

**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**9<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

<b>Application No:</b>	DET/2022/0044	
<b>Location</b>	Land at Heath House Lane, Lower Tean	
<b>Proposal</b>	Change of Use of agricultural building to one Dwellinghouse (Use Class C3), and for building operations reasonably necessary for the conversion	
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr J Jeffery	
<b>Agent</b>	Richard Pigott Planning Design Practice Ltd., Derby	
<b>Parish/ward</b>	Checkley / Checkley	<b>Date registered</b> 2 <sup>nd</sup> December 2022
<b>If you have a question about this report please contact:</b> Arne Swithenbank tel: 01538 395578 or e-mail <a href="mailto:arne.swithenbank@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk">arne.swithenbank@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk</a>		

**REFERRAL**

The application is a Prior Notification for change of use under GPDO(2015) Schedule 2 Part 3 Class Q and is referred to Committee at the request of Cllr Kate Mills (Cheadle West).

**1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION**

<b>REFUSE</b>
---------------

**2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

2.1 With three sides clad in sheet metal this is a small modern steel framed, open fronted field shelter or store in a field corner position set in some 20m from an entrance gate from Heath House Lane, an unclassified minor road (D1328). The building is 9m x 6m with a further 1.4m canopy overhang to the open front. The heights are 2.5m at the rear and 3.6m at the front inner edge of the canopy which then tilts down slightly to the front. There is a concrete floor with a step down part way along between the left (north west) and right (south east) ends.

2.2 The building stands close to a mature hedge to the rear (north east) and the field boundary to the road is also strongly hedged.

2.3 Land bordering to the rear (outside the application ownership) is shown on the Staffordshire Heritage Environment Record as being "landscape park around Heath House which was in existence by 1836". Heath House is a Grade II\* Listed building (first Listed 1967) some 500m to the NE. The South Lodge to

Heath House stands as a now separate private dwelling some 50m north of the application building and is regarded as being curtilage Listed.

2.4 There are no further near neighbours. The 20<sup>th</sup>C residential fringe of the smaller village of Lower Tean lies across the fields some 400m to the south west.

2.5 There are clear views to the site from the public road junction of Teanhurst Road with Uttoxeter Road.

### **3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL**

3.1 This is a very similar proposal to two previously refused schemes (August and December 2020). The accompanying revised planning statement seeks to address in turn the reasons for refusal of the DET/2020/0053 scheme. A particular difference is that this scheme proposes to extend the side walls to the full extent of an existing canopy across the open front of the building. It had previously been put to this applicant under DET/2020/0018 that doing this would contravene one of the limitations of Class Q – external dimensions not to extend beyond the external dimensions of the existing building “at any given point”. Amended plans were submitted for the DET/2020/0018 scheme and the same were also used in the DET/2020/0053 application omitting this element.

3.2 In addition to the Planning Statement there is a structural appraisal dated March 2020 which had also been submitted with the two earlier applications. Also submitted as an appendix to the Planning Statement is an Inspector’s decision for Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/W/18/3202031 at Hayes Gate Farm, Star Bank, Oakamoor, Staffordshire ST10 3BN.

### **4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 10/00801/FUL – construction of barn/sheep shelter including new access – refused

4.2 11/00067/FUL – construction of barn/sheep shelter including new access – refused

4.3 11/00476/FUL – construction of barn/sheep shelter including new access – approved

4.4 DET/2015/0022 – change of use of agricultural building to a dwelling house (Use Class C3) a Class Q application – withdrawn – the then building was larger than the earlier consents had allowed so was not authorised

4.5 SME/2015/0082 – Enforcement Notice: without planning permission, the erection of a steel framed shed [to the extent that it exceeded the earlier consent]

- 4.6 23rd June 2016 – enforcement appeal decision – the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld. Planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under s.177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.
- 4.7 DET/2020/0018 – prior approval for change of use of agricultural building to a dwelling house including alterations to front elevation – refused August 2020
- 4.8 DET/2020/0053 – conversion of Agricultural Building to a dwelling under Class Q of the General Permitted Development Order – refused December 2020

## **5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION**

5.1 The development plan comprises the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Document SPD/SPG and supporting evidence documents.

### **Local Plan (adopted 9<sup>th</sup> September 2020)**

- SS1 Development Principles
- SS2 Settlement Hierarchy
- SS10 Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
- DC1 Design Considerations
- DC2 The Historic Environment
- DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
- H1 New Housing Development
- NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
- NE2 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
- T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

### **National Planning Policy Framework February 2019**

Paragraph(s) 1 – 14;

Section(s) 4 – Decision making; 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities; 11 – Making effective use of land; 12 – Achieving well designed places; 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

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

- Space About Dwellings SPG
- Design Principles SPG
- Design Guide SPD adopted 21st February 2018

### **Local Plan Supporting Evidence Documents:**

- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008)

## **6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT**

## Public

- 6.1 Neighbour consultations x 24 issued for response by 4<sup>th</sup> January 2023. Site notice posted for responses by 5<sup>th</sup> January 2023.
- 6.2 Representations have been received from 12 members of the public raising issues and queries all in objection summarised as follows.
- The site of the proposed dwelling is inappropriate. It is a green field, a rural location of great character, and the site interferes with panoramic views over open countryside. This is a protected view in the emergent Neighbourhood Plan.
  - The original “agricultural” building built by Mr Jeffery violated the planning permission given in that it was too big, but no remedial work was carried out as requested. There has been no agricultural activity of any kind here since 2015 and Mr Jeffrey has no credible business in farming. There is considerable concern locally that the proposal is disingenuous.
  - The building has no architectural merit and is stylistically inappropriate for a dwelling in this area, let alone this location.
  - This is not a potential “infill” site, it is outside of the natural boundary of the village of Lower Tean and not close to any other housing block.
  - no demand for additional housing in the local area with evidence that nearby new dwellings (less than 1km away) have failed to sell
  - proposal brings no social or economic benefit to anyone.
  - Prime agricultural land and should remain so
  - Height of the agricultural building exceeds regulations
  - Will pave the way to develop the rest of the field
  - The development is very close to South Lodge and will detract from it
  - The site is visible from Heath House, a 2\* listed building of architectural and historical significance.
  - many previous applications have all been rejected. There appears to be no new material modification to the plans.
  - object for reasons of conservation, increased traffic through our village, and the general urbanization of a rural area
  - allowing this would mean others will want to do the same and we will continue to lose our much loved green fields
  - The large wardrobe dressing room looks large enough to be a second bedroom
  - The plans seem odd. Looks superficial – a one-bed shack.
  - Have lived next to this field for 40 years and recently never witnessed any farming activity that would warrant the need for a dwelling.
  - This is clearly green belt land and permission should not be granted.
  - No credible farming on this field for some considerable time.
  - there are numerous brown sites available without encroaching on to prime farming land/green belt unnecessarily
  - the view from this location is also a protected view over open countryside.
  - Nearby 48 houses scheme at Fole Dairy site means no need to build in the open countryside as already more than enough to meet our proposed quota of houses for the parish

- The tall hedge mentioned in the application is transparent in winter, and the site is clearly visible for many months.
- The building in question is totally out of character for the local area and completely inappropriate for the village.
- The proposed change of use is not in accordance with permitted development rights.
- concern locally that the present application is a means to an end....to pave the way for future housing on a much larger scale.
- The building is outside the natural boundaries of the Lower Tean village. It is a fair distance from the village so can't be considered as infill, in fact it will stick out like a sore thumb.
- letter from Staffs County Council states explicitly that the "Site is not in a sustainable location".
- may become part of a bigger expansion if the planning permission was granted
- applicant is a builder living [elsewhere] why would he need a small dwelling here?
- need detailed drainage and flooding plans before more construction in the local area
- appears nothing has changed since the previous applications
- This land is not being used for any farming purposes that requires a dwelling constructed on the land.
- There is an emerging local plan for the Checkley parish [neighbourhood plan]
- Site lies well outside both previous and new proposed village boundaries
- Will also be within an area designated as a protected view. That is the sweeping view across open farmland towards The Heath House, a Grade two listed Gothic Mansion. It is inappropriate for its proposed setting, and will harm the protected view, and the heritage aspect of The Heath House.
- This and previous applications are an attempt to exploit current planning law.
- This application was soundly rejected by the council previously on the grounds of unsuitability and light pollution across the valley. This small parcel of land appears to have no livestock present on the land for any sustained period of time and the caravan situated on the land, to my knowledge, has not been occupied.

### **Parish Council**

- 6.3 Checkley Parish Council: Happy to defer this to the planning officers and DET. The Parish Council would also appreciate that if this application fits the class Q criteria, it is looked at in a positive light.

### **SMDC Waste Collection Services**

- 6.4 No issues regarding waste collections. Bins would have to be presented at the road side.

### **SMDC Environmental Health**

- 6.5 No objection subject to conditions. Opinion is that this application should be subject to a full planning application due to the number of conditions advised to protect the local environment, human safety and neighbourhood amenity.

### **Staffordshire County Council Highways**

- 6.6 No objection subject to conditions. Application site red line does not connect to the highway, though blue line does. Access route is clear. Parking is not specifically shown, but there is adequate space within the blue line to park vehicles. Site is not in a sustainable location. Though as highways have previously recommended approval, for the time being this recommendation will be maintained.

### **SMDC Heritage Conservation Officer**

- 6.7 Objection. There is no real mention of the surrounding heritage assets, their significance, landscape assessment or consideration of setting in this scheme. There are 9 listed structures in this vicinity that are relevant to the proposed development. As a result, I don't feel the significance of this collection of heritage assets has been explored or noted, and therefore NPPF guidance notably paragraph 194 has not been adhered to.

## **7 POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS / PLANNING BALANCE**

### **Policy Context**

- 7.1 In its general approach, in accordance with policy SS1, the Council expects the development and use of land to contribute positively to the social, economic and environmental improvement of the Staffordshire Moorlands. When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. This means that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Core Strategy shall be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 7.2 The Development Plan for the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council consists of the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Document (September 2020) 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'; the adopted Design Guide (2018) a Supplementary Planning Document and the Council's Local Plan Supporting Evidence Document: Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008).

- 7.3 Development boundary mapping has now been adopted in accordance with the new Local Plan (September 2020). The Local Plan places this location in the Other Rural Areas area policy governed by SS10. Policy SS10 for the rural areas is that:
- “These areas will provide only for development which has an essential need to be located in the countryside, supports the rural diversification and sustainability of the rural areas, promotes sustainable tourism or enhances the countryside”.
- 7.4 This application however has been submitted under Class Q of Part 3 to the GPDO (2015) Schedule 2. This is a form of Permitted Development but one subject to the Local Planning Authority making a determination as to certain matters.

### **Principle of Development and Main Issues**

- 7.5 Subject to a series of detailed criteria set out under Part 3 of Schedule 2 to the General Permitted Development Order (2015) Class Q, the conversion of a building *“in use as an agricultural building”* as part of an established agricultural unit on 20th March 2013, or when last in use prior to that, can be converted to a dwelling. Agricultural building is specifically defined at paragraph X to part 3 as one *“used for agriculture and which is so used for the purposes of a trade or business”*.
- 7.6 The local planning authority may refuse an application where, in the opinion of the authority—
- (a) the proposed development does not comply with, or
  - (b) the developer has provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with, any conditions, limitations or restrictions specified in this Part as being applicable to the development in question.
- 7.7 The local planning authority must, when determining an application—
- (a) take into account any representations made to them as a result of any consultation under sub-paragraphs (5) [highways] or (6) [flooding] and any notice given under sub-paragraph (8) [public consultation];
  - (b) have regard to the NPPF(2021) so far as relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval, as if the application were a planning application.
- 7.8 The application building was erected sometime following the 11/00476/FUL consent (27th July 2011) and is known to have been under construction as of 8th October 2011 (LPA air photo archive).
- 7.9 The main issues to consider as set out in the GPDO under Part 3 Class Q are:
- Whether or not the application and proposal details as submitted comply with GPDO (2015) in particular Schedule 2 Part 3 Class Q – permitted change of use;
  - transport and highways impacts of the development;
  - noise impacts of the development;

- contamination risks on the site;
- flooding risks on the site;
- whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwelling houses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order;
- the design or external appearance of the building;
- the provision of adequate natural light in all habitable rooms of the dwelling house;
- provisions of Part 3 paragraph W (prior approval) including “assessments of impacts or risks”.

7.10 In a specific point of detail the application is found not to comply with the Class Q criteria in that Development is not permitted by Class Q if:

(h) the development would result in the external dimensions of the building extending beyond the external dimensions of the existing building at any given point;

7.11 The phrase ‘at any given point’ is very specific. This application proposes an extension to the side walls taking the building forward in its front elevation by c.1.2m. This applicant had submitted a similar proposal with DET/2020/0018 but amended it once the LPA pointed out the requirement and stuck to this revision with DET/2020/0053. The point has been raised again with the agent but this time the applicant has declined to amend the proposal. The issue is that, whilst the canopy could be retained as part of the conversion, the requirement not to extend the building ‘at any given point’ would be directly contravened in the area below the canopy by the additions to the side walls.

7.12 Whether the building was in agricultural use at the relevant date of 13<sup>th</sup> March 2013, and for the purposes of a trade or business, was looked into very thoroughly with the DET/2020/0053 application. Various copy documents detailing a selection of financial payments by Mr B W Jeffery – the then owner / proprietor – were provided. In business terms the transactions are small and of a scale which would indicate a hobby activity. Whether this amounts therefore to ‘a trade or business’ as required under Class Q may still be open to doubt but it appears now evident that Mr B W Jeffery was engaged in farming activity and the 2011 approved field shelter was an application in his name. The payment transaction records provided cover a period overlapping the 20<sup>th</sup> March 2013 date criterion of Class Q. On balance it can be concluded that the building meets this usage test.

### **Transport and highways or noise impacts; Contamination or Flooding risks**

7.13 There being no objection or concerns raised from the Highways Authority (subject to conditions) nor from the EHO (again subject to conditions) there are no grounds for concern in respect to noise or contamination and there are no known flooding risks at this site and therefore no objection under these headings.



**Whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3**

- 7.14 As noted under site description above, the site adjoins land recorded as being of heritage significance as “landscape park around Heath House which was in existence by 1836”. Heath House is Grade II\* Listed and the erstwhile South Lodge to Heath House stands 50m north of the application building and is regarded by the LPA as being curtilage Listed with Heath House.
- 7.15 The Council’s Heritage Conservation Officer has previously advised that the proposal would detrimentally impact on the rural setting of the landscape park and setting of the lodge and southern entrance to the estate. Indeed there is a strong sense of the rural farmland setting at this location, well separated from the defined residential area of Lower Tean to the south west. The introduction of a dwelling with all the inevitable domestic comings and goings and curtilage effects would be likely to noticeably change the ambience of this setting. This is certainly undesirable in terms of protecting the heritage assets and in terms of the NPPF should be regarded as amounting to “less than substantial harm”. The effect may be considered compounded by the inevitable oddities of the design (discussed below) resulting from the forced conversion of a utilitarian farm building never conceived for habitation.
- 7.16 NPPF paragraph 199 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”.
- 7.17 Paragraph 200 goes on to say that: “any harm or loss [to a heritage asset] should require clear and convincing justification.” NPPF paragraph 202 states that: “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.”
- 7.18 Historic Environment Policy DC2 of the Local Plan gives protection to designated heritage assets and their settings and non-designated heritage assets as set out in the NPPF. Accordingly there is found with this proposal to be ‘less than substantial harm’ to the setting of the curtilage listed South Lodge. There is also found to be some harm to the setting of the historic park land to Heath House.
- 7.19 There is also nothing to suggest that there wouldn’t be a continued farming interest in using this building if it were made available.
- 7.20 The Council’s Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment places the location in the Dissected Sandstone Uplands Landscape Character Type (LCT). In terms of Landscape Quality the location is within an area assessed as being of ‘very high’ landscape quality (level 5 in the County-wide context). In

addition this location is noted in the character assessment as being within an area that has the very highest sensitivity to impacts of landscape change.

### **Design or external appearance**

- 7.21 The design is inevitably compromised and restricted by the current building form. Used as a dwelling it would have no connection with local building tradition, ceasing to appear as an innocuous small field shelter which is its evident intended use and function in its current form. Notably this is a point seemingly recognised in the supporter comments saying: “we feel that materials sympathetic to the surroundings must be considered”. The existing materials are not unusual for a field shelter but have no basis in a dwelling. Brought into a habitable use the building would simply seem odd and contrived relative to its surroundings.
- 7.22 The available curtilage cannot exceed 68.4m<sup>2</sup> being the land area occupied by the agricultural building (including its canopy). From within this area some c. 12.5m<sup>2</sup> need to be provided as parking space leaving c.56m<sup>2</sup> which is below the 65m<sup>2</sup> minimum garden amenity space expected by the Council’s adopted space about dwellings standards.

### **Provision of adequate natural light in all habitable rooms**

- 7.23 With, in effect, just two habitable rooms both served by large windows in their south west facing elevation and being of limited depth of 6m away from the large windows there can reasonably be considered likely to be adequate natural light.

### **Other matters**

- 7.24 Some of the representations refer to the land as being ‘green belt’ – in the planning meaning of the term it is not. Several refer to other locations being more sustainable eg in proximity to existing settlement or that brown field sites are more appropriate / and/or are available in the area but the Class Q permitted development rights are not restricted on these grounds. Highways concerns are raised but in the absence of objection from the Highways Authority it would not be appropriate to resist this development on highways grounds. Reference is made to the building at one time having been larger than the approved scheme and comments that “nothing was done”. In fact though, as noted in the report, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council took enforcement action (see 4.5 and 4.6 above) and secured a reduction in building size by requiring the owner to return it to that approved. As regards the Checkley Neighbourhood Plan this was recently approved for public consultation by the Council’s Cabinet (14<sup>th</sup> February 2023) and is therefore at an early stage of consideration and at this stage can only be given limited weight. Some points raised in objection such as the possible financial benefit or otherwise of the development to the owner of the site are not a material

planning consideration. All other matters are effectively addressed in the report discussion.

## **8. Conclusion and Planning Balance**

- 8.1 As discussed in the report it can be accepted that this building was likely to have been in use agriculturally at the relevant date. Whether this amounts to use “for the purposes of a trade or business” may remain open to question as the scale of activity appears not necessarily more than that of a hobby. On balance however it is found appropriate to conclude that the building does qualify on this count.
- 8.2 In the earlier decisions the LPA noted that recent structural strengthening had been carried out and took the view that as this wasn’t part of the building at the relevant date of 20th March 2013 the building had not at that time been one which could be regarded as being capable of conversion. There has subsequently been at least one appeal decision in which an Inspector has concluded that minor operations that would not otherwise have needed planning consent should be discounted. The agent has drawn attention in particular to a Staffordshire Moorlands appeal 3202031 at Hayes Gate Farm, Oakamoor. The point is discussed by the Inspector at paragraph 12 of the decision. The Inspector went on in that appeal decision to assess the degree of building work necessary to achieve the conversion which the Council had contended exceeded that permitted by Class Q which must not amount to a re-build but again the Inspector found this to be within accepted limits. As the degree of work is perhaps similar in this case it is not recommended that the application be refused on this count.
- 8.3 There remain two significant concerns with this proposal and these figured previously in the Council’s refusals. The altered building, changed from its low-key use as a one-time small field shelter to use as a dwelling, would significantly change the character and appearance of the area and in turn bring harm to the setting of the adjacent South Lodge, a curtilage Listed Building to the Grade II\* Heath House and to the general wider setting so as to detract from the historical setting of Heath House and the significance of its parkland surroundings. The small field shelter in its current use is a low-key structure but if the comings and goings and all the activities associated with a dwelling were introduced – such as permanent parking of vehicles, night time domestic lighting, garden and associated outdoor domestic garden furnishings and activities – the agrarian and field nature of the location would be significantly altered. The agent contends that the effects would not be seen in conjunction with the historic landscape and its associated historic buildings and concludes that there would be no harm to the setting of South Lodge or any other designated heritage assets. From a visit to the area however the interconnections of the proposal site with its surroundings become very apparent. The impacts are not neutral and should be assessed as harmful. In the categories set out in the NPPF the development would be regarded as causing ‘less than substantial’ harm. An Local Planning Authority is expected to weigh this harm against any public benefits of the development. In this case

the creation of a single dwelling may be considered to bring some public benefit in terms of housing supply but the contribution – a single dwelling – relative to the overall need can reasonably be considered relatively inconsequential. It is appropriate to conclude that a single dwelling does not outweigh the identified harms to heritage.

- 8.4 The compromised external appearance of the development – a shed brought into use as a dwelling with large glazing panes – has no place or linkage to the rural building tradition and would therefore seem wholly at odds with its location relating neither to its field position nor to any understood expectation of how a residential dwelling may look. The expansive glazing when illuminated from within at night time and winter evenings has the potential to further accentuate the oddity of the building's position and out-of-place form as a dwelling in this location. The agent contends that this reason for refusal goes beyond the criteria to be assessed under Class Q but design and external appearance are an expressly stated consideration set out in the legislation at paragraph Q.2 (f) for the LPA to undertake.
- 8.5 Although the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five year housing supply this is only of partial relevance in this case. The NPPF sets out at paragraph 11 that proposals which conflict with specific policies in the NPPF designed to protect assets, including designated heritage assets, should not be approved where the policies give a clear reason for refusing the development. In terms of the landscape harm to this highest quality landscape, and one found to have the very highest level of sensitivity, the so-called 'tilted balance' should be exercised. It is then a matter of weighing the benefits of, in this case, a single dwelling relative to the harms identified. It is concluded that provision of a single dwelling relative to the overall number required across the District is not of such significance as to outweigh the harm to landscape which have been identified.

## **9. RECOMMENDATION**

### **A. That Prior Approval is required and Refused for the following reasons:**

- 1. The conversion and use of the building and the curtilage for a dwelling at this location would bring about a marked and harmful change to the character and appearance of the rural field agrarian use of the land. Moreover the development would harm the setting of the adjacent South Lodge, a curtilage Listed Building to the Grade II\* Heath House, and to the adjacent surrounding historic park land setting including to Heath House itself. The proposals would cause less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, where no public benefits exist to outweigh this harm. The development therefore fails to comply with Schedule 2 Part 3 Q.2 (1) (e) and procedures in section W (10) (a) and (b) of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (England) 2015 (as amended) and Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan 2020 policies SS1, SS10, DC1, DC2 and DC3 and H1.**

2. The external appearance of the development would be of a compromised design with no place or linkage to the rural building tradition of the area and therefore wholly at odds with its rural location relating neither to its field position nor to any understood or recognised expectation of a residential dwelling. The development therefore fails to meet Schedule 2 Part 3 Q.2 (1) (f) and procedure section W (10) (a) and (b) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) along with Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan 2020 policies SS1, SS10, DC1, DC2 and DC3 and H1.
3. As a development which would result in the external dimensions of the building being extended by additions beyond the forward limits of the existing side walls despite being beneath a projecting canopy the proposal is found not to comply with Schedule 2 Part 3 Class Q paragraph Q.1(h) of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) which states that development is not permitted if the development would result in the external dimensions of the building extending beyond the external dimensions of the existing building at any given point.

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.

### Informative

1. 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 nonetheless met the requirement in Paragraphs 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

## 10. APPENDICES TO THE REPORT

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

<http://publicaccess.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=166984>

# Location plan

