

LAND TO THE NORTH OF THE A51, SOUTH OF CHORLTON MILL LANE AND WEST OF THE RAILWAY, STABLEFORD, HILL CHORLTON

SKYE PROPERTY GROUP LIMITED (MR ADRIAN SYKES)

19/00961/OUT

The application is for outline planning permission for 11 open market dwellings (including 9 self-build) and 21 affordable dwellings (including 13 self-build bungalows and 2 self-build houses). All matters of detail (appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access) are reserved for subsequent approval.

The application site, which measures 2.74 hectares, lies within the open countryside and a Landscape Maintenance Area as indicated on the Local Development Framework Proposals Map.

The 13 week determination period expired on the 25th June 2020 but an extension of time to 13th November has been agreed.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

- **The proposal represents an unsustainable development due to the reliance on the use of private motor vehicles, by reason of the site's location, and the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.**
- **The development would have an urbanising effect on the open countryside and would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.**
- **In the absence of a secured planning obligation the development fails to make an appropriate contribution towards the provision of affordable housing which is required to provide a balanced and well-functioning housing market.**
- **In the absence of a secured planning obligation and having regard to the likely additional pupils arising from a development of this scale and the capacity of existing educational provision in the area, the development fails to make an appropriate contribution towards education provision.**

Reason for Recommendation

The proposal would extend built development into the open countryside and would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. Due to the location of the site away from a higher level of services, employment and public transport links, residents would be dependent on the use of private motor vehicles. The development of the site would also result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

The proposed development would result in additional pressure on school places and in the absence of a financial contribution, such an adverse impact would not be appropriately mitigated against. A planning obligation is also required to secure affordable housing in accordance with policy. Whilst the applicant has confirmed a willingness to enter into a planning obligation, no agreement is currently 'on the table'.

Statement as to how the Local Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner in dealing with this application

Additional information has been sought and received but it is considered that the applicant is unable to overcome the principal concerns in respect of this development.

KEY ISSUES

The application is for outline planning permission for 11 open market dwellings (including 9 self-build) and 21 affordable dwellings (including 13 self-build bungalows and 2 self-build houses). All matters of detail (appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access) are reserved for subsequent approval.

The application site, which measures 2.74 hectares, lies within the open countryside and a Landscape Maintenance Area as indicated on the Local Development Framework Proposals Map.

Although concerns have been raised by residents and the Parish Council regarding drainage and flooding, Staffs County Council Flood Authority are satisfied that subject to conditions, it would be feasible to achieve an acceptable Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme design within the proposed development. Subject to conditions, the application raises no issues of impact on residential amenity, trees or wildlife and therefore the main issues for consideration in the determination of this application are:-

- Is this an appropriate location for residential development in terms of current housing policy and guidance on sustainability?
- Would the proposed development have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area or the wider landscape?
- Would the proposed development have any material adverse impact upon highway safety?
- What, if any, planning obligations are necessary to make the development policy compliant?

Is the principle of residential development on the site acceptable?

The application site lies within the Rural Area of the Borough in the open countryside.

Core Spatial Strategy (CSS) Policy SP1 states that new housing will be primarily directed towards sites within Newcastle Town Centre, neighbourhoods with General Renewal Areas and Areas of Major Intervention, and within the identified significant urban centres. It goes on to say that new development will be prioritised in favour of previously developed land where it can support sustainable patterns of development and provides access to services and service centres by foot, public transport and cycling.

Policy SP3 of the CSS seeks to maximise the accessibility of new residential development by walking, cycling and public transport.

CSS Policy ASP6 states that in the Rural Area there will be a maximum of 900 net additional dwellings of high design quality primarily located on sustainable brownfield land within the village envelopes of the key Rural Service Centres, namely Loggerheads, Madeley and the villages of Audley Parish, to meet identified local requirements, in particular, the need for affordable housing.

Furthermore, Policy H1 of the Newcastle Local Plan (NLP) seeks to support housing within the urban area of Newcastle or Kidsgrove or one of the village envelopes.

Policy HG1 of the CHCMAW Neighbourhood Plan states that new housing development will be supported in sustainable locations. These are;

- Within the village envelope of Baldwin's Gate
- As a replacement dwelling, or limited infill housing or within a built frontage of existing dwellings; or
- In isolated locations in the countryside only where circumstances set out in paragraph 79 of the NPPF apply.

It also goes on to state that to be in a sustainable location, development must;

- Be supported by adequate infrastructure, or provide necessary infrastructure improvements as part of the development
- Not involve the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land;
- Avoid encroaching onto or impacting on sensitive landscape and habitats;
- Not involve the loss of any important community facility

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where there are no relevant

development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in the 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.

(Para 11(d))

Footnote 7 to paragraph 11d states that for applications involving the provision of housing, this includes situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer, as set out in paragraph 73).

The Council is currently able to demonstrate a five year supply of specific deliverable housing sites, with the appropriate buffer, with a supply of 7.3 years as at the 31st March 2019.

CSS Policies SP1 and ASP6, and Local Plan Policy H1 are concerned with meeting housing requirements, but Inspectors in a number of previous appeal decisions, have found that these policies do not reflect an up to date assessment of housing needs, and as such are out of date. However, the overall strategy of directing new development to the larger settlements, which have access to a wider range of facilities, reflects the environmental objective in the NPPF which seeks to protect and enhance our natural environment and make efficient use of land.

Paragraph 103 of the Framework seeks to actively manage patterns of growth to locations which allow a choice of sustainable transport modes, whilst recognising that such options vary between urban and rural areas. Policies SP1, ASP6 and H1 provide for development in the larger rural settlements, which have access to a wider range of facilities. In this way, the policies allow for development to meet rural needs whilst limiting the need for travel. Whilst out of date in respect of detailed housing requirements, the policies are part of an overall strategy which remains consistent with the Framework. In a very recent appeal decision (Ref. 19/00700/FUL) the Inspector gave these policies significant weight.

Policy HG1 of the CHCMAW Neighbourhood Plan which is also concerned with meeting housing requirements cannot be considered to be out of date.

On the basis of the above, NPPF paragraph 11(d) is not engaged.

The applicant submits that given that a large proportion of the development has been allocated to affordable housing, it constitutes a Rural Exception Affordable Housing Site pursuant to paragraph 77 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 77 of the Framework states that in rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. Local planning authorities should support opportunities to bring forward rural exception sites that will provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs, and consider whether allowing some market housing on these sites would help to facilitate this. The NPPF defines rural exception sites as small sites used for affordable housing in perpetuity where sites would not normally be used for housing. It states that rural exception sites seek to address the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection. A proportion of market homes may be allowed on the site at the local planning authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding.

Policy CSP6 of the CSS indicates that within the rural area, where published evidence of need highlights a local need not capable of being met through normal housing provision policy, sites may be released as rural exception sites. It goes on to state that: if such a site cannot be accommodated within an existing village then a site immediately adjoining the village may be deemed appropriate; that the scale of development should not exceed the level of need identified; that schemes should be able to be afforded by local people identified as having housing need; and that they should remain affordable in perpetuity. In dismissing an appeal for 6 dwellings in Mow Cop (Ref. 18/00921/OUT), the Inspector considered that this policy is consistent with the Framework.

In terms of whether there is an affordable housing need, the applicant asserts, using the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), that there is an unmet need for affordable housing in the Borough. Whilst it is accepted that there is a need for affordable housing, in terms of whether the site meets the requirements of CSP6, this site is not within a defined village boundary or immediately adjoining a village.

The applicant also argues that there is significant shortfall of self-build development opportunities in the Borough and that this development would go some way to meet the demand.

Paragraph 61 of the NPPF states that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes). Footnote 26 to paragraph 61 states that under Section 1 of the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, local authorities are required to keep a register of those seeking to acquire serviced plots in the area for their own self-build and custom house building. They are also subject to duties under sections 2 and 2A of the Act to have regard to this and to give enough suitable development permissions to meet the identified demand. Self and custom-build properties could provide market or affordable housing.

Notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph 61 and its footnote, the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas and states that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of local communities. The NPPF sets out that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Turning to the sustainability and accessibility of the site, it is accepted that given the development surrounding the site, the proposed dwellings would not be isolated. However Stableford has no facilities and the shops and services of Baldwin's Gate are approximately a 3km walk away via public footpaths over agricultural land. The nearest bus stop is approximately a 2.3km walk away along the A51 with no lighting and a footway along only part of the route.

The applicant makes reference to an appeal that was allowed last year for 12 dwellings at Croft Farm (Ref. 18/00507/FUL). That site is approximately a 10-15 minute walk from Baldwin's Gate via a public footpath that is well maintained and therefore the Inspector considered that it would be a realistic and attractive walking route for the occupants of the development. In contrast, the current site is much further away from Baldwin's Gate and the public footpath is unsuitable for walking during or following inclement weather and at any time for wheelchair users and those with pushchairs.

Owing to the lack of alternative options, it is likely that occupiers of the proposed dwellings would need to make use of private motor vehicles for most, if not all, trips and therefore would not have adequate access to services by an acceptable choice of modes of travel. The proposal would conflict with Policy HG1 of the CHCMAW Neighbourhood Plan which states that new housing development will be supported in sustainable locations and Core Strategy Policies SP1 and ASP6, and Local Plan Policy H1, all of which direct residential development to larger urban and rural centres which have access to a range of services and facilities. There is further conflict with Core Strategy Policy SP3, which seeks to maximise the accessibility of new residential development by walking, cycling and public transport.

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland.

As stated above, Policy HG1 of the CHCMAW Neighbourhood Plan states that to be in a sustainable location, development must, amongst other things, not involve the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

The best and most versatile land is defined as that which lies within Grades 1, 2 and 3a. An Agricultural Land Quality Assessment based upon a field survey in December 2019 has been submitted with the application which concludes that the majority of the site comprises Grade 2 agricultural land (very good quality) with a small area of Grade 3b agricultural land (moderate quality).

On this basis also, the development is not in a sustainable location.

Would the proposed development have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area or the wider landscape?

Paragraph 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Paragraph 127 of the framework lists 6 criterion, a) – f) with which planning policies and decisions should accord and details, amongst other things, that developments should be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

CSS Policy CSP1 states that new development should be well designed to respect the character, identity and context of Newcastle and Stoke-on-Trent's unique townscape and landscape and in particular, the built heritage, its historic environment, its rural setting and the settlement pattern created by the hierarchy of centres. It states that new development should protect important and longer distance views of historic landmarks and rural vistas and contribute positively to an area's identity and heritage (both natural and built) in terms of scale, density, layout, use of appropriate vernacular materials for buildings and surfaces and access. This policy is considered to be consistent with the NPPF.

Policy NE1 of the CHCMAW Neighbourhood Plan states that new development will be supported that complements the landscape setting and character of the area, preserves or enhances and does not cause significant harm or degradation to the intrinsic rural character and ecological and environmental features of the area. Policy DC2 details a number of criteria that new development should meet if it is to be supported. This includes, amongst other things, that the development reflects local character, maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the landscape and responds sensitively to local topography.

RE5 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance SPD (2010) states that new development in the rural area should amongst other things respond to the typical forms of buildings in the village or locality and that new buildings should respond to the materials, details and colours that may be distinctive to a locality.

R12 of that same document states that residential development should be designed to contribute towards improving the character and quality of the area. Proposals will be required to demonstrate the appropriateness of their approach in each case. Development in or on the edge of existing settlements should respond to the established urban or suburban character where this exists already and has a definite value. Where there is no established urban or suburban character, new development should demonstrate that it is creating a new urban character that is appropriate to the area. R13 states that the assessment of an appropriate site density must be design-led and should consider massing, height and bulk as well as density. R14 states that developments must provide an appropriate balance of variety and consistency.

Although an indicative layout has been submitted to show how the site may be developed, layout, scale, appearance and internal access arrangements are all matters reserved for subsequent approval, and therefore, it is not considered necessary to comment in detail on or consider the layout submitted. Up to 32 dwellings are proposed comprising a variety of house types. The density of the proposed scheme would be approximately 12 dwellings per hectare. Your Officer's view is that given the location of the site, the density of the proposed scheme is appropriate.

CSS Policy CSP4 indicates that the location, scale, and nature of all development should avoid and mitigate adverse impacts (on) the area's distinctive natural assets and landscape character. This

policy is considered to be consistent with the NPPF which states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

Supplementary Planning Guidance to the former Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan, which was adopted in 2001, identifies the site as being within a 'Sandstone Hills and Heaths' landscape character type. It states that this is a landscape varying from intensive arable and pastoral farming. The SPG was used in the NLP to set policies for landscape consideration. This site is within a Landscape Maintenance Area and NLP Policy N19 states that within such an area it will be necessary to demonstrate that development will not erode the character or harm the quality of the landscape.

The site is an open agricultural field within an undulating open landscape with the field patterns, hedgerows and mature trees reinforcing the character of the area. The application is accompanied by a Landscape Assessment which states that the site has medium/high landscape sensitivity to development due to potential loss of its open character. It states that the openness of the site is enjoyed by several local properties on the immediate site boundary that overlook the site and users of public rights of way that cross the site. It asserts that the immediate visual envelope is small and views into site are restricted but acknowledges that the site is partially visible from several viewpoints that are up to 200m away, particularly the northern and central portion which are identifiable by the rising topography and line of mature trees respectively.

The Assessment recommends landscape mitigation measures comprising retention of all the existing boundary hedgerows and site trees and the addition of native tree planting. Screening should be considered from views into the site, in particular those views identified from receptors to the south and east of the site. It concludes that a comprehensive Landscape Scheme would have the potential to reduce the impacts of the development and help mitigate for the loss of openness on the public footpaths crossing the site.

The proposed development would be highly visible from the public footpaths that cross the site and would be visible from various wider views. Although the application asserts that the character of the site is negatively influenced by the detracting elements of the overhead power lines that run across the site and the railway line and its associated infrastructure, your Officer disagrees. A development of this size is at odds with the character of this rural area and therefore would be a very incongruous addition. The change to the rural character of the site would impact adversely upon the character of this part of the countryside.

Would the proposed development have any adverse impact upon highway safety?

The NPPF states that safe and suitable access to the site should be achieved for all users. It advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The most up to date planning policy (contained within the Framework) indicates that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. In 2015 the Secretary of State gave a statement on maximum parking standards indicating that the Government is keen to ensure that there is adequate parking provision both in new residential developments and around Town Centres and high streets.

The application is accompanied by a Transport Statement (TS) which includes a traffic speed survey and information regarding visibility splays. The TS concludes that appropriate visibility can be achieved in both directions and that the small amount of vehicular movements associated with the development can safely be accommodated onto the highway network. The document concludes that the impact of the proposed development on the highway network cannot be considered severe.

The Highway Authority considers that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of the likely impact on the local highway network. However, they recommend that the application is refused on the grounds that the proposed development fails to provide a safe all weather all season pedestrian route to local facilities, services and public transport facilities and as a consequence would increase the likelihood of pedestrian/vehicle conflict resulting in increased highway danger.

Whilst it is not considered that a highway safety reason for refusal could be sustained on such grounds, the lack of access to services by an acceptable choice of modes of travel is considered in detail above.

What planning obligations are considered necessary and lawful?

Section 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations states that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

Certain contributions are required to make the development acceptable. These are the provision of 25% affordable housing and a contribution of £142,578 towards education provision. These contributions are ones which make the development policy compliant and 'sustainable'. They are considered to meet the requirements of Section 122 of the CIL Regulations being necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

APPENDIX

Policies and Proposals in the approved Development Plan relevant to this decision:-

[Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy \(CSS\) 2006-2026](#)

Policy SP1:	Spatial Principles of Targeted Regeneration
Policy SP3:	Spatial Principles of Movement and Access
Policy ASP6:	Rural Area Spatial Policy
Policy CSP1:	Design Quality
Policy CSP3:	Sustainability and Climate Change
Policy CSP4:	Natural Assets
Policy CSP5:	Open Space/Sport/Recreation
Policy CSP6:	Affordable Housing
Policy CSP10:	Planning Obligations

[Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan \(NLP\) 2011](#)

Policy H1:	Residential Development - Sustainable Location and Protection of the Countryside
Policy N3:	Development and Nature Conservation – Protection and Enhancement Measures
Policy N4:	Development and Nature Conservation – Use of Local Species
Policy N17:	Landscape Character – General Considerations
Policy N19:	Landscape Maintenance Area
Policy T16:	Development – General Parking Requirements
Policy C4:	Open Space in New Housing Areas
Policy IM1:	Provision of Essential Supporting Infrastructure and Community Facilities

[Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan \(CHCMAWNDP\) 2019](#)

Policy NE1:	Natural Environment
Policy NE2:	Sustainable Drainage
Policy COM3:	Developer Contributions
Policy DC2:	Sustainable Design
Policy DC3:	Public Realm and Car Parking
Policy DC4:	Connectivity and Spaces
Policy DC5:	Impact of Lighting
Policy DC6:	Housing Standards
Policy DC7:	Renewable Energy
Policy HG1:	New Housing
Policy HG2:	Housing Mix
Policy HG3:	Local Play, Sports and Recreational Facilities

Other material considerations include:

[National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\) \(2019\)](#)

[Planning Practice Guidance \(PPG\) \(2014\)](#)

[Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents](#)

[Space Around Dwellings SPG \(SAD\) \(July 2004\)](#)

[Developer contributions SPD \(September 2007\)](#)

[Newcastle-under-Lyme Open Space Strategy](#) – adopted March 2017

[Affordable Housing SPD \(2009\)](#)

[Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance SPD \(2010\)](#)

[Planning for Landscape Change - SPG to the former Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan](#)

[Waste Management and Recycling Planning Practice Guidance Note \(2011\)](#)

[Staffordshire County Council Education Planning Obligations Policy](#)

Relevant Planning History

None

Views of Consultees

The **Environment Agency** has no objections subject to a condition regarding contamination of controlled waters.

The **Lead Local Flood Authority** raises no objection subject to a condition requiring the submission, approval and implementation of a detailed surface water drainage scheme.

The **Highway Authority** states that the application is acceptable in terms of the likely impact on the local highway network but objects on the grounds that the proposed development fails to provide a safe all weather all season pedestrian route to local facilities, services and public transport facilities and as a consequence would increase the likelihood of pedestrian/vehicle conflict resulting in increased highway danger.

Staffordshire County Council as the **Public Rights of Way Authority** states that there are public footpaths which run through the site and which do not appear on the site plan. The documents indicate that the intention is to divert the footpaths. The applicant should be aware that any planning permission given does not construe the right to divert, extinguish or obstruct any part of the public paths.

The **Landscape Development Section** has no objections in principle to the submitted additional arboricultural information subject to conditions regarding a construction phase tree protection plan, arboricultural method statement, details of special engineering within RPAs and any other relevant construction details, all to BS5837:2012. Open space and play provision should be to Fields In Trust LEAP and LAP standard, and management proposals should be submitted. Concern is raised that the strategic site layout as outlined is fragmented and disjointed. The areas beneath power lines have not been effectively utilised, resulting in what appears to be meaningless vacant areas that are likely to be unusable and visually detractive. The woodland, ecological areas and footpaths should be better integrated into the overall scheme and the play area should be overlooked for natural surveillance. This should be addressed at the outline stage and a comprehensive landscape framework agreed, but if permission is granted then a landscaping scheme should be conditioned that addresses these issues.

The **Environmental Health Division** has no objections subject to conditions regarding a Construction Environmental Management Plan, noise levels, electric vehicle charging points and a lighting scheme.

The **Waste Management Section** states that the layout is very unclear about what surfaces are adopted or to highway standard, and no swept path analysis has been provided. Unless the surface to the properties is adopted or to highway standard, no collections will be made from the front of the individual properties, and instead a collection point will be required where the arms meet the main road through the site. Collection points cause problems where containers cause visibility problems for drivers and pedestrians, but mean that containers tend to be left out between collections, leading to complaints from neighbours. In addition, unless it is clear that a collection freighter can turn around in the development, collection points at the adopted highway will certainly be required.

The **Education Authority** states that the development falls within the catchments of Baldwin's Gate CE (VC) Primary School and Madeley High School. In determining whether there is a need for the

developer to mitigate the impact of this development it was calculated that 28 dwellings would require 6 primary school places and after discounting RSL dwellings from secondary (in line with our Education Planning Obligations Policy) it was calculated that 18 dwellings would require 3 secondary places. These are based on a pupil product ratio (PPR) 0.03 per dwelling per year group. Using 7-year groups for Primary and 5-year groups for secondary. There are projected to be an insufficient number of school places at Baldwins Gate CE (VC) Primary and Madeley School to mitigate the impact of this development at both primary and secondary phases of education.

The primary school education contribution has been calculated as follows: £14,402 (cost multiplier) x 6 (number of places required for development) = £86,412

The secondary education contribution has been calculated as follows: £18,722 (cost multiplier) x 3 (number of places required for 21 dwellings) = £56,166

This gives a total contribution of £142,578.

The **Housing Strategy Section** states that 25% of the dwellings should be affordable housing, with 15% social rented and 10% shared ownership. The units should be integrated sufficiently within the development and should be built to the same standard as the other units on the site.

Severn Trent Water has no objections subject to conditions regarding submission of details of foul and surface water flows.

Staffordshire Police do not foresee any obvious crime or disorder issues arising from the development of this site along the lines of the layout drawing within this application. The area is generally a low crime one and the development would be set back from the main road partially behind a woodland buffer. A number of recommendations are made to reduce criminal opportunity.

Chapel and Hill Chorlton Parish Council objects to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- The site is not in a sustainable location and would be completely dependent on vehicle use to access services.
- There is no safe, adequately lit pedestrian access along the A51 to the nearest bus stop.
- The idea that residents could access Baldwin's Gate via the public rights of way is not practical as this is over agricultural land totally unsuitable in the dark.
- For such an isolated site to be considered, paragraph 79 of the NPPF must apply and be in a sustainable location.
- The proposed pavement to link to Stableford would only serve to link to a small settlement with very limited facilities. Vehicle use is the only practical form of transport in the area.
- There is no bus service and the nearest bus stops are 1.3 miles away.
- The site is a single large field in agricultural use and an agricultural report shows the land to be best and most versatile.
- Drainage from the site could pose a risk of pollution to the Meece Brook.
- There would be a loss of habitat and harm to the night time environment and nocturnal wildlife from light pollution.
- There is no evidenced need for the dwellings.
- New housing should be directed to more sustainable locations in the urban area.
- The layout and design are not in keeping with a rural character.
- Part of the site is prone to flooding.
- The proposal ignores public footpaths that run through the site.
- The Parish Council is disappointed that the developers made no attempt to engage with them and clarity is sought regarding the geographical extent of engagement with local residents.

Representations

Letters of objection have been received from the occupiers of 8 properties, The Stableford Management Company and the Steering Group for the Chapel & Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan. A summary of the comments made is as follows:

- Contrary to policy including the Neighbourhood Plan
- Unsustainable location due to lack of local services and facilities
- Unsuitable pedestrian links to Baldwin's Gate
- Increased flooding
- Highway safety
- Lack of infrastructure
- Loss of agricultural land
- Impact on wildlife
- Adverse visual impact on rural character of the area
- Impact on rights of way
- Lack of meaningful engagement with the local community
- Inaccuracies in the application
- Light pollution
- Failure to demonstrate that the development is a Rural Exception Site

Applicant/agent's submission

The application is accompanied by the following documents:

- Travel Statement
- Transport Statement
- Design & Access Statement
- Phase 1 Contaminated Land Assessment
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Landscape Assessment
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Agricultural Report
- Design Review Panel Report
- Tree Survey
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
- Minerals Safeguarding Statement
- Community Statement
- SUDs Report

All of the application documents can be viewed on the Council's website using the following link:

<http://publicaccess.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/online-applications/plan/19/00961/OUT>

Background Papers

Planning files referred to
 Planning Documents referred to

Date report prepared

28 October 2020