the existing outbuilding, along with the erection of 2 two-bedroomed apartments and a detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the Council's decision to refuse the LDC was well founded. This turns on whether the proposed development has planning permission.
3. The planning merits of the proposal are not relevant.

Reasons

4. A decision notice¹, was issued on 29 January 2024. This has, written in capitals at the top of the page, "PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT". The notice describes the proposed development as "*Outline application for access, layout and scale – Demolition of existing outbuilding. Proposed two no.2 bedroom apartments and a detached dwelling*" at 64 Lichfield Road, Stafford. The decision notices also states "Stafford Borough Council ... permits the above development ... subject to the following conditions." No conditions are listed.
5. Under this there is a heading "*The reasons for the Council's decision to grant permission for the development subject to the above conditions are:*" However, there are no reasons for granting planning permission. Instead, there is text citing planning harm and planning policy conflicts. The text reads as five separate reasons for refusal.
6. There is an informative towards the end which includes the words "*the proposal is not considered to achieve an acceptable and sustainable development*".

¹ Council reference 23/38495/OUT

7. I appreciate that the officer report indicated an intention to refuse permission. The decision notice is clearly defective and there is no dispute about that. However, defects do not necessarily invalidate a decision notice.
8. I note the Council's reference to *James Hay Pension Trustees Ltd v First Secretary of State [2006] EWCA Civ 1387*. In that case, the court found that the document failed to comply with key statutory requirements and therefore it did not constitute a decision. However, I do not consider that the decision notice before me fails to comply with key statutory requirements. In this appeal, the decision notice has the Council reference number, date, the site address, a description of the proposal and it states that the development is permitted.
9. I have also had regard to *Archid Architecture and Interior Design v Dundee City Council [2014]*. In that case, the decision notice that Dundee City Council had issued was similar to the one before me in that it purported to grant planning permission but then gave reasons for refusal. The Court of Session found that the decision notice was valid unless and until the court ruled otherwise. The Scottish judgement has persuasive value.
10. In this case, the document clearly states that planning permission is granted. Although the notice contains what look like reasons for refusal, nowhere does it say that permission is refused. As in the *Archid* case, I consider that Stafford's issued decision notice is a valid permission. A planning permission is irrevocable unless quashed by the courts or revoked by the Council under s97 of the Act. Neither of these has occurred. It does not matter that the Council issued it in error.
11. My finding that the document is a valid permission is not the end of the matter. The purpose of an application under s192(b) of the Act is to determine whether a proposed development would be lawful.
12. For the proposed development to be lawful it would require either (i) an outline permission with reserved matters discharged or (ii) a grant of full planning permission
13. Firstly, there is no suggestion that any reserved matters have been submitted or approved. Therefore, the required approvals in respect of outline permission do not exist.
14. Secondly, the appellant claims that the decision made by the Council is a full permission. The appellant supports this claim by saying that the permission lacks any condition requiring the submission of reserved matters. However, s92(2) of the Act deems outline planning permission to be granted subject to conditions relating to the time limits for submitting reserved matters applications and for implementing the permission. This is even if the conditions are not printed on the decision notice.
15. Furthermore, I see from the evidence before me that the application was specifically made in outline with appearance and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval. The application was made on a specific form for an outline application and the completed form indicated that the application was sought only for access, layout and scale. Whilst elevational details were submitted, permission was not sought for detailed design and the Council treated them as for illustrative purposes only. I have no evidence that any substantive landscaping details were provided. Moreover, the operative part of the planning permission (in the

description of development) makes it outline only for access, layout and scale. Therefore, full planning permission does not exist for the development either.

16. The required permissions to commence development do not exist and therefore the development would not be lawful.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the Council's refusal to grant a certificate of lawful use or development for "the carrying out of works that were the subject of application 23/38495/OUT which will comprise of the demolition of the existing outbuilding, along with the erection of 2 two-bedroomed apartments and a detached dwelling" is well-founded and that the appeal should fail. I will exercise accordingly the powers transferred to me in section 195(3) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2026

by **P Barton BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 September 2026

Appeal Ref: 6010165

The Ferns, 6 Broc Hill Way, Brocton, Stafford, Staffordshire ST17 0UB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Dave Owen against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/41298/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “proposing to remove existing stables with more appropriate agricultural building to be sited on existing concrete pad for housing tractors and various other equipment for land maintenance”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 17 August 2026. The policy emphasis of the parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not changed. As a result, I have not sought comments on the new version of the Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and any relevant development plan policies; and
 - whether other considerations clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm as to amount to very special circumstances.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

4. The Framework identifies that the objective of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential features of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
5. Whilst not contained within the decision notice, the officer report refers to Policy SP7 of The Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031 (PSB), which includes a requirement for new development within the Green Belt to be consistent with

national policies. I have had regard to it insofar as it is consistent with the latest version of the Framework.

6. Development within the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it falls within one of the exceptions given in policy GB7 of the Framework. No exceptions under the previous version of the Framework in support of the appeal scheme have been presented.
7. Located to a corner of a broadly rectangular-shaped parcel of land in the Green Belt, which consists primarily of grass, the proposed building would replace an existing stables building that I saw is predominantly being used for the storage of logs. Whilst the surrounding land contains many trees with some overhanging into the site, and other trees were within the grounds around the house, there were a limited number of trees within the rectangular-shaped parcel of land. I also observed pieces of equipment, including modest-sized ride-on mowers, within this parcel of land.
8. Although the proposed building is intended to be used for the storage of land management and horticultural equipment, the appellant has stated that it is not intended to facilitate a commercial agricultural enterprise. On the basis of the evidence before me and from my observations, the proposal would be associated with the ongoing management and maintenance of privately owned land. There is no compelling case that the activities are of a scale and nature that it is for agriculture, horticulture and forestry, or solely for nature conservation, restoration and/or enhancement. Therefore, the proposed building would not meet the exception given in policy GB7 (1)(a) of the Framework.
9. Policy GB7 (1)(b) of the Framework would also not be met as the replacement building would not be in the same use and would be materially larger than the one it replaces.
10. As the proposed building would be sited on an existing concrete slab, for the purposes of my assessment, I have considered this to be previously developed land (PDL). Policy GB7 (1)(e) is relevant and relates to the redevelopment of PDL, which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. In considering the concept of openness, the courts have found that it broadly has visual and spatial dimensions.
11. There would be limited harm to the visual openness of the Green Belt due to the presence of dense vegetation surrounding the site and changes in ground levels resulting in the building sitting within a dip in the landscape. However, the increase in the quantum of development by virtue of the substantially greater footprint and height of the proposed building compared to the existing stables building would result in significant harm to the spatial openness of the Green Belt. Taking all these factors together the appeal building would have both spatial and visual impacts, which would cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Consequently, it would not comply with Policy GB7 (1)(e) of the Framework.
12. Furthermore, based on the evidence before me, none of the other exceptions set out in policy GB7 of the Framework apply to the appeal building.
13. In terms of the proposed permeable paving system between the proposed building and an existing access, due to the nature and appearance of the surface it would not result in an area of urban-style hardstanding encroaching into the countryside.

Consequently, this aspect of the appeal scheme would meet Policy GB7 (1)(f)(i) which includes engineering operations, as the impact on the openness of the Green Belt is minimised, and there would not be a significant conflict with the Green Belt purposes.

14. In conclusion, the proposed building would not accord with any of the exceptions contained in policy GB7 of the Framework and is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt in terms of the Framework and PSB Policy SP7.

Other considerations

15. The need to consolidate and secure existing externally stored machinery, and replace an existing building, as well as the associated up-keep of the appeal site do represent benefits in favour of the appeal scheme. I afford them moderate weight.
16. The appeal site is within the Cannock Chase National Landscape (CCNL). Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended) requires that regard be had to the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of National Landscapes. There is also a duty under Section 245 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 to seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of these areas. These purposes also include increasing the understanding and enjoyment by the public of the special qualities of the National Landscapes. The Council has not raised an objection to the proposal's impact on the CCNL, and from my own observations, I see no reason to reach a different conclusion. A lack of harm in this regard has a neutral impact on the planning balance.
17. Although the appeal site also falls within 15km of the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC), the Council indicates that as the proposal would not create a new residential unit, holiday accommodation or visitor attraction, there would be no adverse impacts resulting from increased recreational pressure. As I have found the appeal scheme would be unacceptable for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to consider whether there would be any likely significant effect on the integrity of the SAC or undertake an Appropriate Assessment. If I were to find the proposal acceptable in this regard, a lack of harm would be a neutral factor.
18. A lack of harm or policy compliance with regard to, amongst other things, the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, highway safety, ecology and trees are neutral considerations that weigh neither for nor against the proposal.
19. The appellant refers to positive discussions with the original case officer, that the application was initially recommended for approval and that the Council do not provide formal pre-application advice for proposals of this nature. I am mindful that the authorising officer is not duty bound to follow the advice of the case officer. Therefore, these matters do not lead me away from my findings and I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the proposal.

Green Belt Balance

20. Policy GB6 of the Framework is clear that substantial weight should be given to the harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. I have found that there

would be harm to the Green Belt by reason of the proposal's inappropriateness and its effect on openness.

21. The Framework states that the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm resulting from the development must be clearly outweighed by other considerations for permission to be granted. The other considerations in this case, as detailed above, do not have sufficient cumulative weight to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm. As such, the very special circumstances necessary to justify this development do not exist. This would be contrary to the Framework and PSB Policy SP7. Moreover, for this reason, policy S5 of the Framework is not engaged.

Conclusion

22. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

P Barton

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2026

by **P Barton BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 September 2026

Appeal Ref: 6011209

Land east of Lichfield Road, Little Haywood, Stafford ST18 0FH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Kate Perry against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/41603/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use to dog walking field and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 17 August 2026. The policy emphasis of the parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not changed. As a result, I have not sought comments on the new version of the Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.
3. The application form indicates that the development started on 1 July 2025. However, I have considered the appeal based on the proposed plans before me, rather than anything that has been carried out on site.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

5. Access to the field and the associated parking and turning area is via an existing access point off the A51 Lichfield Road. There is no dispute between the parties in relation to the width dimensions of this access, as indicated on the submitted plans. On the basis of the evidence before me and from my own observations, I am satisfied that 2 vehicles can be positioned alongside each other on this access, within the kerbstones, before it reduces to a width that can only accommodate a single vehicle.
6. However, due to the extent of the width and radii of the access, a vehicle entering the site off the A51 would need to undertake this manoeuvre with particular care if there was a vehicle leaving the site at the same time. It would also require the vehicle exiting the site to be fully positioned to the correct side of the access, as shown on the submitted drawings. If a vehicle were to exit the site in a position that is not immediately adjacent to that side of the access, any vehicle wishing to enter

the site would need to wait in the carriageway of the A51 until the access was clear or drive partly over the highway verge.

7. The provision of an on-line pre-booking system, with instructions, and a 15-minute buffer between appointments, which could be conditioned, seeks to manage the movement of vehicles so the previous customer has already left before the next customer arrives.
8. However, there is no compelling evidence before me that the time frame of this buffer would be sufficient, taking into account people arriving early and leaving late due to, for example, misjudging the time required to travel to the site or retrieving, cleaning and drying dogs before being placed into a vehicle.
9. Despite the monitoring of the site by CCTV, a lack of an on-site presence to actively enforce the arrangements means that I am not persuaded that there would not be occasions where an overlap between visitors associated with different bookings on the site would occur. Consequently, there is the real possibility of vehicles entering the site at the same time as others exiting.
10. The stretch of the A51 that the access is located along is relatively straight with no other accesses within the vicinity. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that vehicles would be driving in a manner that would reflect the speed limit and this was reinforced by my observations of the traffic flow on the A51. For visitors not familiar with the exact location of the access, and in the absence of appropriate signage, vehicles may have to decelerate hastily, resulting in different tracking when entering the site than that shown on the submitted plans.
11. As such, the proposed access arrangement could result in vehicles waiting on the A51 or overriding the adjoining highway verge, resulting in the potential for conflict between highway users as well as mud and debris ending up on the highway. Consequently, on the evidence presented, and even with a driver exercising caution when using the access, I cannot conclude with reasonable certainty that the development would not represent a hazard to highway users.
12. Although I noted 2 low yellow poles and a number of small orange flags around the access, these were not particularly prominent and did not sway me away from my findings or provide a suitable warning for the location of the site's entrance.
13. My attention has been drawn to an approval¹ for a similar proposal, and the differences with the appeal scheme, including a narrower access width, a greater number of dog walking fields and parking spaces, its positioning on a road with a higher speed limit and a shorter handover period. Moreover, it is also claimed that the approved plans share similarities with the appeal scheme as they do not show wider radii kerbs and the existing access was not approved to be widened.
14. Notwithstanding this, photographic evidence submitted by the Council of that particular site before and after the development shows significant changes to the access, including what appears to be wider radii kerbs. Furthermore, I do not have full details relating to the particular circumstances of that development, including the vehicular movements associated with the site's previous use and the traffic flows and conditions of the highway, and whether the circumstances are comparable to the appeal proposal. As such a comparison is of limited relevance

¹ Planning decision Ref: 22/036826/FUL

in this instance. I have therefore considered the appeal before me on its individual planning merits.

15. For the above reasons, the development has an unacceptable effect on highway safety, contrary to Policy T2 of The Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031, which requires, amongst other things, all new development to have safe and adequate means of access and not materially impair highway safety or traffic movement.

Other Matters

16. I recognise that there is a level of support for the appeal scheme, including, but not limited to, the provision of a service and a form of rural diversification. However, these benefits do not overcome the adverse impact on highway safety that I have found and to which I have attributed significant weight.
17. Concerns that the suggested alterations to the access would not be financially viable or sustainable for such a small-scale venture to absorb have not been substantiated and as such I give this matter limited weight in the planning balance.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

18. Given in Policy S3 of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policy S5 applies as the type of development proposed would be located outside of a settlement. However, policy TR6 of the Framework is clear that development proposals should be refused if they would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Applying policy S5 (2), the moderate benefits listed above are significantly outweighed by the adverse effects I have found in terms of highway safety.
19. The appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

P Barton

INSPECTOR