

**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

14 November 2019

Application No:	SMD/2019/0452	
Location	Land east of Sandfields, Kingsley Road, Cellarhead	
Proposal	Erection of 2 detached dormer bungalows	
Applicant	Mr and Mrs Berrisford	
Agent	Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy Ltd	
Parish/ward	Caverswall / Caverswall	Date registered 22 nd July 2019
If you have a question about this report please contact: Arne Swithenbank tel: 01538 395578 or e-mail arne.swithenbank@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk		

REFERRAL

The application is referred to the Committee at the request of Cllr Paul Roberts in order for committee to consider in particular the Green Belt and specifically whether the location is within a village.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

1.1 The site is within the Green Belt on the south west side of the A52 Kingsley Road at a point some 150m east of the Cellarhead cross roads. The site comprises a c.50m width of roadside field with dry-stone wall along the rear of the roadside pavement and native species hedgerow towards the Sandfields end. The depth of the site from the road is c.45m and the site area is c.0.23ha. The rear (SW) boundary is a well maintained native species hedgerow with further farm fields beyond. The application red edge overlaps slightly with land used as garden and parking to Sandfields to the north west which is in the same ownership.

1.2 The detached dwelling of Sandfields is a modernised and extended property but appears to have at least 19th C origins with a building corresponding to the extant two storey house present on the 1887 OS map. Parking and gardens to Sandfields are somewhat loosely separated from the fields.

1.3 Bordering the site to the south east is Pathways, a detached dwelling fronting the road and the first in a row with two pairs of semis beyond and then a further detached house.

1.4 Opposite the site, across the road to the north east, is a garden plot and parking to serve Fern Cottage with essentially field countryside surrounding.

1.5 A public footpath right of way enters the application site from the public road in the corner boundary with Pathways. A stone squeeze style about midway along the site rear (SW) boundary takes the path onwards into fields beyond.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks full consent for two detached three bedroom dormer bungalows of 198m² gross internal floor area. Materials would comprise a red/orange brick and grey roof tiles to match the area. The agent has confirmed that a pre-commencement condition to require more specific details would be accepted.

2.2 The dwellings would be tall with a roof ridge of 7.8m and generous in layout. The properties would have a high eaves at the front of 4.0m with a middle section dropped lower to form a canopy over the door. They would be set back c.18m from the road edge, slightly closer but a similar distance to the 20m of Pathways. Sandfields is c.10 back from the road.

2.3 The dwellings would have an extended footprint with tall double garages attached. The two are only narrowly separated by a gap of 1.2m but their side-on alignment is staggered so that the more north westerly of the pair is set 4m forward of the other.

2.4 There would be a gap between the side wall of the south easterly of the two dwellings to Pathways of c.4m within which it is proposed to divert the route of the public footpath. No side elevation windows are included in the proposals.

2.5 Detailed landscaping is submitted on dwg 00887 AL(0)03 rev. C. A single drive entrance would serve the two dwellings necessitating a linking drive in parallel to the main road in front of the north westerly of the two. A walled boundary rear of the visibility splay is proposed along c.35m the frontage similar in amount to the current wall length.

2.6 The link below to the Council's website is where the detail of this application can be viewed.

<http://publicaccess.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=130206>

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 79/06834/OLDDC – site for two detached dwellings – refused

- 3.2 83/11940/OLDDC – site for dwelling – “closed”
- 3.3 88/01079/OLD – adj to Sandfields Farm Kingsley Road Cellarhead Caverswall – site for one dwelling – refused
- 3.4 At Sandfields: 04/00075/FUL – pitched roof over existing garage – approved
- 3.5 At Pathways: 99/00283/OLD – first floor extension – approved

4. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

- 4.1 The development plan comprises the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Development Plan Document (26th March 2014) and supporting evidence documents.

Core Strategy Development Plan (Adopted 26th March 2014),

- S01 Spatial Objectives
- SS1 Development Principles
- SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- SS6c Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
- DC1 Design Considerations
- DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
- R1 Rural Diversification
- R2 Rural Housing
- NE1 Biodiversity
- T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPD/G):

- Space About Dwellings SPG
- Design Principles SPG

Core Strategy Supporting Evidence Documents:

- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) July 2018

- Paragraphs 1 – 14
- Section 4 Decision making
- Section 12 Achieving well designed places
- Section 13 Protecting Green Belt Land
- Section 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Local Plan Submission Version (February 2018)

- SS1 Development Principles
- SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- SS8 Larger Villages Area Strategy
- SS10 Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
- DC1 Design Considerations
- DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting

H1	New Housing Development
NE1	Biodiversity and Geological Resources
T1	Development and Sustainable Transport

4.2 Local Plan process

The Council agreed to publish the Local Plan Submission Version for representations in February 2018. At this point, the Council agreed that the Local Plan was “sound”. Formal representations were then invited from residents, businesses and other stakeholders to provide them with the opportunity to support or challenge the soundness or legal compliance of the Local Plan. This stage in the process followed three previous public consultations since 2015 which had informed the preparation of the Local Plan alongside a comprehensive evidence base.

In June 2018, the Council subsequently agreed to submit the Local Plan Submission Version to the Secretary of State for examination. An examination in public is ongoing in order to determine whether the Local Plan is sound and legally compliant. Hearing sessions were conducted in October 2018 and the Inspector issued his initial post-hearing advice in January 2019 which set out some actions for the Council and a range of modifications that would be necessary to make the plan sound. The full schedule of modifications was the subject of public consultation between 18th September 2019 and 31st October 2019. The schedule consisted of modifications that the Inspector has so far deemed necessary to make the Local Plan sound. Following the consultation, the Inspector is expected to consider the responses before issuing his final report. Depending on the recommendations in the report, the Council may then be in a position to adopt the Local Plan.

In this context, the Council’s position on the weight to be given to the policies contained in the Local Plan Submission Version in terms of the three criteria set out in Paragraph 48 of the NPPF is as follows:

- The stage of preparation: the Local Plan is now at an advanced stage of preparation as the Council has submitted it to the SoS for examination;
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies: this varies depending on the policy in question. Where reference is made in this report to any emerging policies the level of outstanding objections to each policy will be noted and recommendation made as to the amount of weight to be given to the policies at this stage in the process;
- The degree of consistency of policies with the NPPF: given that the Council has submitted a Local Plan that it considers to be sound, all policies are deemed to be consistent with the NPPF.

5. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Site Notice	Consultation period expired: 3 rd September 2019
Neighbour Notification	Consultation period expired: 19 th August 2019

Public Comments:

Three letters of objection have been received stating:

- The site is on green belt with a public footpath and if allowed will set a very dangerous precedent allowing anyone to build on green belt area.
- The access is opposite a neighbour dwelling but is not shown on the plans.
- In the last 5 years the Council has allowed 2 developments which has increased the properties 3 fold on the traffic situation. It's a 50 mph area and used as racetrack to Alton Towers and within the last 12 months JCB have just built a new car park for a 1000 cars and a new lorry park of which 95% use Kingsley road as their route to work.
- Kingsley road Cellarhead crossroads is one of the most polluted area in staffs moorlands we have queuing traffic at busy times stretching for 1/2 a mile with standing traffic and this development would add an estimated 10 more.
- There is a proposed access to the rear field is this for more development?
- There is no mention of having to remove a lamp post, road signs etc.
- Cellarhead does not need any more new houses. Our current infrastructure cannot harbour further development.
- Our infrastructure already cannot cope with the population.

Parish Council

Caverswall Parish Council – No objections to this application subject to neighbours' approval.

Severn Trent Water

Minimal impact on the public sewerage network therefore no objection and no requirement for a drainage condition. Advisory notes re possibility of public sewers within the site.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

No objection subject to conditions. Technical note includes details of radar speed survey, giving a snapshot of speeds on Friday 14th June 2019, times not stated.

The purpose of the requested speed survey was to determine if there was adequate frontage to provide a safe visibility splay, not to calculate it to the minimum splay based on a snapshot radar survey, which can itself affect driver behaviour. Speed limit of A52 at the access point is national (60mph). The speed survey does demonstrate that there is adequate frontage to provide a 67m visibility splay to the west. The extent of the blue line is not clear, but the hedge on the frontage of the existing Sandfields is included in the 67m. This will also improve visibility for users of the existing access and vehicles using the A52.

There is an existing streetlight at the access point. This will need to be replaced and relocated by Eon. Relocation to the apex of the entrance wall to the east of the proposed access is most likely, but this should be discussed with Eon at an early stage. There is an existing Advanced Direction Sign on the frontage of the site which obstructs the required visibility splay. This will need to be relocated or raised or the sign face redesigned and raised (all on new posts) to incorporate the additional sign below the main face. Highway works agreement should be commenced at the earliest opportunity to ensure developers timescales are more likely to be met. This ADS does not need to be illuminated.

Submitted drawing shows a wide access but no details of how wide the dropped kerb will be at the carriageway edge. Condition above seeks clarification of this.

AES Waste Services

No issues with this application.

6 POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS / PLANNING BALANCE

Policy Context

6.1 The Local Planning Authority is required to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material circumstances which indicate otherwise and in determining these applications, it shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, in so far as material to the application and to any other material considerations.

6.2 Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) states that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-takers this means: “(c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or (d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies, which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting planning permission unless: (i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole”. NPPF para 8 identifies the three dimensions to

sustainable development as economic, social and environmental. The National Planning Policy Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions.

6.3 Policy SS1 of The Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy identifies that development should contribute positively to the social, economic and environmental improvement of the Staffordshire Moorlands. Core Strategy policy SS1a establishes a 'Presumption in Favour of Development' in line with National Planning Policy

6.4 The Development Plan for the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council consists of the Adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Development Plan Document (March 2014) with regard also being given to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance documents: 'Space About Dwellings' and 'Design Principles' and the Council's Core Strategy Supporting Evidence Document: Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008). Development boundary mapping remains for the present time as approved under the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (September 1998).

Principle of Development and Main Issues

6.5 The site lies within the green belt , whereby in accordance with Policy SS6c, strict control will continue to be exercised over inappropriate development within the Green Belt allowing only for exceptions as defined by Government Policy.

6.7 The NPPF states at paragraph 144 that: "When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt."

6.7 The fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The Government identifies five purposes of the Green Belt:

- To prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;
- To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic market towns
- To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

6.8 Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (NPPF 143). 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations (NPPF 144).

6.9 NPPF paragraphs 145 and 146 set out specific exceptions by which certain forms of development can be considered as being not inappropriate in the Green Belt. One of these exceptions is at 145 (e): "limited infilling in villages". There are no planning definitions to this term.

- 6.10 The proposed development site is bounded by development to either side – Sandfields to the north west and the row beginning with Pathways to the south east. On this basis the site can reasonably be considered ‘infill’ as it would fill a gap between existing development.
- 6.11 However, the built elevation frontage in this proposal would extend to 40m including the 1m space between the two dwellings in a site of width c.46m. Although the proposal is for just two dwellings which can reasonably be regarded as being ‘limited’ in number the actual plot width could accommodate more dwellings. The adjacent detached property called Pathways and the two pairs of semis alongside occupy in total a similar (slightly lesser) width of c.44m for example. A development of five dwellings would not be regarded as limited infilling.
- 6.12 As well as being limited and infill the proposal site must be within a village to meet the test of paragraph 145 (e) of the NPPF. A combined larger village under the name, ‘Werrington and Cellarhead’ is defined with a development boundary in the adopted local plan. No change to this boundary is proposed in the emerging Local Plan. This development boundary is contained to the west of Leek Road and north of Cellarhead Road. All land east of the cross roads is within the Green Belt including land to both sides of Kingsley Road. The application site begins at a point c.140m east of the Cellarhead cross roads and as such is not within the settlement boundary. That however is not necessarily determinative in terms of consideration of whether for the purposes of interpretation of NPPF policy the site is within a village. The former Bowling Green Inn – now a physio centre – stands on the north side of Kingsley Road at the cross roads and is washed over by Green Belt. There is then a gap of c.100m to Fern Cottage which stands opposite the application site. After Fern Cottage there is then a further gap of c.100m to New Homestead Farm.
- 6.13 On the south side of Kingsley Road at the cross roads is a group of buildings which include a dwelling (formerly a store) on the corner and the former Hope and Anchor pub. Between these buildings and Sandfields is the SMD/2013/0976 approved and completed development of 22 dwellings known as Cherry Gardens. All is washed over by Green Belt. On this basis on balance it is perhaps appropriate to give the benefit of the doubt and accept that the village of Cellarhead extends to the west of the cross roads, and that the two former pubs and other adjacent buildings at the cross roads either side of Kingsley Road would be included.
- 6.14 With the post 2013 development of 22 dwellings forming Cherry Gardens being immediately adjacent to the rear of the former Hope and Anchor the “village” could now be reasonably expected to include this development. Although, it should be noted that, approval for Cherry Gardens was based on it being a rural exceptions site enabling an affordable housing scheme on the edge of or within a village in a rural area that would not otherwise normally be released for housing. In turn, given that the dwelling known as Sandfields (present at least since the late 19thC) is next adjacent, it may be logical to regard this as also

being within the modern day village. That said there is some sense of a disconnect between the Cherry Gardens development and Sandfields and notably the 30mph speed restriction – often a tell-tale of where built-up development such as a village is perceived to begin – is positioned at the juncture of Cherry Gardens and does not include Sandfields.

- 6.15 Further development east along Kingsley Road takes the characteristic form of sporadic ribbon development. On the south side of the road the application site marks the first break from the built-up zone as it has now become. Infilling this gap would effectively extend the built up zone again at least as far as the dwelling known as Buchan Ness the most easterly in the row of two pairs of semis and two detached dwellings adjoining the application site. On the north side of Kingsley Road development is altogether more sparse with a 100m gap from immediately rear of the former Bowling Green Inn at the Cross Roads to Fern Cottage and a similar gap to Homestead Farm. It is acknowledged that there is a recently constructed cul-de-sac development further to the east on the site of the former haulage yard but this again was only allowed as an exception to Green Belt policy as it constituted the redevelopment of a brownfield site and is physically somewhat divorced from the settlement.

Design and visual impact

- 6.19 Policy DC1 of the Core Strategy requires that all developments shall be well-designed and reinforce local distinctiveness by positively contributing to, and complementing the character and heritage of, an area. Development should be of a high quality, adding to the value of a local area, be designed to respect the site and its surroundings and promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, density, layout, siting, landscape, character and appearance.
- 6.20 In design terms, the two dwellings comprise two detached chalet style bungalows that have wide frontages with limited space in between. The design per se, does not raise any concerns. However the combination of the width and height of the dwellings and garages combined, and the limited spacing between the buildings would result in development which extend across virtually the entire width of the site. This would be out of keeping with the scale of development found elsewhere in the immediate vicinity and harmful the visual character of the area. It is proposed to construct the dwelling with brick and tile and in the event of approval it would be appropriate to require traditional tile form.
- 6.21 The site currently is attractive and well maintained with a mixture of stone wall and good native species hedgerows. An attractive stone squeeze stile conveys the public footpath through the rear hedgerow into the countryside beyond. The site is seen in full from the public road and from the public footpath approach from the SW. There would be a significant loss to the current sense of openness at this point. The characteristic of Kingsley Road is one of intermittent openness to which this site contributes significantly. Its development would result in a significantly extended un-broken run of developed road front in the approach to Cellarhead or from Cellarhead and delaying the sense of release into the rural landscape. Accordingly, the

proposed dwellings would have a suburban impact on an otherwise open and rural character of the land.

Impact on residential amenity

- 6.22 The closest residential properties are Pathways to the east and Fern Cottage on the opposite side of the road. Adequate amenity space and separation distances for privacy are achieved for both existing and future residents. Accordingly it is considered that the relationship to surrounding residents is not a constraint to development of the site.

Ecology

- 6.23 No ecology survey has been submitted but this is not a protected site and the field grassland is the main habitat present and it is evidently agriculturally improved with an absence of species diversity. There would be a loss of frontage hedgerow and in the event of approval the bird nesting legal informative would be required. Other conditions recommended would include soft and hard landscaping provision.

Highways

- 6.24 The NPPF and Core Strategy policies DC1 and T1 require that all development proposals secure safe and suitable access to a site whilst making a contribution towards meeting parking requirements and ensuring that all new development can be satisfactorily accommodated within the highway network. Off-road parking space is provided within the proposed garages along with driveway parking. Access will be provided from a single point along Kingsley Road with shared turning and manoeuvring facilities.
- 6.25 The concerns of local residents are noted, however, the Highways Authority is satisfied that sufficient visibility can be achieved allowing for the 60mph zone at this point. In event of approval conditions would be needed to require appropriate re-positioning of street furniture, a point raised in the representations received. For the avoidance of doubt there are no issues as to the sustainability of this location with bus routes active on all roads converging at the cross roads. Overall the proposed access would not harm highway safety and would not have an adverse impact on the operation of the surrounding road network.

Other Matters

- 6.26 There would no doubt at some level be a loss of public amenity in terms of the quality and enjoyability of the access to the rural surroundings by way of the public footpath across the site, as raised in the representations. It would though be feasible to retain an access route as the plans show. A diversion order would need to be applied for by separate process under TCPA(1990) s.257.

6.27 A Grade II Listed Milepost close to the existing entrance to Sandfields is positioned just outside the submitted application boundary and would not be affected. Strict considerations apply in respect of heritage. For nearby Listed Buildings there is a statutory duty placed on the Local Planning Authority, under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to consider the impact of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the Listed Buildings affected, and their settings. An LPA can only discharge its duty if it has carried out a proper assessment of the impact on a Conservation Area and/or a Listed Building, is conscious of the duty and has demonstrably applied it in assessing the proposal. This assessment extends to setting – the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. NPPF paragraph 193 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, “great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation”. Despite the development, the mile post would remain in its existing position at the edge of the roadside hedgerow and its significance historically as a marker of direction and distance for users of the public road would not be altered. The hedgerow backdrop to the mile post in turn would or could be retained at this point by condition.

7. Conclusion and Planning Balance

7.1 The site lies within an area of Green Belt. Therefore, the main issues are:

- Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and any relevant development plan policies;
- The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it;
- The effect of the proposal on the landscape character of the area;
- If the proposal is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

7.2 In order not to be inappropriate development it is necessary to be satisfied that Cellarhead can be considered a village. As discussed in the report this is not obviously clear cut but on balance the assessment is that it may reasonably be so considered.

7.3 There is no doubt that the proposed site represents a gap between existing development. However it is not only necessary to find that Cherry Gardens and Sandfields are within the village but also that the further away row of dwellings (two pairs of semis and two detached dwellings) which the gap falls between are also in the village. The conclusion reached is that Sandfields (the one-time farm house) has only become a part of the village as a result of the village expanding to adjoin it. The further row is judged to represent an example of

classic sporadic roadside ribbon development recognisably beyond the village limits. On this basis the gap cannot represent infilling in a village but in fact would amount to further peripheral expansion of the village along the south side of Kingsley Road resulting in the “joining up” of sporadic developments in a ribbon form .

- 7.4 Some doubt is also raised as to whether the infilling is in fact truly ‘limited’ as the length of gap could accommodate significantly more than the two large dwellings proposed.
- 7.5 In terms of openness and the purposes of the green belt the development would clearly reduce openness and would be in conflict with at least two of the green belt purposes – to check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The development would be contiguous with the large post war estate at Moorside High School and in turn with Werrington and ultimately the City of Stoke-on-Trent. As such it is arguable that the site has a front line role in terms of maintaining the Green Belt.
- 7.6 As discussed elsewhere in the report the development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- 7.7 No very special circumstances have been advanced in support of the scheme and none are identified.
- 7.8 Notwithstanding the current undersupply of housing it should be noted that NPPF paragraph 11 stipulates that Green Belt policies (footnote 6) shall continue to apply.

8 RECOMMENDATION

A. Refuse for the following reasons:

1. The proposed residential development does not fall under the criteria of development that can be exceptionally allowed in the Green Belt listed under paragraphs 145 or 146 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and therefore the proposal is deemed to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which by definition, in paragraph 143, is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Council considers that no very special circumstances have been demonstrated in the application that could be considered to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt or outweigh the operation of Green Belt policy. Furthermore the proposal is found harmful to openness and countryside character and quality. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SS1, SS1a, SS6c and R1 of the Cores Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed width, height and scale of the dwellings, including garages and the limited spacing between the buildings would result in a development which

would extend across virtually the entire width of the site. This would be out of keeping with the scale of development found elsewhere in the immediate vicinity. Accordingly it is considered that the development would have an unacceptable suburban impact on the visual and open character of the area, contrary to Policies DC1,DC3, and R1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

B In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision

Informatives

1. Assessed as a whole the proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraphs 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The application has been determined in accordance with Policies: SS1; SS1a; SS2; SS4; SS6c; SD1; SD4; H1; DC1; DC3; C1; R1; R2; NE1 and T1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan and the NPPF.

Land adjacent to Sandfields, Kingsley Road, Cellarhead – location plan

