

**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

25 June 2020

Application No:	SMD/2019/0287	
Location	Broad Oak Farm, Leek road, Kingsley Moor	
Proposal	5 holiday cabins to replace existing paintball complex	
Applicant	Mr Harrison	
Agent	JM Planning	
Parish/ward	Kingsley	Date registered 10/10/2019
If you have a question about this report please contact: Jane Curley tel: 01538 395400 ex 4124 Jane.curley@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk		

REFERRAL

This application has been referred to Committee by Councillor Worthington to assess the impact on the surrounding area and the possible damage to any trees in close proximity, the comparison with the existing use, vehicle movements and economic benefits of tourism.

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application site lies in open countryside which is designated as Green Belt. It lies on the edge of Ancient woodland known as Broadoak Wood. It has, according to the application operated as a paintball activity by Quest Paintball Stoke Ltd who has operated from the site since 1995. However it goes on to state that the applicant is considering winding down the paintball operations at the site

2.2 The site includes a collection of structures although no size details of these were provided with the initial application. During the processing of the application the applicants Agent provided the following information;

'The existing buildings within the main compound, together with the wooden fort (all of which are covered by the certificate of lawfulness) have a cumulative volume of 954.6m³ (a detailed breakdown can be provided if required). The proposed cabins have a volume of approximately 194.1m³ each, giving a total of 970.5m³. The proposed development would therefore result in only a very modest increase of approximately 16m³, which given that the proposed cabins are more contained in terms of their spread than the existing buildings, would not result in a material loss of openness. If the 16m³ of additional built form does prove problematic, we could reduce the scale of one of the units accordingly.'

2.3 The application refers to three permanent buildings comprising a concrete panel shelter and seating area, a shop and a toilet block with washing facility. In addition there are two storage containers and on a separate part of the land a structure known as the fort

2.4 A Certificate of Lawful Development was granted in 2018 under reference SMD/2018/0638. This confirmed that the structures on the land used for the purposes associated with the paintball activity were lawful operational development. However the Council was not able to confirm that any use of the land or structures was lawful as a result of the intermittent use of 'the land' for clay pigeon shooting.

2.5 The application refers to the land being used along with wider areas of the applicant's farm land for clay pigeon shooting known as Kingsley Moor Shooting Ground. Kingsley Moor Shooting Ground relies on the temporary use rights of 28 days per calendar year provided by Part 4 of the GPDO 2015. A planning permission was granted in 1988 to permit up to 78 shoots per year for a temporary period, but that permission expired and was not renewed.

3. PROPOSAL

3.1 The application seeks permission to remove all existing structures on the site and erect five holiday lodges. The lodges have dimensions of 10.2m by 7m and contain 4 bedrooms with bathroom and open plan kitchen, dining and sitting area.

4. RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

- S01 Spatial Objectives
- SS1 Development Principles
- SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- SS6C Rural Area Strategy
- SS 7 Churnet Valley strategy
- DC3 Landscape character
- E 3 Tourism and cultural development
- DC1 Design Considerations
- T1 Development and Sustainable Transport
- NE 1 Natural environment

Emerging Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan

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 agreed by the Council and the subject of public consultation between 18th September 2019 and 31st October 2019. The schedule consisted of modifications that the Inspector has deemed necessary to make the Local Plan sound. Following the consultation, the Inspector concluded that further hearing sessions were necessary to consider; proposals for safeguarded land at Gillow Heath in Biddulph, housing land supply, Local Green Spaces in

Cheddleton (Ox Pasture), Biddulph (Dorset Drive and implications for the emerging neighbourhood plan) and Blythe Bridge. They were held on 4th and 5th February.

On 27th February, the Inspector issued his post hearing advice. Key recommendations in the letter include:

- The proposed safeguarded land at Gillow Health, Biddulph should be removed. Neither should the site be allocated for housing as requested by the landowners as the case for exceptional circumstances has not been met. The land will remain Green Belt as per the Local Plan Submission Version agreed by the Council in June 2018
- No further housing allocations in Biddulph are required
- No further amendments to the housing trajectory are required aside from pushing back the predicted commencement of the Wharf Road, Biddulph site (excluding BDNEW) until 2022/23.
- Monitoring of housing supply will determine if a full or partial Local Plan review is required within 5 years
- Land at Ox Pasture (Cheddleton) and Dorset Drive (Biddulph) should revert back to the Local Green Space designations as per the Local Plan Submission Version as agreed by the Council in June 2018.
- Other modifications were considered during the recent hearings sessions are necessary to make the plan sound, including; updating neighbourhood area housing requirements (Policy SS4) to reflect the latest monitoring data, updating the employment land area for the Tunstall Road allocation to reflect the masterplan and other adjustments to the wording of Policy SS4 and Policy DC2.

No further representations will be sought by the Inspector. As such, the Local Plan policies as proposed to be modified in September 2019 along with the Inspector recommended revisions (February 2020) provide a strong indication of the final policies likely to be adopted in the Local Plan. The Inspector's final report is expected within 2 months and will reflect the post hearing advice. The Council will be able to consider the adoption of the Local Plan at this point. As such, the plan is at a very advanced stage of preparation with some of the key outstanding objections now having been resolved following the February 2020 hearing sessions.

Given the above, the majority of policies (as modified) can be given substantial weight.

Emerging Policies

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

- DC1 Design
- E4 Tourism and cultural development
- SS10 Other Rural Area Strategy
- SS11 Churnet Valley Strategy
- DC3 Landscape impact
- T1 Sustainable access and travel
- NE2 Trees, woodland and hedges

National Planning Policy Framework

5. SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2018/0638 Certificate of Existing Lawful use/development – granted albeit that this confirmed that the structures on the land used for the purposes associated with the paintball activity were lawful operational development. However the Council was not able to confirm

that any use of the land or structures was lawful as a result of the intermittent use of 'the land' for clay pigeon shooting.

6. CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 10th December 2019
Press Advert: 13th November 2019
Neighbour letters: 1st November 2019

Public Comments

None received

Kingsley Parish Council

No objection but recommend a condition that several passing places are provided on the long lane

Natural England

No objection. Do not consider that the development would have any significant adverse impact on the Churnet Valley SSSI. Suggest a CEMP and LEMP be imposed to deal with construction methods and landscape proposals including tree and hedgerow removal

Peak and Northern Footpath Society

No objection. Proposal could affect footpaths 25, 26 and 27. Recommends a condition on any approval that there should not be any obstruction of any public right of way. If this is not possible either temporarily or permanently, a Diversion Order should be sought before development commences.

Environmental Health

No objection subject to conditions

Regeneration Officer

Concern that the existing paint ball business will be displaced as a result of the application without any evidence of lack of demand for this business/use.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

No objection. Advise that the site already has a commercial and leisure use and that there are no recorded injury accidents on Broad Oak Lane and no recorded injury accidents within the last 5 years in the vicinity of the Broad Oak Lane/A52 junction.

SCC Public rights of way

Public Footpath No. 26 Kingsley Parish runs to the south-west of the application site. It does not appear from the application documents that this right of way will be affected by the proposals, however, the attention of the applicant should still be drawn to the existence of

the footpath and to the requirement that any planning permission given does not construe the right to divert, extinguish or obstruct any part of the public path. The applicant should be reminded that the granting of planning permission does not constitute authority for interference with the right of way or its closure or diversion.

It is important that users of the path are still able to exercise their public rights safely and that the path is reinstated if any damage to the surface occurs as a result of the proposed development. The surface of the footpath must be kept in a state of repair such that the public right to use it can be exercised safely and at all times.

The County Council has not received any application under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to add or modify the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way, which affects the land in question. It should be noted, however, that this does not preclude the possibility of the existence of a right of way at common law, or by virtue of a presumed dedication under Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980. It may, therefore, be necessary to make further local enquiries and seek legal advice in respect of any physically evident route affecting the land, or the apparent exercise of a right of way by members of the public

Trees and Woodland Officer

No objection subject to conditions. Advises that there would be no significant loss of, or impact on, the on-site trees. The site is adjacent to a registered Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (Broadoak Wood); Ancient Woodlands are regarded as important and irreplaceable habitat, with local and national planning policies in place to protect them against loss, damage and disturbance. In the case of this application, the proposed cabins would be on previously/currently developed areas close to but outside the Ancient Woodland boundary, and would not have direct adverse impact on the

Ancient Woodland. It is not considered that the proposed holiday cabins would create any additional or intensified disturbance to the Ancient Woodland beyond that which it would replace. The site is screened around its north and east sides by existing mature woodland. The site is sufficiently far from public footpaths to the south and west (c.350m away) with intervening hedgerows and trees, such that the proposed cabins would not have significant adverse visual impact as experienced from these publicly accessible viewpoints. The cabins would anyway replace existing dilapidated paintballing structures.

Staffordshire Wildlife Trust

No objection subject to conditions.

Habitats

The PEA reports an area of poor semi improved grassland that has potential for protected species. This area should be included within an ecological design strategy as an area to be managed and improved, to enhance biodiversity.

Species

Bats

A number of trees on site have been found to contain potential roosting features but these are to be retained. Should this change further surveys would be required. Precautionary

measures will be needed for any external lighting so an approved lighting mitigation plan will be required.

Birds

Habitats on site have the potential to support nesting birds. Mitigation measures should be in place to avoid harm to birds during works. Works should be carried out avoiding the bird breeding season which runs March-September inclusive; Where this is not possible and works are to be scheduled during the bird breeding season, a nesting bird check should be carried out by a competent surveyor. If an active nest is found, the protection of this nest will be required, with an exclusion zone around the nest and access points being used by the birds. This is required to remain in situ until the chicks have fledged and the nest becomes inactive.

Mammal, Amphibians, Reptiles

The PEA identifies some habitats could support mammals, amphibians and reptile species therefore precautionary measures should be adopted during works to avoid any detrimental impacts. The recommendations outlined in the PEA report should be included in a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) to be secured via condition as part of any approval.

The PEA provides a number of enhancement recommendations to achieve a biodiversity net gain. An ecological design strategy (EDS) should be produced that includes the recommendations as far as possible and should be secured via condition as part of any approval.

Recommended conditions

- Artificial lighting plan approved by a suitably qualified ecologist to be submitted
- Bird mitigation measures to protect birds during nesting season
- Provision of construction environmental management plan (CEMP) prior to the commencement of works, to capture the working method recommendations detailed in the PEA, to protect wildlife during construction works.
- Provision of environmental design strategy (EDS) to detail the recommended enhancements recommended in the ecology report are included as far as possible.

Severn Trent Water

No objection

7. OFFICER COMMENTS

7.1 This site lies within the open countryside which is designated Green Belt. Policy SS6C of the adopted Core Strategy sets out the spatial strategy for the rural areas of the District such as this. It confirms that strict control will be exercised over inappropriate development in the Green Belt allowing only for exceptions as defined by Government policy. It says that tourist opportunities will be enhanced in this area by a) supporting sustainable tourist development in the Churney Valley in accordance with Policy SS 7 and b) Outside the Churnet Valley allowing small scale tourism development in line with Policy E 3 and R 1. Policies SS10, SS10 and E4 of the emerging Local Plan do not change this position. The site lies within the Churnet Valley.

The first issue to assess therefore is whether or not the proposal is appropriate development in the Green Belt.

Green Belt

7.2 New buildings are generally inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However paragraph 145 of the NPPF sets out a number of exceptions. It provides at g) for the:

'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would: – not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or – not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority'.

7.3 The applicant seeks to rely on this in deeming the development to be appropriate in the Green Belt. He says that the existing buildings on the site have a cumulative footprint of approx. 402m² and that the cabins have a cumulative footprint of 357m². However when considering impact on openness, the assessment is more than simply a comparison of ground coverage. This was put to the applicant during the processing of the application. who subsequently provided volume calculations indicating that the existing buildings within the main compound together with the wooden fort (all of which are covered by the certificate of lawfulness) have a cumulative volume of 954.6m³ which compares to 970.5m³ for the proposed cabins, an increase of approximately 16m³. The applicant also points to the fact that the cabins are more contained in terms of their spread than the existing buildings. He also says that the scale of one of the units could be reduced to provide a comparable volume and that the height of the cabins is similar to the existing buildings (although no specific details are given). The applicants conclusion based on these figures is that there would be no greater impact on openness.

7.4 However this is not entirely accepted. The majority of the existing structures are rather makeshift in nature, suiting of course the purpose for which they were presumably constructed. In comparison, the proposed lodges would have a more permanent feel and appearance. Furthermore the proposal is for holiday accommodation. Whilst customers using the existing paint ball activity use the existing car park some distance from the application site, it is considered unrealistic to suggest, as the application does, that guests of the holiday accommodation would do the same. Understandably they would want/need to park close to their lodge because they will have luggage/food/drink etc to carry for their stay. The actual parking of vehicles, the provision of more formal access tracks and parking areas together with external lighting required for safety and security, provision of sitting out areas and the general external activity and paraphernalia connected with the permanent use would result in a more intensive development which would, in Officers view have a greater impact on openness than the current loose collection of buildings which have a very informal temporary appearance with in fact no lawful permanent use (see History above). For these reasons the conclusion is that the proposal is inappropriate development and therefore should not be permitted unless there are other considerations which amount to the very special circumstances needed to outweigh the harm and justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt in accordance with Policy SS6C, emerging Policy SS10 and advice in the NPPF. This matter is returned to in the planning balance below.

7.5 Even if one were to accept that this was appropriate development in the Green Belt, which it isn't, it is also necessary to consider whether the proposal for holiday accommodation on the site accords with spatial policies in the Core Strategy and the Churnet Valley Masterplan which generally support sustainable tourism. The site does lie within the

Churnet Valley and therefore Policy SS7 and emerging Policy SS11 are relevant. These policies refer to the Churnet Valley being an area of sustainable development and of support for short stay and long stay visitor accommodation. The CVMP supplements these policies. It provides the framework for achieving sensitive development to ensure that the potential of the Churnet Valley is realised but not at the expense of what makes it special.

7.6 The site lies within/closely associated with the Central Character Area where only minimal development is envisaged which is defined as that which is limited to the conversion of existing buildings, development within settlements in line with the Core Strategy and sensitive development to support/maintain existing facilities. The strategy on which the Churnet Valley Masterplan (CVMP) is based clearly seeks to focus new development in a number of key locations (Moneystone Quarry, Alton Towers, Anzio, Boltons Copperworks for example) with only minimal development elsewhere in order to protect and enhance the natural beauty of the Churnet Valley.

7.7 Applying these policies the proposal does not involve the conversion of existing buildings, the site is not within a settlement and there is no evidence to suggest that it would support existing facilities at the site. It would replace the existing paintball activity on the site but as confirmed in SMD/2018/0638 this is not a lawful use. It is known that a clay pigeon shoot operates on the applicants land holding and includes the application site but there is nothing to suggest the proposal would support this. It is understood that this operates under the GPDO for no more than 28 day pa. The site is some distance from the nearest settlement with services and facilities, Cheadle. No assessment/evidence is provided of public transport availability but even if a limited bus service does exist on the main Cheadle Road, guests are unlikely to walk the not inconsiderable distance to reach the main road and thereafter the nearest bus stop. The applicant refers to the significant economic benefits to the scheme. However these are not quantified and it is difficult to see what significant benefit 5 lodges would bring. There is some mention of the proximity of the site to other destinations. However apart from walking activities in the Churnet Valley including to the Consall Gardens any links with Alton Towers, the Peak District, Kingsley Bird and Falconry Centre would be by car (para 5.2). There are no sustainable linkages to any of these existing attractions or explanation as to how they could be reached. The applicant also refers to the 5 lodges providing a boost to local services such as nearby public houses and restaurants but again this is not qualified or quantified.

7.8 Policy E3 and emerging Policy E4 also relate to the provision of tourism development. It states that such development "*will be assessed according to the extent to which it supports the local economy and promotes the distinctive character and quality of the District and enhances the role of Staffordshire Moorlands as a tourism and leisure destination.*" In addition, new tourist and visitor accommodation should be developed in locations that offer good connectivity, with new build development considered in exceptional circumstances where it is required to "*support or complement existing accommodation, facilities or attractions and there is an identified need which cannot be met in other ways. Preference will be given to buildings which are non-permanent in nature.*" As discussed above the site does not offer good connectivity and there is no evidence to suggest that it will support an existing facility or that there is an identified need to justify new build development in this location. The cabins could not be described either as 'non permanent'. Emerging Policy E4 sets out those circumstances where new tourist accommodation will be supported. However the proposal fails to comply with any of the three criteria because:

- a) The site does not have good connectivity with other tourist destinations and amenities, particularly by public transport, walking and cycling
- b) It is not in or close to settlements where local services, facilities and public transport are available and;
- c) it is not within an area specifically identified for tourism development in the Churnet Valley

Masterplan

7.9 Overall the conclusion is that the proposal would not deliver sustainable tourism. There is conflict with the NPPF and Policies E3, SS7 and the Churnet Valley Masterplan because the proposal would result in sporadic new tourism development which is not related to or necessary to support an existing tourist facility. It is remote from public transport and services and facilities. Furthermore it is contrary to the spatial strategy of the CVMP which seeks to encourage sustainable tourism in the CV but to sensitively manage this so that development is focused on a number of key locations with minimal development elsewhere in order to protect the natural beauty of the Churnet Valley – the very essence which draws visitors to it in the first place. Emerging policies SS11 and E4 do not change this position.

Landscape Impact/ Impact on Ancient Woodland

7.10 As described above the proposed lodges would replace existing structures with five holiday cabins within existing woodland clearing. The Trees and Woodland Officer advises that there would be no significant loss of, or impact on, the on-site trees. He further advises that the site is adjacent to a registered Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (Broadoak Wood). Ancient Woodlands are regarded as important and irreplaceable habitat, with local and national planning policies in place to protect them against loss, damage and disturbance. In this case the proposed cabins are close to but outside the Ancient Woodland boundary and the Trees and Woodland Officer advises would not have direct adverse impact on the Ancient Woodland. He says that the proposed holiday cabins would not create any additional or intensified disturbance to the Ancient Woodland beyond that which it would replace.

7.11 The site is screened around its north and east sides by existing mature woodland. The site is sufficiently far from public footpaths to the south and west (c.350m away) with intervening hedgerows and trees, such that the proposed cabins would not have significant adverse visual impact as experienced from these publicly accessible viewpoints.

7.12 For these reasons the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and no harm to the Ancient woodland. As such the proposal is in accordance with Policy DC3 and NE1 and emerging policies DC3 and NE2.

Design

7.13 The cabins are simple structures of typical chalet style under a pitched roof. They have dimensions of 10.2m by 7m with a height of just over 3 m. Materials are indicated to be timber cladding under a felt roof. There is no objection to the design or materials proposed. The design is considered to accord with Policy DC1. The plans and supporting Planning Statement are silent as to the provision of any car parking adjacent to the lodges. As discussed above it is considered unrealistic to expect guests to walk from the car park with luggage. It is not therefore possible to assess this aspect of the proposal

Amenity

7.14 The proposed lodges are some distance from residential properties and the traffic from 5 lodges is unlikely to give rise to any undue increase in noise and disturbance from comings and goings along Broad Oak Lane which also serves other properties. As noted in the application the paint ball use has operated for some time and the Council has no record of any complaints. The Environmental Health Officer has raised no objection to the application

subject to conditions. With these in place there would be compliance with relevant parts of DC1 and SD4 and the NPPF.

Biodiversity

7.15 The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment which has been assessed by Staffordshire Wildlife Trust. The PEA reports an area of poor semi improved grassland that has potential for protected species. The PEA provides a number of enhancement recommendations to achieve a biodiversity net gain. SWT raise no objection to the application. They advise that an Ecological Design Strategy (EDS) could be conditioned to secure the recommendations of the PEA as far as possible and achieve a net gain in biodiversity. Other conditions could be imposed to mitigate any adverse impact on protected species during and post construction. With these in place there would be compliance with Policy NE1 and the NPPF.

Highway Safety

7.16 The applicant says that the use of the paintball centre is well established and that it generates more traffic movements to and from the site than the five cabins would. Although traffic movements are not clarified anywhere in the application the Local Highway Authority raises no objection to the application. They advise that they have taken into consideration existing/previous uses at the site and the fact that there are no recorded injury accidents on Broad Oak Lane and no recorded injury accidents within the last 5 years in the vicinity of the Broad Oak Lane/A52 junction. The application is considered to comply with relevant parts of DC1 and T1 and the NPPF.

8. CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

For the reasons above there is conflict with the Development plan; the development will not deliver sustainable tourism. The proposal is considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore harmful by definition. It is also considered that there would be some harm to openness. There are no other considerations that amount to the very special circumstances necessary to outweigh this Green Belt harm. Furthermore the provision of new tourism accommodation in this location is not in accordance with spatial Policy SS7 or E3 or the adopted Churney Valley Masterplan. Policies in the emerging Local Plan do not change the position. A recommendation of refusal is therefore made

RECOMMENDATIONS

A) That planning permission be refused for the following conditions:-

- 1. The proposal is considered to amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The applicant relies on paragraph 145 of the NPPF to argue that the proposal amounts to appropriate development in the Green Belt. However whilst a comparison of the existing and proposed buildings footprint and volume suggests that there would be no significant increase, it is considered that the combination of parked vehicles, provision of formal tracks and parking spaces, provision of external lighting and the general external activity and paraphernalia associated with holiday use will result in a development which is considerably more intensive visually than the existing loose collection of temporary buildings/structures which in fact have no lawful use and because of this the proposal would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It is thus inappropriate development and harmful. There are no other considerations which amount to very special circumstances to outweigh**

this harm. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy SS6C of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy DPD, Policy SS10 of the emerging Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan and the NPPF.

2. The site lies within the Churnet Valley. Policy SS7 and emerging Policy SS11 refer to the Churnet Valley being a location for sustainable tourism and of the support for short stay and long stay visitor accommodation. The adopted Churnet Valley Master Plan supplements these policies. It provides the framework for achieving sensitive development in the Churnet Valley to ensure that tourism development is not at the expense of the special qualities of the Churnet Valley. The site lies within/closely associated with the Central Character Area where only minimal development is envisaged which is defined as that which is limited to the conversion of existing buildings, development within settlements in line with the Core Strategy and sensitive development to support/maintain existing facilities. The proposal does not accord with these criteria. Policy E3 and emerging Policy E4 also provide support for sustainable tourism where the site has good connectivity with other tourist destinations and amenities particularly by public transport, walking and cycling; where the site is in or close to settlements where local services, facilities and public transport are available or where the site is within an area specifically identified for tourism development in the Churnet Valley Masterplan. None of these criteria are satisfied and there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal is related to or necessary to support an existing tourist facility. The proposal would result in sporadic tourism development. It would not deliver sustainable tourism. There is as such conflict with the NPPF; Policies E3, SS7 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy DPD; Policies E4 and SS11 of the emerging Local Plan and the Churnet Valley Masterplan.

Informatives

It is considered that the proposals are unsustainable and do not conform with the provisions of the NPPF. It is considered that the applicant is unable to overcome the principle concerns and thus no amendments to the application were requested

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.

